

1,500 election reform bills have been introduced in state legislatures around this nation. The American Civil Liberties Union and other organizations have been filing suits in California and in other states demanding that uniform methods of casting and counting ballots be put in place. I applaud these efforts and I believe that outdated technology is a large part of the problem.

We also need a greater awareness of how our voting system works. We need better and more uniform standards, better enforcement, better education, greater and more convenient access to voting places, and a generally easier and more user-friendly electoral process.

To begin to address these problems, I have introduced several important pieces of legislation. I've recently introduced H.R. 934, a bill that would establish National Election Day on the 2nd Tuesday of November, in presidential election years, as a legal public holiday in order to substantially resolve the serious problem of the lack of time for people to vote or participate in the federal election process, due to employment commitments.

This bill would merely federalize what some states have done with great success so that employees in the private sector will be able to exercise their constitutional right to vote or take part in the electoral process as election volunteers with no restraints.

I've also introduced H.R. 60, the Secure Democracy for All Americans Act, which would establish a five member commission and provide funding necessary to perform a study into federal, state, and local voting procedures in order to produce a report and make recommendations for appropriate legislation and administrative actions. This legislation is greatly needed.

In addition, I've recently founded the bipartisan Congressional Election Reform Caucus, which was established to enable all members of Congress to engage in a serious review and dialogue of the election process in this nation as a recognition of the disenfranchisement of voters because of voter confusion, poor voter machinery and work commitments.

I have also drafted legislation that provides for much needed "provisional ballots" so that people erroneously "purged" or dropped from the voting rolls can register at the polls, vote, and have that vote counted. I am also introducing legislation that would create a uniform voter "purging" requirement, because too many states and localities have confusing and conflicting standards of how long you may remain inactive as a voter before your name is purged from the voting rolls. With my legislation, you would have a single uniform 10 years from the time you last voted until you are purged from the rolls. This makes good sense.

I would also like to commend Congressman CUMMINGS for today introducing electoral reform legislation, and for the commitment to this issue by the Congressional Black Caucus and by the many other members of this Congress who believe in this legislation.

These bills affirm our constitutional right, as citizens of this democracy, to vote and have that vote counted, because if our votes are not counted, our voices are not heard. I hope that in the months to come, our voices will come together in support of common-sense solutions and reform, and bring us closer towards

our goal of equal access and equal justice under the law.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my special order today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

A NEW ERA OF DEFENSE PARTNERSHIP BETWEEN THE UNITED STATES AND INDIA IS ON THE HORIZON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I believe that a new era of a defense partnership between the United States and India is on the horizon. I come to the House floor this evening to discuss the potential for stronger defense ties between these two nations.

This relationship between the United States and India makes sense, and it is time that the world's two greatest democracies come together as natural allies. Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, I would like to see India and the U.S. form a stable defense alliance. Such an alliance would help secure our national security and those of our allies while isolating nations such as China, which pose a threat to India and other Asian democracies.

Assistant Secretary of State Richard Armitage, who called on New Delhi in a visit last weekend, said that he was very pleased with the warm support and cooperation extended by the Indian government on various matters, including defense and military cooperation. Bridging a new defense relationship with India would be remarkable, given the history of this nation's ties with the United States in the past.

During the Cold War, India unofficially joined hands with Russia in the non-alignment movement. This created tense relations between the United States and India, and ultimately the U.S. viewed India negatively. However, the Cold War is over. We have no reason to view India as a threat.

In fact, India and the United States have many similar democratic interests, and as a result, both countries could work together and work together well against the threat from a military buildup in China or from rogue nations in Asia that threaten American interests.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are still reeling from the incident last month when Chinese authorities detained a

U.S. plane and military personnel. This incident and others exacerbate the difference between our democratic system and China's Communist regime. It highlights the need to have India, a stable democracy for over 50 years, as an ally in the region.

It was well documented that the Chinese have transferred missile technologies to rogue nations. The Chinese premier has reaffirmed this during a recent visit to Pakistan, during which he disclosed his commitment to helping Pakistan develop its military.

Threats to U.S. security loom large in Asia. Pakistan is politically unstable, is full of terrorism, as is documented in the U.S. annual terrorism report, and is moving further away from a return to civilian government.

The central Asia region is brewing with the extensive Osama bin Laden networks, which hold another comprehensive threat to U.S. security and regional interests. We do not need to look back too far, just to last year, to remember the tragic incident of the USS Cole.

U.S.-India defense relationships have increased under the Bush administration. This was clearly evidenced in external affairs minister Jaswant Singh's visit to Washington last month when President Bush, Secretary Powell, Secretary Rumsfeld, and national security adviser Condoleezza Rice made commitments to build on our relationship and to increase cooperation on defense and military matters bilaterally.

This is evidenced in the prompt scheduling of the U.S. Joint Chiefs chairman General Henry H. Sheldon's visit to India later this month to discuss high-level military issues between the two nations.

If a U.S.-India defense relationship can be nurtured, I believe it will improve bilateral, commercial, and trade ties and expand our existing investment commitments.

In order for us to do this in a substantial way, we must first remove all remaining sanctions on India. Many American and Indian scholars, as well as officials from the Department of State, have now acknowledged that the sanctions have done more harm to American companies doing business in India than to India itself, and removal of the sanctions will allow us to engage in a more comprehensive relationship with India.

Mr. Speaker, collaboration between the United States and India is moving both countries in a positive direction. As two great democracies, the United States and India are natural allies, and a strong defense relationship is the next logical step in our foreign policy.

1600

BUSH ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the

gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), Chairman of the Committee on Resources.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. MCINNIS) for yielding to me.

Folks in America, of course, Mr. Speaker, realize that today the Vice President of the United States was able to come up with an energy policy that makes an awful lot of sense, and tonight myself and some of my colleagues from the Committee on Resources would like the opportunity to discuss that issue.

It never ceases to amaze me when some of my colleagues or environmentalists lash out at big oil as if it were some diabolical archenemy lurking in the shadows ready to pounce.

It is amusing to watch them stage press conferences to make big oil some sort of bogeyman for environmental problems and for our current energy crisis, and afterwards step into their energy-consuming SUVs or gasoline-powered cars and drive over asphalt-paved roads in their nicely lit, air-conditioned homes which were built and furnished with hundreds of products derived from chemicals, plastics, and other materials because of petroleum.

It reminds me of the story of school children raised in the city, being asked where milk comes from, and having them respond and say well, it comes from the store.

Somehow, I think we are all missing an important step: the production phase. The oil has to come from somewhere. The energy we all consume, the lights in this building to keep the cameras functioning, has to come from somewhere.

As our economy grows, we have children and grandchildren and they grow up, receive educations, get married, get jobs, raise families. Where are they going to get the energy that sustains life, warms their homes, and transports their children to school? Where are we going to get our energy and what are we going to do about the current building energy crisis?

Many of my environmental friends say that we really do not need to focus on production of more oil or energy sources because of various environmental concerns. Usually urban dwellers, these individuals assert that conservation is the answer.

Harkening back to the days of Jimmy Carter, when we were told just to turn our thermostats down and put on a sweater, I do not believe that we can conserve our way out of this situation. It did not work in Jimmy Carter's day, and with even more demands today it certainly will not be the only answer.

Yes, we can and should do all we can to not be wasteful in our homes and at

work. We should all turn off lights that we are not using, install more fuel-efficient heating and cooling systems, and encourage the development of alternative fuels and more fuel-efficient vehicles.

But is the answer to our current crisis for all to rush out and purchase hybrid gas-electric vehicles that are small, underpowered, and fail to meet even the most basic transportation hauling requirements of the typical American family, let alone thinking about buying one of these vehicles to pull our boat down to our favorite lake, camping trailer to our favorite campground?

It would probably pull the bumper right off the car while sitting in the driveway. We are not there yet, and we have a long ways to go.

Those of us from the West know all too well the hurt that the lack of energy and increase in oil and gas prices is causing our economies. We in the West often have to travel dozens of miles and hours at a time just to commute across long distances between our communities.

In the First District of Utah that I represent, it would take nearly 7 hours, traveling at the legal speed limit from between 65 to 75 miles per hour, to travel from the northern border of Utah to the southern border, a distance of over 400 miles.

Often, our communities are spread across vast distances, and the only viable option for transportation has to be using motor vehicles. The skyrocketing price of fuel has hit them especially hard. They do not have the option, as urban dwellers in the East may have, to take mass transit or ride a bicycle to work.

For the sake of our quality of our life, our jobs, our economy, we have to begin to really address the energy problem that we are facing in this country.

Much of what we are facing in this country, I believe, could have been prevented or mitigated significantly if the previous administration had not been, to use the words of former Secretary Bill Richardson, asleep at the wheel on energy policy.

Over the last 8 years, I watched as the previous administration basically took their marching orders from the extreme environmentalist lobby, and whether it was through executive order or by promulgating new regulations, locked up millions of acres of public lands to any reasonable energy development.

Mr. Speaker, I watched with concern as the Clinton administration let our Nation drift from less than 33 percent dependence on foreign oil when he took office to more than 50 percent today. I believe the figure is 57 percent.

President Bush has taken over the reins of government and has been left one messy problem to clean up regarding energy.

For 8 years, all we got was poll-driven photo-ops, like the infamous release of millions of gallons of water to float a kayak down the Connecticut River in order to provide a nice picture of Vice President Gore in his election efforts. All we got was President Clinton dispatching then-Secretary Richardson to the OPEC masters to literally get on his knees and beg and beg them not to raise oil prices.

America deserves better, and I am glad that President George Bush has made development and implementation of a coherent and comprehensive long-term strategy on energy as one of his very top priorities.

I just met with President Bush this week, and I know that President Bush and Vice President CHENEY understand the complexities of this issue. They are committed to working with Congress to come up with the tools that are needed to fix the problem. But there is no easy fix.

We must all recognize that natural resources are to be actively managed and wisely employed to advance the human condition.

We must have a policy that balances competing goods of environmental preservation or restoration, while ensuring public access and outdoor recreation to our public lands.

America needs balanced conservatism that recognizes man's role as God's steward, not the extreme environmentalist view that it too often views as the problem.

Just like the urban school child who may think that milk comes from a carton and not a cow, we as Americans need to look beyond the overinflated rhetoric of extreme environmentalist alarms that the Earth is in the balance, and educate ourselves on where our energy comes from and what the options are for our future.

We need to separate facts from assertion and science from political dogma. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to working with this administration as chairman of the Committee on Resources to do our part.

We all have been affected by rising energy prices, not just California. Wyoming Governor Jim Geringer recently recounted to the House Committee on Resources the story of a distraught elderly woman who called a Wyoming county commissioner in tears because her natural gas bill to heat her modest home was \$500 a month and her Social Security check, which she relied on to provide medicine and food, was only \$600.

The crisis is hurting the elderly, the poor, farmers, and small business owners. Small family farmers, who are our Nation's real endangered species, are feeling the crunch of huge increases in diesel fuel to power their tractors. The fertilizer they use, which is a petroleum-derived product, has skyrocketed even as commodity prices have remained low or fallen.

It will be a miracle if many more of them hang on and survive in the next few months.

What about the trucking industry? We all benefit from a strong and robust trucking industry. The fresh food and produce we buy at our local supermarkets is made possible only because of truckers. If they were to shut down for even 1 week, our Nation would be in a lot of distress. Their costs for fuel have skyrocketed, along with everyone else.

What is the effect? Who pays for all of these increased costs? In the short term, the truckers and farmers must pay these large costs, and it is hurting them big time. In the long run, we all pay for these increased costs.

Petroleum products make up such a large percentage of everyday life, so many things we totally take for granted, so that it will not take long until we see these negative effects.

We must take action. We must do it today, Mr. Speaker. Vice President CHENEY's energy task force report points the way to a long-term solution to our energy crisis that includes conservation but goes further to include more research into clean, renewable energy sources and increased production of hydropower, nuclear energy, gas, oil and coal.

I am sure Congress will follow this plan closely this summer in preparing a package that provides reliable, affordable, and environmentally-clean energy for decades to come, while maintaining consumer choices in our standard of living.

Right now our Nation's energy problems have taken on an urgency we have not seen for almost 30 years. For the first time in memory, demand for electricity in the West this summer is expected to exceed maximum output. Demand could exceed supply by as much as 7,000 megawatts during parts of June, July, and August.

The production strain on the power grid will be so great that several hot days or a power plant failure could trigger outages that would cascade like dominoes through the West.

Shortages are coupled with soaring prices. Gasoline is already over \$2.70 a gallon in some parts of California. We have all heard predictions of \$3 a gallon in California and the Midwest before the summer is out.

Al Gore's book, *Earth in the Balance*, called for those higher gas prices, which may explain one reason why the previous administration did nothing to forestall this crisis.

Natural gas prices jumped sharply this winter and will jump again this summer when natural gas is used at its annual peak. These prices have already driven up the costs of goods, services, and housing across the country.

Skyrocketing prices threaten small business. They threaten the health of the ill and the elderly who must choose

between livable temperatures or buying food. Low-income families, anxious to keep infants and small children comfortable, have already tapped out most State and local emergency assistance programs.

The crisis did not happen overnight. It took us a lot of years to get there. It has been 20 years since a large refinery was built in the U.S. and more than 10 years since a power plant was built in California, even as the population there continued to increase dramatically.

We have neglected energy production and infrastructure. We are producing 30 percent less oil now than 30 years ago. Natural gas development on public lands is down by 14 percent, and we need at least 38,000 miles of pipeline to deliver the natural gas we need.

Our new economy runs almost entirely on electricity. Yet, according to the Edison Electric Institute, investment in our transmission system has declined by 15 percent a year since 1990, while use has jumped 400 percent in the last 4 years alone.

Our transmission grids across the country need repair, updating, and expansion. The Bonneville Power Administration provides affordable power to hundreds of towns and western cities. But Bonneville Power has not added new transmission lines in the system in 14 years, and much of its grid is 30 years old.

Bringing the system up to an adequate capacity will cost an estimated \$775 million. The strategy in the Bush energy plan is both comprehensive and long term.

The Bush administration recognizes that hasty, short-term fixes threaten both our economy and environment. Decisions made in a crisis prompt us to waive environmental regulations.

In the late 1970s and 1980s, after a profound energy price shock, the Federal Government established the Energy Mobilization Board to override Federal, State, and local environmental laws that got in the way of energy production. Right now, Clean Air Act limits are being waived in California in a rush to avert a large disaster. By focusing on diverse long-term solutions, the Bush energy plan avoids these kinds of choices in the future.

Short-term fixes also threaten our economy. Upgrading and expanding our infrastructure requires investment money. Yet utility companies are reporting that Wall Street is alarmed by talk of price caps in California.

They are understandably hesitant to invest in companies that could be impacted by these price caps. We desperately need to invest in our Nation's energy infrastructure, fully and with confidence. We must avoid short-term fixes that pose long-term threats to our economy and environment.

The Bush energy plan calls for prudent streamlining of the process for li-

censing new nuclear plants and the recycling of hydropower plants.

Mr. Speaker, I am a big fan of nuclear power. Regardless of what the American public has been led to believe by the likes of the Hollywood bunch or antinuclear activists, new technologies and nuclear power have made it the most safe, affordable, and environmentally friendly form of energy.

New technology for reprocessing spent fuel rods exists and is improving. Nuclear power accounts for only 20 percent of the U.S. power supply. Yet in Europe, it is 35 percent. In France alone, it is 70 percent. This energy is clean, economical, and safe.

We have not had a new nuclear reactor built in this country in more than 20 years. It is time we stop letting inflammatory rhetoric and fear tactics of uninformed special interest groups stand between us and one of the best energy sources we have.

We must reduce the time and costs of relicensing hydroelectric plants. The previous administration created a battery of new Federal dam regulations aimed at wiping out hydropower.

Recent events have proven the previous administration to be foolish in this regard, but those regulations still stand today, and we have to do something about them. Because of them, towns and cities that own dams must spend years and millions of dollars to relicense their dams and meet several dozen new, stringent environmental requirements. One of those dams is the Cushman Dam owned by the city of Takoma, Washington.

This dam generates enough power to light 25,000 homes for a year. The previous administration would not let the city relicense its dam unless it met several dozen new environmental requirements that will cost tens of millions of dollars. That city is now fighting in court for the very survival of the primary power source.

□ 1615

In Utah and Arizona, Lake Powell produces tremendous amounts of clean hydropower. Yet, extreme environmental groups like the Sierra Club are advocating working toward decommissioning the dam and draining the lake, all to let a river run through it. Yet, to make up for the lost electricity, it would take at least five coal-fired generating plants.

Sometimes we are not too smart on how we approach complex problems. Hydropower is clean and renewable, and we must do more, not less, in that area. We need to maximize power generation of Federal Bureau of Reclamation dams, even as the previous administration put regulations in place that placed power generation at the very bottom of a long list of other priorities.

The Bush energy plan calls for opening a small percentage of the Arctic

National Wildlife Refuge for oil exploration and development. I totally support it.

Despite the doomsday slick commercials one sees on TV by some groups, I know it can be done in an environmentally sensitive manner. The vast majority of the refuge would remain off limits to oil production.

Current estimates suggest the oil we can gently distract from ANWR would replace Iraqi oil imports for the next 58 years. That is not just a 6 months of oil, as some special interest groups would have us believe. We are talking about replacing the oil we receive from one of the most hostile foreign governments.

Oil development on the coastal plain of ANWR will only impact 2,000 acres of 19.6 million acres. It would provide an estimated 735,000 well-paying jobs.

We have new technology to tap oil and gas in a way that protects the Arctic tundra and nearby wildlife.

ANWR is not only rich in oil but is rich in natural gas.

Mr. Speaker, in October of 1996, then-President Clinton announced that he had created the Grand Staircase Escalante National Monument, and with one fell swoop of his mighty pen, and without so much as a scintilla of input from any elected official from the State of Utah, locked up a million acres of public lands from future coal or energy development.

That is my home. I know a lot about southern Utah. I have lived there all of my life. I can tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, we locked up a trillion tons of low-sulfur coal that could be used and done in an environmentally sound way.

Mr. Speaker, President Clinton had made the statement when he announced it, he said "We can't have mines everywhere." No. Mr. Clinton is right. We cannot have mines just anywhere, just where it is there. Just like Willy Sutton was quoted as saying, when asked why he robbed so many banks, he said "because that's where the money is". The reason we have mines in places is because that is where the ore is.

By locking up the Grand Staircase, our Nation has lost a mammoth reserve of high-Btu, low-sulphur coal that could power hundreds of cities in this country for centuries to come. The impact on the surface of the site would be almost negligible.

In conclusion, let me just say the future is bright. I know Americans know how to handle a problem when they see it coming, but they want somebody who will give them some direction. American people are bright, and they are patriotic.

As President Bush and Vice President CHENEY said, we have got a plan for you; we can make it work. I think the American people will realize we all have to sacrifice a little bit; but in the long run, we will be better off. It is the

people who never have a plan, who are asleep at the switch, who are the ones, who have given us trouble at this time.

Now is the time for America to say here is a good plan, let us get behind it, and let us follow it.

ENERGY CONSERVATION

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, let me tell my colleagues, in my opinion, the biggest problem we have got out there is not so much the immediate energy crisis that we now face, it is the fact of our dependency upon foreign countries for our energy needs.

Right now, today, as we speak, 60 percent of our energy requirements come from foreign countries. We cannot afford for the future of this country, for future generations, for planning the future progress of this country to continue to increase our dependency or, in fact, to continue to have our dependency at a 60 percent rate. It puts this country in high danger of energy espionage or energy blackmail.

We cannot continue that path of going down that direction because the direction or the result of where that leads us is not good for future generations.

There are two separate ways, two methods to address our dependency on foreign oil. One of those methods, of course, as we have heard from the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN), the previous speaker, is more exploration. We have got to find more of our own energy resources.

But the second one, and this was highlighted today and it has been highlighted again and again and again, is conservation. Conservation is something that everybody in America can practice this minute, this hour.

Those of us on this floor, those of us across this country, as we hear these comments, we can begin to conserve energy. We can begin to become less dependent on foreign oil by exercising a little individual responsibility ourselves.

I will give my colleagues an example. Right now our latest census, I think, showed our population at about 282 million people. Can one imagine how much energy we would save if 282 million people that were using lights turned off the light as they left the room. Think of the instant savings in electricity.

If we had 282 million people who combined trips to the grocery store every week, every Sunday, if these 282 million people took a look and said, all right, we ought to have our groceries. Here is what we need this week. Let us go to the grocery store once instead of three times, or let us go twice instead of three times.

Now, obviously we do not have a clear factor of 282 million people because we have young people and there are people that do not drive, et cetera. But my colleagues understand the point.

Imagine how much water we could save, how much energy on water heaters we could save if, instead of running the garbage disposal with hot water, we ran our garbage disposal with cold water, if these millions and millions of people ran that garbage disposal for 20 seconds, which really in most cases is adequate to dispose of the garbage that one has, instead of continuing to allow the water and the electricity generating, running the garbage disposal to run for 60 seconds or 70 seconds.

We can conserve as the citizens of this country. We can contribute to help alleviate this problem. I have got a couple of examples. Now I am not going to go through all of these because I have several of my colleagues that I think have very important points to offer. But there are some key conservation areas that I am asking those of you who are hearing me, who are listening to go ahead and deploy yourself this evening in your own home. Set an example in your own home.

The best thing you can do when you go home this evening, most of us use ceiling fans for cooling in the summer. In the summer, make sure your fans are running in a clockwise direction. Clockwise. Because that is what pulls the cool air off the floor.

So when you go home this evening, look at your ceiling fan. Most ceiling fans will run both directions. I would guess that many of you today, when you go home, will find out that your fan is actually going counter-clockwise. If you move it, simply one flick of the switch to clockwise, you have done something today to help conserve energy in this country.

Many of you own automobiles. I would bet most of you who own an automobile have not read your owner's manual; or maybe when you purchased the car, in my particular case, several years ago, you read the owner's manual then, but you have not looked at it since.

Take a look at your local newspaper. Your local quick lube. They say change your oil every 3,000 miles. Do you know what the experts say, that major automobile company that designed your automobile, that were in charge of the manufacture of your automobile? More likely than not, you are not required to change your oil every 3,000 miles. In fact, if you look at your owner's manual tonight on your way home from work, I will bet you it says in your owner's manual change the oil every 5,000 miles or every 6,000 miles.

Do you know that, if we could get people to change their oil when the owner's manual tells them to change their oil instead of changing their oil when the marketing enterprises out there, the quick lubes tell you to change your oil, we could save a minimum, a minimum in this country of 11 million barrels of oil a day. We could start today.

There are a number of different things. Do you know how much energy we could save if people simply closed the refrigerator after they walked away from it, if people shut off the air conditioner when they were not going to be home?

A lot of us want to help get this country out of this problem. A lot of us in our hearts, we do not have it in our hearts to waste energy. We have it in our heart to be good citizens, and good citizens help conserve energy.

Let me just summarize it like this. I have had a number of constituents who have said to me, gosh, it is going to take a while for us to get electrical generation in place ready to go. It is going to take a while for us to find additional energy resources so that we can lessen our dependency on foreign oil. What can we do in the meantime?

Again, let me repeat to all of my colleagues, as we leave these Chambers, we can help immediately by turning out lights, by not changing that oil every 3,000 miles, by making sure that the direction of the ceiling fan is going as it should go.

I myself this morning, as I walked into my office, it is routine for me when I get to my office to turn on all the lights in my office. But for the first 2 hours I am in my own office in the morning, I sit at one location in my office; and I read newspapers. I only need one light. I do not need six lights. This morning in my office, I only had one light on, not six lights. The rest of my colleagues can do that as well.

So my contribution to these comments this afternoon is let us all contribute today to conservation. That is exactly what the Republican plan calls for. That is exactly what our President and our Vice President have said.

Again, we need two elements to lessen our dependency on foreign oil. We need to look for other energy resources. There is no question about it. We need to do it in an environmentally clean and safe manner. But we also need to conserve. If we combine those two elements, this country will, I think in a modest period of time, fairly quickly move out of this energy crisis, and we will be secure with energy for the future generations. That is what is critical.

ENERGY SHORTAGE MAY BE MOST SERIOUS PROBLEM FACED IN YEARS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BALLENGER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PETERSON) is recognized for 31 minutes, the remainder of the leadership hour.

Mr. PETERSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the problem facing this country, an energy shortage, may be the most serious problem we have faced in years. The California brownouts are

only a symptom of a huge energy shortage that is prevalent in this country.

Ten dollar oil and a dollar per gallon gas lulled this country into a comfort zone that all is well with energy availability.

The Clinton-Gore administration, unfortunately, had no energy policy. The Clinton-Gore administration sold that conservation, and conservation is appropriate, and renewables would gradually replace fossil fuels. Yet, they supported new difficult regulations that made it almost impossible to realize this hydro, the most prevalent of renewables.

The Clinton-Gore administration sold that conservation renewables would gradually replace fossil fuels. Yet their regulations and policies did not support the relicensing of hydro, the most prevalent renewable source. They certainly did not propose the renewal or to make it easy to renew the operating license of existing safe nuclear plants. In fact, in reality, the Clinton-Gore administration started phasing out fossil fuel production before there was a replacement available.

So today we have a shortage of almost all kinds of energy. When one looks at how we make electricity today, 52 percent of our electricity comes from coal; 20 percent comes from nuclear, but most of those plants need to be relicensed and many felt it would be unable to relicense them in the last administration; 7 percent comes from hydro, and many feel it is going to be very difficult under the last administration's rules and regulations to relicense hydro, the most available renewable energy we have and the cleanest. Natural gas currently powers 16 percent of electric generation; oil, 3 percent; other renewables, 2 percent.

Now, we need to continue on the other renewables. We need to continue with solar and wind and geothermal. But if we double it, it will only produce 4 percent of our electricity. If we triple it, it will only produce 6 percent of our electricity.

□ 1630

In the next 20 years America's demand for oil will increase by 33 percent according to the Energy Information Institute. We are increasingly dependent, as we have already heard, on foreign governments for our oil. Back in 1973, when we were in crisis, we imported just 36 percent of our oil from overseas. Today we are somewhere between 58 and 60 percent. The number of U.S. refineries has been cut in half since 1980. A few have expanded, but no new ones have been built.

Then we come to natural gas. Consumer prices for natural gas have spiked this year. Home heating costs have doubled. I know industries who use a lot of gas who had their rates double, triple, and quadruple. Amer-

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

In fact, one of my fears, one of my personal fears that I have been observing for the last couple of years is the amount of gas we have allocated to generation, because it is the quickest to build and it is the cleanest fuel we can burn to make electricity. The amount we have allocated to generation is greater than the amount that is being predicted to come into the system.

What happens when we use more than we have? The prices are going to escalate. It is the one fuel that worries me because it is what most American seniors use to heat their homes. It is what most American businesses have as the fuel that runs their business. Our hospitals and our schools and our universities, most of them use natural gas. If natural gas prices spike excessively again this year, we will have a huge heavy load placed on business, we will harm the economy, and we will force seniors to not be able to live in their homes.

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. When we look at the map, the whole California coastline is closed, the whole eastern coastline of this country is closed, all of the area around Florida is closed; and yet other countries drill all around their shorelines and use natural gas as their heat. I guess Norway is one of the best at it.

Even if we find supplies of gas, moving it to market will require an additional 38,000 miles of pipeline and 255,000 miles of transmission line at huge costs.

Electricity, hydroelectric power generation, as I said earlier, is expected to fall sharply because of relicensing. Coal has historically been America's one source for affordable electricity. It currently powers half of America's electricity generators. Our Nation has enough coal to keep those plants running for 250 years. In fact, we have 40 percent of the world's coal, and we have 2 percent of the world's oil. It seems to me that coal should not be in a phase-out mode, as it has been with the past administration. We must use clean coal technologies to ensure this country's future for energy in the future.

Coal generators have already been required to make broad reductions in emissions. The Bush administration supports these efforts and will back it up with greater incentives for investments in clean coal technology. President Bush made the right decision not to impose new Federal mandates on the emissions of carbon dioxide. That is