

ENERGY: PREPARING FOR THE FUTURE

Price controls, tapping strategic reserves, creating new federal agencies – if these were any solution, we'd have resolved our energy problems a long time ago.

– Vice President Dick Cheney

OVERVIEW

One overarching message must be articulated first, last and consistently: *Energy development and the environment can and must co-exist, and this balance must be part of a truly comprehensive, long-term solution that reduces American dependence on foreign oil.*

SIX KEY ENERGY MESSAGE POINTS

1. *Focus on the overall energy situation, not just one component.* Environmental extremists will try to bury all energy solutions by focusing on whatever is the most controversial element of your program. That's why you must stress again and again that you support a *"truly comprehensive energy solution,"* from energy exploration and diversifying resources to research and conservation measures. Americans want to know you have a thoughtful, balanced approach that will SOLVE the energy problem.
2. *Talk about the "incredible developments in energy research, exploration, and technology," that will result in minimal impact on the environment.* By describing in some detail the latest technological advancements and your commitment to the *"highest safety standards,"* you will assure them that it is truly possible for energy exploration to co-exist with a protected and clean environment.
3. *"When you flick the switch, you have a right to expect the light to go on."* Then continue: *"We have a responsibility to every American to ensure safe and reliable gas and electricity now and forever, and we know that you expect nothing less."* Americans forget that electricity doesn't come from the light switch and gasoline from the pump. You must remind them.
4. *Assert that America must be ENERGY INDEPENDENT AND ENERGY SELF-SUFFICIENT.* This is the "oh, wow!" statistic in this debate. Most people are not aware that almost 60% of our oil production is from foreign sources. Once they are made aware, they are extremely uncomfortable that we are so dependent on others, especially OPEC, for such a critical resource. *Of all players in the energy debate, no one is more hated than OPEC. Let me be clear: OPEC is the enemy.*

5. **Don't avoid the environment issue – but we are CONSERVATIONISTS, not environmentalists.** Americans are becoming increasingly concerned with the protection of our environment. If you want trust and respect on any energy issue, you must emphasize your commitment to a clean, safe and healthy environment and your understanding of the importance of conservation.
6. **Describe the result of inaction in specific detail.** Just tell them what the good citizens of California were forced to deal with last year: **“Skyrocketing prices. Rolling blackouts. Two dollars for a gallon of gas – or more. It didn't have to happen. We could have planned for the future. We should have been better prepared. We must make sure that it doesn't happen again, in California or anywhere else.”**

The only weakness in Republican energy language involves environmental concerns. Americans want their energy always available, but they also want it cheap and clean. While the rhetoric of our opponents is compelling, the core of their argument depends on two beliefs: that energy production is by definition anti-environment, and that **“Washington regulations”** represent the best way to preserve the environment. To prove them wrong, keep the following environmental language recommendations in mind:

KEY ENERGY- ENVIRONMENT MESSAGE POINTS

1. **Assure your audience that you are committed to “preserving and protecting” the environment, but that “it can be done more wisely and effectively.”** Begin by emphasizing your commitment to **“a balanced approach”** between our national energy needs and maintaining a clean, safe and healthy environment. Tell a personal story from your own life that demonstrates an interest in a clean environment. Since many Americans believe Republicans do not care about the environment, ***you will never convince people to accept your ideas until you confront this suspicion and put it to rest.***
2. **Talk in terms of the future, not the past or present.** The environment is an area in which people expect *progress*, and when they do not see progress being made, they get frustrated.
3. **The three words Americans are looking for in an environmental policy are “safer,” “cleaner,” and “healthier.”** Two words that summarize what Americans expect from regulators and agencies are **“accountability”** and **“responsibility.”**
4. **A balanced approach.** Conclude with the desire for **“a balanced approach between developing the energy sources we need and the clean environment we deserve.”**

WORDS THAT WORK

“Our national energy policy will stress the need to diversify America's energy supply. It will be founded on the understanding that diversity of supply means security of supply, and that a broad mix of options, from coal to windmills, nuclear to natural gas, will help protect consumers against price spikes and supply disruptions.

And our national energy policy will be balanced. It will leapfrog the myths that stifle change, rejecting the notion that there is no middle ground between environmental protection regardless of the costs and energy exploration regardless of the impact.”

– Spencer Abraham, Secretary of Energy

THE PERFECT ONE-MINUTE SOUND-BITE

“Demand for energy in the United States is outstripping supply, and will continue to grow as our 21st century high-tech economy expands. Higher energy costs are squeezing family budgets, undermining farms and small businesses, jeopardizing jobs, and threatening the long-term health of our economy.

Our energy problems are largely the result of shortsighted domestic policies. The problem has been years in the making, and it will take years to solve.

I am committed to the dependable, affordable and environmentally clean production of energy for America's future. I am committed to an energy policy that enhances national security. I know we can do it. We have the best scientists, the best engineers and the best technicians in the world.

We will put them to work to develop a 21st century energy program that leads America toward energy self-sufficiency and is the envy of all other nations.”

THE PRINCIPLES OF THE PRESIDENT'S NATIONAL ENERGY PLAN

- 1) Because our current energy challenges were created in part by short-term thinking and inaction, the National Energy Plan is comprehensive and long-term in outlook. There are no easy solutions or quick fixes.
- 2) Because we believe the priorities of more energy and a clean environment must co-exist, the plan promotes environmentally friendly, advanced technologies to increase energy supplies that will use energy more cleanly and efficiently.
- 3) Because we believe the government should not dictate private behavior, the plan respects the right of Americans to live the lifestyle of their choice and will enhance individual and community quality of life.

THE FIVE COMPONENTS OF THE PRESIDENT'S NATIONAL ENERGY PLAN

- 1) **Increase Energy Supply.** Increase energy production from our domestic oil, natural gas, clean coal, nuclear, and renewable resources, and reduce dependence on energy from foreign sources.
- 2) **Modernize the Energy Infrastructure.** Repair and expand our antiquated energy infrastructure – the outdated network of electric generators, transmission lines, refineries and pipelines that convert raw materials into useable fuels.
- 3) **Promote Conservation.** Apply the most advanced technologies and the opportunity of cost savings to increase product efficiency and reduce personal energy use.
- 4) **Provide a Clean Environment.** Increase efforts to develop environmentally friendly alternative energy sources and safer methods of production to better protect the water, air and natural lands.
- 5) **Guarantee Energy Security.** Reduce American dependence on foreign energy sources. Energy self-sufficiency and security will become a priority in our trade and foreign policy, restoring American credibility with overseas suppliers and building strong relationships with energy producing nations in our own hemisphere.

INTRODUCTION: LEADERSHIP, NOT POLITICS

Americans want a “common sense, comprehensive, long term approach” to energy policy. They do not want a single solution or a single energy source. You succeed when you sell your energy policy as a complete package – a diversity of sources and solutions. In a single sentence, Americans want a ***“balanced, comprehensive plan that includes conservation measures, advanced technology, and a diversity of energy sources.”***

WORDS THAT WORK

Our strategy will be comprehensive in approach, and long term in outlook. By comprehensive, I mean just that – a realistic assessment of where we are, where we need to go, and what it will take. By long-term, I mean none of the usual quick fixes, which in the field of energy never fix anything. Price controls, tapping strategic reserves, creating new federal agencies – if these were any solution, we’d have resolved the problems a long time ago.

-- Vice President Dick Cheney

Americans demand action and leadership, not politics as usual. Unfortunately, politics as usual is all the Democrats have to offer. Because of the reoccurring energy problem, people are paying a lot more to drive their cars; they are paying a lot more to cool their homes; they fear the energy problem’s effects in this troubled economy; and some have experienced blackouts. They don’t want name-calling and they don’t care who is to blame. They want solutions, and they want them now.

THE SINGLE STRONGEST ARGUMENT

If we fail to act, Americans will face more and more widespread blackouts. If we fail to act, our country will become more reliant on foreign crude oil, putting our national energy security into the hands of foreign nations, some of whom who do not share our interests. And if we fail to act, our environment will suffer, as government officials struggle to prevent blackouts in the only way possible, by calling on more polluting emergency backup generators and by running less-efficient old power plants too long and too hard. America cannot allow that to be our future, and we will not.

-- President George W. Bush

This is where the Democrats are failing. Their high-pitched, vicious rhetoric isn't working. In fact, it is exactly what Americans *don't* want to hear from their elected officials.

When we ask the public to describe the Democrats on energy, the most commonly used words are "*rhetoric*," "*polarizing*," "*vague*." By comparison, when asked to describe Vice President Cheney, even liberal Democrats have positive comments: "*authoritative*," "*factual*," and "*realistic*." People see President Bush as "*clear and concise*" and "*informative*."

I cannot say this more strongly: The Republican message on energy as explained by President Bush and Vice President Cheney transcends partisanship, ideology and politics. It is the language of a successful energy solution. And the message put forward by House Republicans, led by Chairman Billy Tauzin, is clear and compelling. If you want a communications role model who knows energy and how to communicate about it, look no further than Rep. Tauzin.

Sure, the Democrats will attack the process. They will attack the messenger and the results, as well. But their attacks as they are currently articulated just make Republicans angry and Democrats embarrassed. "*Is this all they have to offer?*" asked one Democrat. The Democrats' language on this topic is *divisive* and *partisan* – a foolish approach in this post-partisan, post-September 11 era. "*Where are their ideas? Where are their solutions?*" These aren't my questions. They are the questions of Democrats after watching Dick Gephardt, John Dingell, Senator John Kerry and others talk about energy policy.

DEMOCRAT WORDS THAT DON'T WORK

This administration, in darkness and secrecy, has put together something that they call a set of principles that is going to get us out of this mess. It appears, however, that they are so steeped in Texas tea that they have an inability to really address the problem as it exists. They want to drill, dig, and detonate our way out of this mess, and throw away environmental protections – none of which appears to be very wise or make good sense.

A LONG-TERM APPROACH

Americans don't expect a "quick fix." Voters understand that this situation did not develop overnight, and will not be solved overnight. *In fact, nearly 70% of Americans believe it will take longer than two years to solve the national energy problem.*

WHEN WILL OUR ENERGY PROBLEMS BE SOLVED?	
<i>Longer than two years</i>	<i>67%</i>
<i>Next two years</i>	<i>14%</i>
<i>Within the next year</i>	<i>9%</i>
<i>Next few months</i>	<i>4%</i>
<i>Next few weeks</i>	<i>2%</i>

After President Bush took office, many Americans began to realize that for the past eight years, our nation has not had a long-term energy policy to address our increasing energy usage and decreasing resources. The volatile situation in the Middle East has made this realization all the more acute. Skyrocketing heating bills and the ever-increasing costs of gasoline last year served as a wake-up call. The public expects you to move forward with a comprehensive, balanced energy policy now before the situation gets any worse. But again, they do not want a quick fix that will only result in another energy shortage.

WHICH SHOULD BE A HIGHER PRIORITY?	
<i>A comprehensive long-term solution so that America is more energy efficient and problems like this never arise again.</i>	<i>78%</i>
<i>Immediate relief now to the escalating prices for gas and electricity because people are really hurting.</i>	<i>18%</i>

Remember, you must educate your constituents. Most Americans have little or no knowledge of the facts about energy exploration, resources, demands, and oil consumption. It is your responsibility to teach and explain. Give people the facts first, and then you can discuss potential solutions. If you educate your constituents on exactly why we're in this mess, they will reject the "*quick fix band aid approach*" offered by the Democrats and embrace your more balanced approach.

WORDS THAT WORK

We have an energy crisis in America. You can't drill your way out of it, and you can't conserve your way out of it. We must balance energy conservation efforts with moves to produce more energy in this country.

A problem that took eight years of neglect to develop will take more than eight days or eight months to solve. We must begin today, but in acting quickly, we must also act prudently. In rushing to put a band aid on this problem of high prices, I am unwilling to neglect our environment or harm our national security. Let's be brutally honest. A combination of political band aids by the Clinton administration and environment radicalism have gotten us where we are.

So let us agree that we do not need a political quick fix. We need a long-term, balanced common sense solution that will work not just tomorrow but next year and a decade from now.

"Price caps" are NOT the short-term answer. Nothing scares me more than hearing Republicans talk about price caps. Anytime price caps are discussed, repeat the fact that price caps will not produce energy or encourage conservation. They are another quick fix that will do nothing to solve our energy situation.

TWO "ANTI-PRICE CAPS" ARGUMENTS THAT WORK

It is about supply and demand. The heart of the electricity problem in America is a lack of supply. High electricity prices reflect that supply shortage. The solution is either to increase energy supply or reduce energy demand. Any proposal that does not increase supply or lower demand is not a real solution. Trying to solve a supply problem with price caps will make the supply problem even worse and therefore prolong the crisis.

Conservation is the solution. Price caps are a short-term political solution to a complicated long-term problem. Americans simply consume too much energy, and price controls do nothing to discourage that consumption. Consumers get no "price signals" telling them that a fuel or commodity is in short supply and that they should use less. We need to do more to reduce our consumption of energy. Making energy artificially cheap is the wrong answer. Using less energy is the right answer.

THE IMPORTANCE OF PRICE STABILITY

Stability is one of the key goals that can be achieved by implementing the Bush administration's National Energy Policy. The plan will help us to mitigate the adverse affects of a big run-up in fuel prices on the American and world economy.

LANGUAGE THAT WORKS

"When you get sharp swings in prices, everybody may say hurrah if oil goes down to \$10 a barrel, but when that occurs you drive out a lot of marginal production in the United States. When you lose that small-scale domestic production, you become more dependent on foreign sources. Plus, you also lose the investment that would otherwise occur in non-OPEC sources overseas. And when we get these rapid run-downs in price, it really isn't in anybody's interest. If oil hits \$10 a barrel, it's only a matter of months before we're back up to 30 or 35. Stability is the key.

"Conservation alone cannot close the gap, but it's a very important part of our overall strategy. As a country, we've greatly increased our energy efficiency over the years. Out of 12 energy recommendations the Sierra Club came up with not long ago in its own energy plan, 11 of them are in our report. So the notion that somehow we've created a report here that is anti-environment, you'd have to say, 'Well, the Sierra Club is anti-environment, too.' And that just isn't true.

– Vice President Dick Cheney

LANGUAGE THAT DOESN'T WORK WITH DEMOCRATS

"There's been this charge that our energy meetings were run in secret. But they were run the same way we do everything else with respect to policy, from economics to education. A group of Cabinet officials and agency heads produced the report, and it has not been secret. The folks that were responsible for putting it together are all listed right up here in the front.

"We've been very sensitive to the environment and to the need for conservation and renewable resources. If you look at our report, virtually all of the financial incentives, for example, that we've recommended to the Congress, involve conservation and renewables. We don't have any big financial package in there for conventional production. When we put the report together we decided at the very first meeting that we had to spend a lot of time on those issues or we wouldn't have a credible report."

OIL, ANWR AND TECHNOLOGY

Exploring for oil in the ANWR (it's "EXPLORING," *NOT* "DRILLING") is just one component of a comprehensive energy policy. Therefore, you must discuss the entire policy, from energy exploration and diversifying resources to research and conservation measures. Americans want to know that you have a balanced approach. *Do not, I repeat, do NOT allow the radical environmentalists to force you into talking about only this one component.*

Brownouts, blackouts, price spikes, gas shortages are not part of American terminology, nor should they be. Any discussion of energy must begin with the core principle that *when it comes to oil, gas and electricity, America must not depend on any foreign nation.* That is the single strongest argument you have for exploration in the ANWR. Especially now, given the turmoil in the Middle East and the possibility of a wider war, the importance of American energy independence is clearer than ever.

WHICH SHOULD BE A HIGHER PRIORITY?	
<i>Increase energy independence</i>	42%
<i>Protect the environment</i>	26%
<i>Stabilize prices</i>	18%
<i>Avoid energy rationing</i>	12%

Always, always, always stress the importance of national security. America imports more than 55 percent of the oil we consume. This dependence on foreign oil threatens our national security as well as our economy. This isn't news to you, but it is a real shock to most Americans. *Once they are made aware of this dependence, their perspective changes completely.* You will find them very concerned and much more supportive of increasing our nation's oil production. The threat to national security over the lack of American oil independence is one of the best arguments to influence those who are initially skeptical or opposed to greater domestic oil production.

WORDS THAT WORK

American dependence on foreign oil threatens our national security. When more than half of our energy needs comes from foreign sources, particularly OPEC, that alone is a security risk. OPEC has already slowed down production and tried to gouge us on prices in response to the war in Afghanistan. What happens if they decide to limit sales further? We have barely 45 days worth of oil in our Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Imagine what would happen if that reserve runs out.

MORE WORDS THAT WORK

We need less dependence on foreign fuel and more attention to developing our own secure, domestic energy supply. We need more American oil, more American gas, and more use of American clean-coal technology. This is the only way to guarantee an uninterrupted supply of energy when we need it.

It is possible for energy exploration and the environment to co-exist and THRIVE. The environmental rhetoric on the impact of oil drilling is initially compelling and powerful, but it does not withstand scrutiny. The North Slope's petroleum industry is the cleanest, most technologically advanced and most heavily regulated in the world. Facilities are designed for minimal environmental impact.

The experience at Prudhoe Bay has proven that oil drilling does not harm wildlife. In fact, the Central Arctic caribou herd at Prudhoe Bay has grown from 3,000 to 25,000 during the past 20 years, while oil has been produced in the area. This proof of wildlife co-existing with energy exploration will definitely garner support among your constituents.

Be aware that the opposition continues to confuse the public by claiming that the Alaskan coastal plain is unspoiled beautiful wilderness, the last remaining Arctic ecosystem, the "Serengeti of the North." While eight million acres of ANWR are indeed beautiful and pristine, this land is already designated as wilderness. And more than nine million more acres are classified as a National Wildlife Refuge. *No one can touch that land, ever.*

However, when the public learns that the area being considered for oil drilling is no Serengeti, opinions begin to change. When people are told that it is a frozen, barren land for nine months of the year, that the sun doesn't shine AT ALL for eight weeks and that wind chills can drop to minus 110 degrees, watch as they peel away. And when you show them a photograph of the frozen, flat, non-pristine plain to illustrate your point, it's game, set and match.

WORDS THAT WORK

We should trust the experts, not the politicians. If the independent experts, who have spent their lives studying energy and environmental issues, conclude that oil exploration will not have any impact whatsoever on the surrounding environment, that should carry more weight than the politicians who would rather play politics than find a long-term solution.

Additionally, it is important to emphasize to your audience that while we have the highest environmental standards and technology in the world, other nations have few laws and little environmental oversight. The majority of Americans who are concerned with *our* environment have never considered the impact of the oil that we were import from overseas. Then say, "*if you are truly concerned about the impact on nature, then what is done in Siberia is just as important as Alaska – and America is leading the world in the science, technology and engineering of energy exploration.*"

This is why it is essential that you make your audiences aware of the incredible developments in energy exploration technology, which result in very minimal impact on the environment. The average American has no idea about the latest technological developments. It is therefore crucial that you make the public aware of these advances. This is less important than the other arguments, but it's the icing on the cake.

WORDS THAT WORK

We must always keep in mind that we have the highest environmental standards and the most advanced technology in the world. Our nation's strict federal and state laws ensure that the environment is always protected.

However, the same cannot be said for other nations. All too often, their technology is inferior and there is little environmental oversight. Depending on our own energy resources will always be smarter, safer and cleaner than importing oil from nations with much lower standards.

More than 10 years later, the public still remembers the devastating Exxon Valdez oil spill. By describing the latest technology advances and your commitment to the highest safety standards, you will assure them that it is truly possible for energy exploration and a protected and clean environment to co-exist.

Once again, a picture is worth a thousand words. After viewing before and after photos of explored areas, the people we tested were pleasantly surprised by the minimal impact – one small cap – that is possible with today's technology. Whenever you can, bring photos to illustrate the advancements in technology.

NR

WORDS THAT WORK

Should exploration and development ever take place in the coastal plain of ANWR, it would take place in the frozen winter. If there is no oil, the equipment would be dismantled and when the thaw came, there would be one small cap to show that any disturbance ever took place. The tundra would remain untouched. Like ice fishing on a frozen lake, the icehouse structure would not damage the water below.

Exploration and development of the ANWR has the support of Alaskans and their leaders. *The public is more supportive once they learn that 75 percent of Alaskans favor exploration and production in ANWR. For every meeting and speech, bring supportive letters and quotes from Alaskans, as well as survey results, to demonstrate this point.*

FACTS THAT WORK BEST

- Using modern drilling techniques – such as 3-D seismic to locate oil and directional drilling to recover the oil – means that only a very small area will actually be impacted by development
- More than 75 percent of Alaskans favor exploration and production in ANWR.
- The Inupiat Eskimos who live in and near ANWR strongly support onshore oil development on the coastal plain.
- Development of the oil reserves could create as many as 736,000 new domestic U.S. jobs. (Wharton Econometrics Forecasting Associates)

WORDS THAT WORK

It should be up to the people who actually live in a particular community, the people who must breathe the air and drink the water, to decide whether or not to accept energy exploration in their communities. We should not be able to determine the environmental and energy policies for Alaska. We are talking about their community, their homes, their families.

ENERGY AND ANWR: A 10-MINUTE SPEECH

Have you checked your electricity bill lately? Sticker shock doesn't begin to describe what has happened to electricity prices. Remember how high gasoline prices were a year ago? Can we afford to have those high prices return?

[Skyrocketing prices. Rolling blackouts.] It didn't have to happen. We could have planned for the future. We could have been better prepared. Let me be as blunt and candid as I can. We should have done more. We didn't, and now we're all paying – at the pump and at the light switch.

Make no mistake: We are all paying the price of inaction. Homeowners and renters, farmers and businessmen, hardworking Americans, their parents and their children. These high prices are real threat to an already reeling economy.

But while there may be a shortage of energy, there is no shortage of hot air when it comes to real action. There are a lot of loud voices, a lot of shouting and finger pointing about what to do, but no one has come forward with a truly comprehensive plan that will address our energy needs not just for the next 10 months but for the next 10 years.

But before I offer a solution, and there is one, let me just offer you a few key facts:

Fact: As a nation, we have become too dependent on foreign oil. Currently, 60% of the oil consumed in the United States is imported from foreign sources. American families and industry are held hostage to OPEC to meet their energy needs. This is a national security nightmare waiting to happen.

Fact: Electric demand alone has risen by 25% in the past eight years, while power generation has increased a scant six%. We have an economy that needs the electricity to power up the computers, the electronics, the things that make our day-to-day life easier and better, but we're not producing it. Ask your friends and relatives in California: they're paying double or triple for electricity – when they have it at all.

Fact: Outdated rules have made oil exploration nearly impossible, and no major power plants have been built for a decade. I am absolutely committed to a clean, safe, healthy environment, and I will take a back seat to no one when it comes to promoting common sense environmental protections. But we have gone much too far in our regulations and we have begun to hurt the people we should be helping.

Fact: Technology now exists that allows us to explore for oil with absolutely no impact on the surrounding environment. What was inconceivable 20 years ago is commonplace today. We can dig in areas so safely and cleanly that surrounding communities won't even know there's a well in their neighborhood.

ENERGY & ANWR (cont.)

Fact. Unless we change current energy policies and practices, the problem will get worse. We will be paying more and more and getting less and less. We can't let the finger pointing distract us from what common sense tells us we need to do now.

But skyrocketing prices are not the only crises we face. American dependence on foreign oil threatens our national security. When more than half our energy comes from foreign sources, particularly OPEC, that alone is a security risk. OPEC tried to gouge us by limiting production when we went to war in Afghanistan last fall. What happens if they decide to limit sales further? We have barely 45 days worth of oil in our Strategic Petroleum Reserve. Imagine what would happen if that reserve runs out? Shouldn't we be better prepared?

This brings me to the issue of ANWR and the exploration for oil in Alaska. Environmental lobbyists claim that oil drilling in the ANWR will damage this beautiful, pristine land. Let me give you the facts.

Fact. Ninety-eight percent of the area is either designated as "wilderness" or classified as a "National Wildlife Refuge." Nothing will be touched in that 98 percent. In the remaining two percent, where the oil is, the Arctic winter lasts for nine months, and they don't see the sun at all for eight weeks. That's right. Total darkness, 24-hours a day, for eight weeks. Windchills can reach minus 110 degrees. There are no majestic mountains or sweeping panoramas. It is nothing but ice and darkness.

So let me lay out an energy plan that uses tomorrow's technology today and truly plans for the future.

First, we all need to pitch in to conserve energy starting today. Americans are the first to pitch in to help their neighbors when there's an earthquake, mudslide or some other natural disaster. Even though this is a man made disaster, we should all show the same spirit now. When the temperatures heat up, ask yourself if you can do without air conditioning for an hour so that your neighbor down the street with the asthmatic child or the elderly person down the street can use theirs. Besides, with prices where they are today, you will even save some money.

Second, we need to produce more home-grown oil and electricity, produce it right here in America, and we need to do it quickly. Our country grows the food that feeds the world. We write the software and manufacture the technology that fueled an information revolution across the globe. If we can do all this, surely we can produce our own oil and electricity.

And third, we don't have to weaken our environmental laws to get more plants built or oil drilled. There is a lot of unnecessary red tape in government that has nothing to do with environmental regulations. Let's streamline that process and get government out of the way of progress.

“Winning the Energy Debate”

Answers to the 10 Most Difficult Questions

Q. MUST WE REALLY ACT NOW? SHOULDN'T WE WAIT AND STUDY THE PROBLEM FURTHER?

A. [If we fail to act, Americans will face more and more widespread blackouts.] If we fail to act, our country will become more reliant on foreign crude oil, putting our national energy security into the hands of foreign nations. And if we fail to act, our environment will suffer, as government officials struggle to prevent blackouts in the only way possible, by calling on more polluting emergency backup generators and by running less-efficient old power plants too long and too hard. We cannot allow this to happen.

Q: WHO IS TO BLAME FOR THIS ENERGY SITUATION?

A. The situation we now face was not created overnight. It took eight years of neglect. Eight years without any thought, action or planning for the future. But if we truly want to help American families and our nation's economy, we must stop playing the political blame game and focus on a long-term, comprehensive, common sense energy plan.

Let me share with you some basic facts: No major power plants were built for a decade, in part because regulators didn't anticipate the economic boom. Unnecessary restrictions and bureaucratic red tape made electricity-related construction nearly impossible. Electricity demand has risen considerably in the past 10 years, while power generation has barely increased at all.

This energy situation has made the current recession worse than it otherwise might have been. We cannot allow the Washington bureaucracy and all the red tape to cause one more business to suffer or one more person to lose his job. While there are no quick fixes, we must immediately implement a plan to guarantee accessible, affordable, reliable, clean energy for generations to come. It's time to remove the outdated laws, build the necessary generators, encourage real competition, and start planning for the future. We must plan for tomorrow, not just for today.

Q: OIL COMPANIES ARE REPORTING RECORD PROFITS. WHY DO YOU CONTINUE TO SUPPORT THE OIL INDUSTRY'S INTERESTS?

A: My first and only priority is to ensure that every American has access to affordable, clean energy. Whether it is driving to work, cooking dinner for your family, or protecting your home, your professional and personal lives depend on an uninterrupted supply of energy. That is why it is critical that we increase and diversify our energy sources. In addition to using the latest science and technology to increase environmentally-friendly exploration and production of domestic energy resources, our plan invests in new energy technology; expands the use of alternative and renewable energy such as wind, solar, biomass and geothermal energy; and provides for the safe expansion of nuclear energy.

Q: WHY IS YOUR ENERGY PLAN SO FOCUSED ON OIL DRILLING?

A: We have an energy problem in America because there is not enough supply to fuel our economy. That's why we must balance energy conservation efforts with moves to produce more energy in this country. Our national energy policy must stress the need to diversify America's energy supply. It must be founded on the principle that *diversity* of supply means *security* of supply, and that a broad mix of options, from clean coal to solar energy, from safe nuclear power to natural gas, will help protect consumers against price spikes and supply disruptions caused by war and other anticipated events.

Oil exploration is only one part of the equation. We will use 21st century technology to harvest our nation's traditional sources of energy in a cleaner, more environmentally friendly fashion. But we must also put our best scientists and engineers to work developing alternative sources of energy.

Q: ISN'T IT SAFER AND BETTER TO IMPORT OUR OIL RATHER THAN DRILLING RIGHT HERE IN AMERICA?

A: American dependence on foreign oil threatens our national security. When more than half of our energy comes from foreign sources, particularly OPEC, that alone is a security risk. And knowing that those foreign nations have cut off our oil in the past, TWICE, that poses an unacceptable security crisis. During the recent war in Afghanistan, the OPEC cartel tried to take advantage of the situation by price gouging and restricting production.

Did you know we have barely 45 days worth of oil in our Strategic Petroleum Reserve? Just 45 days! Imagine what happens to our economy – to all of us – if the war on terrorism leads to another oil embargo and that strategic reserve runs out. Unless we want to continue allowing our national security, our economy and our day-to-day living to be dependent on Saudi Arabia and the Saddam Husseins of the world, we must increase and diversify our nation's energy supply. If we are to guarantee an uninterrupted supply of energy, we must increase and diversify our energy sources.

Q: EXPERTS ESTIMATE THAT ANWR ONLY OFFERS A SIX-MONTH SUPPLY OF OIL. DO YOU REALLY THINK SUCH A SMALL AMOUNT OF OIL IS WORTH RUINING A PRISTINE WILDLIFE REFUGE?

A: Energy exploration in a tiny area of Alaska is merely one component of a truly comprehensive, common sense, long-term energy policy. But let me put this in perspective. The oil that we know exists in that small area represents more than 50 years worth of what we now import from Iraq. While this oil alone will not sustain our nation's demand, it will certainly reduce our dependency on foreign sources of oil, particularly OPEC, and that is essential to maintaining our national and economic security in the years to come.

One more point. Have you seen exactly where they want to explore for oil? It is a treeless tract of Arctic desert, barren and frozen for most of the year – a forbidding place with near-total darkness and temperatures of 20 and 30 degrees below zero during the dead of winter. Seventy-five percent of Alaskans favor exploration and production in ANWR. Shouldn't it be up to them – the people who actually live there – to make the decision whether or not to accept energy exploration in their own backyard?

Q: WHAT ABOUT THE IMPACT OF YOUR ENERGY PLAN ON THE ENVIRONMENT?

A: My family loves the outdoors and is committed to keeping it clean and beautiful. We hike in the mountains, and my kids like to fish in the rivers nearby. We must do everything possible to preserve these beautiful national treasures.

But when it comes to protecting the environment, I trust the experts, not the politicians. When the best scientists, people who have spent their lives studying energy and environmental issues, conclude that our energy plan will not harm the environment – that carries more weight with me than the blathering of all the bureaucrats and the politicians in Washington who would rather play politics than find a long-term solution.

Some on the radical fringes of the environmental community would stop all production of energy in this country and are quick to throw blame. But now is the time to set aside partisanship and name-calling, the time for everyone to sit down together and create effective solutions that will keep this country supplied with affordable, clean energy for generations to come.

Fortunately, with today's technology, there simply does not need to be a debate about protecting the environment versus increasing our energy supply. It is not an "either/or" question. If we are smart about our national energy policy, we can provide the energy that we need and protect the country that we love.

Q: SHOULDN'T CONSERVATION BE MORE OF A FOCUS OF OUR NATIONAL ENERGY POLICY?

A: Our new energy plan begins with a 21st century focus on conservation and energy efficiency, and several of our recommendations specifically address and reward greater conservation efforts. The American entrepreneurial system constantly invents ways to do more with less. We pack more and more computing power onto a chip. We carry more and more messages over a cable and we squeeze more and more power out of a barrel of oil or a cubic foot of natural gas. A refrigerator you buy today uses 65 percent less electricity than one that was made 30 years ago. Overall, we use 40 percent less energy to produce new goods and services than we did in 1973. While we have made great strides, we must do more. That is why research and development of energy efficient products and services is and always will be such a high priority.

We have the ability to produce more **AND** conserve more. Our country **CAN** be more energy self-sufficient **AND** protect the environment. America has the best scientists, the best engineers and the best technology in the world. Let's put them to work to find cleaner, safer forms of energy. Let us prove to the world that we can do more with less.

Q: WHY DO YOU OPPOSE PRICE CAPS? WE NEED RELIEF NOW!

A: I am well aware of the skyrocketing electricity prices. When I go home on the weekends, I follow my children around the house reminding them to turn off the lights, turn off the computer, and close the front door. We would all enjoy lower prices. But we must realize that price caps are a short-term band-aid and this is a long-term problem.

I oppose price caps because they do absolutely nothing to increase the supply of energy. In fact, experts believe they will lead to even greater shortages of energy, and that means more price spikes and blackouts in the future. Instead, we must focus our efforts on implementing a comprehensive, long-term solution that will make America more energy efficient and ensure that problems like this never arise again. I have a better solution that will solve this problem forever. If we begin expanding transmission capabilities and construct clean-burning energy plants *now*, that alone will increase the availability of electricity and stop these blackouts from occurring.

Q: WHY WILL THE ENERGY PROBLEM TAKE SO LONG TO FIX?

A: A problem that took eight years of neglect to develop will take more than eight days or eight months to solve. We must begin today, but in acting quickly, we must also act prudently. I am unwilling to neglect our environment or harm our national security by supporting a fraudulent "solution."

Let's be brutally honest. A combination of political band-aids by the Clinton administration and an out-of-control Washington bureaucracy have gotten us where we are. When I come home, many of the things we talk about there in Washington are not what people like you talk about here in the real world. I hear you complain about the price of gasoline, and even though it's falling now, you know full well it's going to spike back up again in the future. The cost of diesel affects farmers. The cost of electricity affects families and small businesses.

So let us agree that we do not need a political quick fix. Our strategy will be comprehensive in approach, and long term in outlook. By comprehensive, I mean just that – a realistic assessment of where we are, where we need to go, and what it will take. We need balanced, common sense solutions that will work not just tomorrow but next year and a decade from now.

We have to get this right. It's important to us. It's important for our children and grandchildren and all future generations of America. It's important for their quality of life, for the quality of the environment that they live in. We must make certain that we make the investment and take the time and the energy to address these issues.

Q: THE ENERGY CRISIS HAS SUBSIDED. SO WHY DO WE NEED A NATIONAL ENERGY PLAN?

A: We should thank Mother Nature for averting an energy crisis in the summer of 2001. Mild temperatures across the country were the primary reason we averted major shortages and price hikes. But that doesn't mean a crisis isn't around the corner. OPEC could cut production yet again, the war on terrorism or the Israeli-Palestinian conflict could cause major disruptions in the Middle East oil supply, or we could have an extremely cold year. We still don't have the necessary generators to produce all the electricity we need. And let's not forget the current recession.

Why leave the future to chance? If we want to continue to be the land of entrepreneurship, innovation, and the American Dream, we must have a long-term national energy policy that will guarantee affordable, reliable, clean energy. We have to plan for tomorrow, not just for ourselves but for generations to come.

Q. COULD THE CALIFORNIA ELECTRICITY CRISIS HAVE BEEN PREVENTED? DID IT HAVE TO HAPPEN?

A: The real crime in California is the lack of leadership on energy. The state had a \$12 billion surplus in 2000. It's gone now – forever. It could have been used for more teachers, to improve roads and reduce congestion, to enhance health care. Fixing the energy crisis could have been done for several billion dollars two years ago, but now it may cost as much as \$50 billion over the next few years. And within a year, California could have the highest debt of any state in America.

And while all this was happening, Gray Davis was holding political fundraisers. Lots of political fundraisers. He's raised over a million dollars in campaign cash from the electric utility industry over the past two years, and then turned around and raised our electricity rates 25%, 50%, sometimes even more. He lined his pockets with a million dollars in campaign cash taken right out of our pockets. He's a million dollars richer, but he's left the state in financial ruin and expects us to pay the tab. If he had devoted his energy to fixing our energy problems rather than worrying about his next election, none of this would have happened.

Q: IN CALIFORNIA, WE TAKE OUR ENVIRONMENT SERIOUSLY. WON'T AN INCREASE IN PRODUCTION RESULT IN POLLUTION?

A: If we plan ahead with the necessary infrastructure and resources, we won't be forced to act hastily and inefficiently in the midst of a crisis. We must build more clean burning power plants now, so that we won't be forced to fire up the outdated diesel fired generators tomorrow. That is the sort of thing that would seriously pollute our environment. If we truly want to provide American families with clean, reliable, affordable energy and protect the environment, we must act now with a long-term, comprehensive strategy that includes building clean, efficient power plants.

THE PERFECT 90-SECOND ELECTRICITY SOUND-BITE

America is competing in the 21st century global market with a 1950s transmission grid. There is absolutely no reason for this country, with all of its advanced research, technology and innovation, to operate in the past. We should have the best, most modern and most reliable electricity system in the world.

Electricity prices are rising and power is in short supply because of years of government regulation. Yet Democrats have turned a blind eye to the problem or have proposed solutions that will only make the situation worse. First, the facts. No major power plants were built for a decade, in part because regulators didn't anticipate the economic boom. Environmental rules and bureaucratic red tape made electricity-related construction nearly impossible. Electric demand has risen by 25% in the past eight years, while power generation has increased a scant six%.

Instead of blaming the politicians, the regulators and the bureaucrats, it's time for all of them to work together. It's time to remove the unnecessary laws, build the necessary generators, encourage real competition, and start planning for the future. Let's plan for tomorrow, not just for today.

A FINAL WORD FROM PRESIDENT BUSH

“Conservation does not mean doing without. Thanks to new technology, it can mean doing better and smarter and cheaper.

“Innovation helps us all make better choices. Smart electric meters can tell homeowners how they’re using power and how they might reduce it when people leave a room. And innovation is bringing us transmission wires that waste less of the electricity they carry from plant to home or office.

“Our new energy plan begins with a 21st century focus on conservation. The American entrepreneurial system constantly invents ways to do more with less. We pack more and more computing power onto a chip. We carry more and more messages over a cable and we squeeze more and more power out of a barrel of oil or a cubic foot of natural gas. A new refrigerator you buy today, for example, uses 65% less electricity than one made 30 years ago.

“Overall, we use 40% less energy to produce new goods and services than we did in 1973.”

-- President George W. Bush