

the same gas we breathe out when we breathe. There are those who have criticized him for that. If he had allowed those regulations to come into place, coal use in this country would have come to a screeching stop because there is no replacement for it.

If America is to continue to have reliable electricity over the next 20 years, coal must play a continued role. If coal does not play a major role, from my point of view, this country will have very high energy prices and this country will face an economic recession. Nuclear power and hydroelectric face uncertain futures due to past policies. Hopefully, they will not under this new administration.

I am encouraged by the recommendation of the energy plan to increase our domestic energy supply by utilizing our public lands in a reasonable manner. Our Nation's public lands could and should play a role in sustainable energy policy. Thanks to so many new incredible developments in energy research, exploration and technology over the last 20 years, we can confidently explore for oil and gas and coal on our public lands in an environmentally-sound manner without leaving anything other than a small footprint.

The Federal Government owns one-third of this country; yet there are those who are opposed to use of public lands for energy production. One-third of America is owned by the Federal Government, and when we add State and local governments, somewhere between 45 and 50 percent of this country is owned by government. If all that land is going to be locked up to resource use, this country does not have an economic future.

Yes, ANWR is one of the areas where there is lots of discussion. The Energy Department says the coastal plain of ANWR is the largest unexplored potentially productive onshore basin for oil and gas in the United States. ANWR could contain enough oil to offset all Iraq imports for the next 46 years. Oil production in Alaska's Arctic occurs under the world's best environmental standards. Many of the countries we rely on for oil have little or no environmental regulations.

Oil development is strongly supported by the Eskimo people who actually live on the north slope of Alaska and by 75 percent of all Alaskans. Exploration would be done using 21st century technology, supercomputers, ice roads that melt in the spring, and directional drilling. Only 3 square miles of the coastal plain of the 30,600 square miles of ANWR would be affected. Only 3 square miles. That would leave 30,597 square miles untouched.

I certainly think for the future of this country, having a strong energy source, and none of these are a silver bullet, none of these solve the problem; but we need them all. It is the equiva-

lent of building an airport one-fifth the size of Dulles in the State of South Carolina. The caribou herd in and near the Prudhoe Bay oil field is five times larger than when development began. All other wildlife species are healthy, no endangered species. Contrary to the myth the environmental extremists created, there is no north slope oil being exported. None has been since May 2000. When it was exported, no more than 5 percent was sold abroad. This is less than exported by the West Coast of the United States.

We barely think about the plight of the American farmer, but agriculture is paying huge costs because of energy. The cost of fertilizer has risen. In fact, some fertilizer plants have actually gone out of business. Some fertilizer plants sold their gas this year because they could make more money in selling the gas than producing the fertilizer.

We have not built a refinery in this country since 1976. In fact, 36 U.S. refineries have closed since 1992. We have not built a nuclear reactor in 20 years. California has not built a power plant of any sort in 10 years. According to Edison Electric Institute, our investment in our electricity infrastructure has dropped 15 percent since 1990; yet use of that system has jumped 400 percent in just the last 4 years. Most of the new plants built in this country are being fueled by natural gas, but we need to have the natural gas to run them.

The future of America depends on an energy policy. I have strong faith in the Bush administration and their proposal to take us where we need to be. There should be debate. Conservation should lead the road. We all need to get into the conservation business. We must use our energy wisely, but we must have a strong source of energy so that we have choices and people have options.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

#### ENERGY CRISIS IN CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) is recognized for the remainder of the leadership hour, 21 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, I am obviously from California, and I would like to talk about some of the problems that we have in California. They are obviously well publicized. Some of the things people talk about are true, and certainly some things are not true.

First, I would like to congratulate my home State of California. No State uses less electricity per capita than the people in the State of California. I think many people may find that as a surprise, but that is the truth. No State uses less electricity per capita than the State of California.

No State uses more renewable energy than any State other than California.

California has been a leader on wind. Right in my own county, Riverside County, in the Banning Pass, if any of my colleagues have been to Palm Springs, they can drive down the I-10 freeway and see row upon row upon row of wind machines that supply needed peaking electricity to Southern California.

No State uses more solar power than the State of California. We have really invested a significant amount of money in California into solar research and the utilization of solar power.

No State uses more geothermal than the State of California. Really, the geothermal industry started in Imperial County, California. If my colleagues go down into Imperial County near the Salton Sea in the beautiful State of California, they can see these huge geothermal plants that were developed to produce electricity.

All of that in California. People in California doing the best they can to conserve electricity, to use renewable energy in California. But today we know that that is still not enough.

Now, there have been reports that California has not built a power plant in 10 years. That is not true. I do not want to correct some of my friends, but we have built power plants in California in the last 10 years. Not large power plants. Certainly there have been power plants built outside of California that import power into California.

I congratulate Los Angeles, the Department of Water and Power, who gets a significant amount of their electricity, the City of Los Angeles, a significant amount of their electricity from the State of Utah using coal, the clean coal that the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) talked about. And I congratulate Mayor Riordan who now is in negotiation with the people in Utah to develop additional plants, one plant that was discussed as large as 3,500 megawatts in the State of Utah, to transmit power into Los Angeles for future demand. That is necessary along with plants being built in California.

Certainly natural gas has been talked about. It is the preferred fuel source in California. But we have a problem in California, in not being able to get enough gas into the State of California because of all of these gas turbine plants that are being built. There have been a lot built of late and a lot more coming online. And we are happy to have them, but we do not have enough natural gas distribution coming into the State of California, which is adding to the increased price of natural gas within our State. So we have an infrastructure problem, not just with gas pipelines coming into California, but with the infrastructure around refineries. Refineries have been talked about. We have far less refining capability in California than we used to have.

California is well known because we have a lot of people, 35 million people. We certainly have a significant number of them living in the L.A. Basin and we have air quality issues. We have done a great job of cleaning up the air in Los Angeles. Doing that we have come up with our own fuel standards in California. We have lower sulfur than any other State in the Union, 15 parts per million or less in gasoline. California was the first State to do that. The U.S. EPA has now required the rest of the States to meet that standard, but California did it first.

Now, one of the unintended consequences of that is many of the refineries did not have enough capital so they went out of business rather than spending the money to upgrade that refinery to meet the new environmental standard. That was an unintended consequence. We do not have enough refineries, so even if we have additional oil, or the price of oil goes down, we cannot get enough petroleum products through a limited number of refineries. So we need to get incentives to build additional refineries to build the clean type of gasoline we need in California and throughout the country.

By the way, one of the problems my people in California, the people that drive every day have in California, is we have a stranded market in essence on gasoline because we have a different kind of gas standard than any other State in the Union. So we cannot import gasoline from anywhere. We have to produce all the gasoline that we make in our State for our drivers.

With respect to the Speaker, I will not get into the issue of oxidates today, but nevertheless to say that we in California will always produce clean gasoline; but we want to make sure we produce it economically and at the best cost available to the people of the State of California.

We do have a crisis in California. We have a crisis throughout this country on energy, and I am so pleased that we now have a President who will address it and a Vice President who took upon himself the time, and certainly in this last 100 days there have been a lot of pressures on this new administration, to recognize this problem that has been neglected for too long.

□ 1645

Now as we proceed with a long-term solution, and we did not get here overnight, certainly in California's case it took many years to get to the point that we are at today, but we finally will see a solution to the problem. I say to my friends and constituents, be patient. I know it is difficult. I filled up my car last week and it cost \$35. No one should tolerate blackouts and these kinds of cost increases, but we have done it to ourselves. But we can get out of it because we have a policy that in the next number of years will

bring us down the road to better energy independence, both with electricity and fuel.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time for my colleagues.

#### PRESIDENT BUSH'S ENERGY POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. BIGGERT). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) is recognized for the remainder of the leadership hour, 14 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Madam Speaker, I would like to talk about the energy policy released today by the administration.

Madam Speaker, for the last several years we have had a strong economy, primarily because we have had affordable and reliable sources of energy; but now we are in an energy crisis which threatens our economic future and our national security.

The President and Vice President have come together and put together a plan, and today they released their national energy policy, which I would encourage every Member and every individual in America to get a copy of and read it through. It is a comprehensive plan. The President recognizes the problem. He is concerned about the effects that high energy prices, both in gasoline and in electricity, will have on the American people and on our economy. We have a bold, new approach to addressing the energy policy in this country.

We need reliable, affordable, and clean energy increases. We need improved infrastructure. We cannot meet tomorrow's challenges with yesterday's technologies. We need new technologies to meet the demands. Some people will say those technologies are not here yet. I will say, Madam Speaker, that Americans are second to none in their ability to solve problems when they set their minds to it. We are the most technologically advanced Nation on Earth. If we set our minds to solving a problem, we can do it.

The President's leadership comes at a very critical time, but we must act now if we are going to have a comprehensive plan to address the energy crisis which will be with us for several years if we do not act. If anyone questions whether there is a serious energy shortage in this country, let me just give a few statistics.

Over the next 20 years, U.S. oil consumption will rise by 33 percent. Over the next 20 years, U.S. natural gas consumption will rise by over 50 percent. Over the next 20 years, U.S. electricity consumption will rise by 45 percent. Since 1992, oil production is down 17 percent in this country, while consumption is up 14 percent. In 1993, we were reliant on foreign oil for 35 percent of our demands. That was during the oil crisis that we had in 1973.

We said at that time we needed to become less dependent on foreign oil because our economy was subject to the whims of those countries in OPEC. Instead of becoming less reliant on foreign oil, we are now nearly 60 percent reliant on foreign oil for our oil needs. The U.S. spends roughly \$300 million a day, or about \$100 billion a year on foreign oil.

It is obvious that the demands for energy in the future are going to increase in this country. So what have we done in the way of supply? In 1990, U.S. jobs in exploration and production of oil and gas were 405,000 in the United States. In 1999, 10 years later, U.S. jobs in exploration and production of oil and gas were 293,000, down 27 percent. In 1990, in the United States, U.S. oil rigs, we had 657 of them in the United States. In the year 2000, working U.S. oil rigs, 153; a 77 percent decline. Thirty-six oil refineries have closed since 1992, and we have not built a new oil refinery since 1976.

The previous administration had no, I repeat, had no long-term energy policy. It seems the energy policy of the past administration was to shut down exploration as we became more reliant on foreign oil, to shut down refineries, to shut down research on clean coal and finding new sources of coal, to shut down nuclear research. It seems that you could sum up the past administration's energy policy as the "Do not worry, be happy," energy policy.

As I said, we have in this country a supply and demand problem, and that is essentially what the energy crisis is, a supply and demand problem.

Let me summarize what President Bush's energy plan does. It is 105 specific recommendations. Forty-two of those recommendations are targeted at conservation. Much has been said by our opponents that the President does not rely heavily enough on conservation. Forty-two of the recommendations are targeted at conservation; 35 recommendations are targeted at energy supply; 25 of the recommendations are targeted at increased energy security; 12 of the recommendations can be done through executive order; 73 of the recommendations are directives to Federal agencies; 20 of the recommendations will require action by this Congress.

Briefly, let me go through the major portions of his recommendations.

First, conservation. He wants to expand government support for programs for conservation, improved energy efficiency for appliances, improved conservation efforts in Federal buildings, and support new fuel-efficient technology for vehicles, buses, transit and other transportations.

In the area of renewable and alternative energies, he wants renewed focus on renewable and alternative energy, reduced delays in geothermal leasing processes, help for communities