

In conclusion, I have offered these two visions which are outside the usual discussion that takes place here on the Hill. It just so happens that they come at a time when there is a great need to keep the dialogue going.

We cannot sit still and wait until the conference committee acts. We should not sit still and wait until the final negotiation takes place, probably at the end of September. We need to keep the pressure on. The public needs to remind each one of us in the Congress that they have made education a priority, and making education a priority, there is a need to have resources behind the rhetoric.

The dilemma we face is that we have two bills that have passed, one in the other body and one here in the Congress, and both have authorization figures much higher than any provisions that have been made in the budget. We need to solve that dilemma in a positive way. We need to have the pressure applied from those who care about education to make the appropriations figure measure up to the authorization figures as a one first positive step.

At least the Leave No Child Behind legislation should not be hypocritical, it should do what it says it is going to do in the authorization bill. That is the first step. The other steps require the kind of vision to go forward that is indicated in these two visions, one from the book written by Bill Cosby and Dwight Allen, and the other from the Leave No Child Behind legislation which deals with more than just education, and is sponsored really with the backing of the Children's Defense Fund.

□ 2230

We are going to hear more about this as we go toward September. The important thing is that we should understand that the door is not closed, and the final decision has not been made. There is room for an appropriation which measures up to the authorization and all of us should dedicate ourselves to the proposition that we will fight to have the appropriation measure up to the authorization for education.

NIGHTSIDE CHAT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. KERNS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. McINNIS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

HONORING OUR FALLEN FIREFIGHTERS

Mr. McINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take a few moments of my Special Order to address a very sad situation that occurred yesterday in Winthrop, Washington State. As my colleagues know, this time of year is the time of year in our Nation across the Nation that we face horrible forest fires. Most of the time, we are able to conquer those fires through the able leadership of the Forest Service, the BLM, our professional fire depart-

ments, our volunteer fire departments and volunteers across the country. But every once in a while the fire gets the best of us, as it did in Storm King Mountain in Glenwood Springs, Colorado, the town that I was born and raised in.

I was in Storm King at the time of the incident and I remember the situation very well. I remember the horrifying fire that took Storm King Mountain. I remember the horrible tragedies and the tears of the young children and the widows and the mothers and the fathers and all the families and the friends and the shock of that community. We had hoped that Storm King Mountain in Glenwood Springs, that the incident would never repeat itself, but we knew at some point in time that it would, because it is almost like part of a fate of fighting fires. Over a period of time, we are going to have casualties. It is a war of its own, really. We think about it, thinking about a fire that is unpredictable, in some cases; some cases it is predictable, an enemy that has no discrimination as far as who it picks to destroy. We see it destroy animals, we see it destroy mountains.

We know that basically, it is a force that can erupt, just like the force erupted yesterday. Yesterday we had a fire of about 5 acres and we had what we call the blowup. The thing that scares anybody dealing with fires, the worst condition that we can have are the conditions that accumulate in the incident called fire blowup. That means we have low humidity, we have very dry timber, and we have a wind that is unexpected that comes in. This fire which burns 5 acres over some period of time exploded from 5 acres to 2,005 acres in a matter of moments. These firefighters that lost their lives yesterday, 4 of them, had no chance. By the way, I understand we lost another firefighter who was a pilot on a slurry bomber at another fire; not this fire, but at another fire somewhere in the northwest as well.

So my words of honor this evening are for all 5 of those firefighters. But I am only knowledgeable on the incident of the 4 firefighters who lost their lives yesterday. I would like to mention their names. Tom Craven, Tom was 30 years old. He was from Ellensburg, Washington. Karen L. Fitzpatrick. Karen was 18 years old, of Yakima. Devon A Weaver. Devon was 21 years old of Yakima. Jessica L. Johnson. Jessica was 19, of Yakima.

Tom, Karen, Jessica and Devon 2 days ago were alive. Two days ago, when our country called upon them to respond to a fire, they did so without hesitation. Now, despite the young age and, in fact, this was one of the first fires, or not the first fire for one of those individuals, despite the age, they received training. And at some point, one has to fight their first fire. At some point, one has to pick up actual field experience.

Almost every firefighter we have had in the history of this country gets

through those first few fires. In fact, almost all of our firefighters are able to retire, or at least leave it without a fatality. But that was not meant to be the case for these 4 young people. We lost a lot of spirit. We lost a lot of youth. Two days ago, we did not have families in mourning, we had families who were excited that their children, in most cases, and I am sure in this case, were doing what they dreamed of doing for a long time, and that is going out and taking on fire, and going out and helping our country in a time of need. Going out and literally saving communities, saving animals, saving vegetation, saving our mountains. We have seen it. We have seen it throughout our country, what these people do. I saw it at Storm King Mountain in Glenwood Springs, Colorado, about 7 years ago.

So my comments tonight are intended to be in honor of these 4 firefighters. In fact, I expand that beyond those 4 firefighters to the fifth firefighter who I understand lost their life yesterday, to all firefighters across the Nation. To those firefighters who today cannot of course hear these words because they are camped out on the side of a mountain fighting a fire somewhere in Colorado or fighting a fire in Oregon or Washington or out there in California. These are gutsy people, and they carry out a mission that takes a lot of risk. They know the risk. They go into it with full knowledge. But I guess if one is a young spirit, one always goes into it thinking, I can overcome, I can get by it, but they did not get by it, and we should recognize them for the hero status that is properly bestowed upon them.

I can say to the families of these 4 deceased, our Nation, the United States of America, owes your family a great deal of gratitude, that we consider these lost firefighters heroes, the way the word "hero" should be used, not for some celebrity sports figure, but for a figure to me that is much more of a hero than any movie star or sports figure could ever be, and that is these 4 young people who gave their lives yesterday for the United States of America.

ENERGY CRISIS IN CALIFORNIA

Mr. Speaker, I would like to move on to my topic discussion. As usual, as my colleagues know, we have had preceding speakers here on the floor, and it was interesting when I listened to my good friend, the respected gentleman from California (Mr. FILNER) and the respected gentleman from California (Mr. DEFAZIO). Both, most of the time, seem to be fairly knowledgeable on the subjects that they address, but I have disagreements with the statements that they made this evening. I was surprised that the gentlemen from California, when they talked about the energy shortage that they have had in California, as has become typical with some of the people out of California, blame everybody else; blame everybody else.

If we listen to the gentlemen from California this evening, or if we listen to the gentleman from the northwest, one would think that everybody in this Nation is to blame for the shortage, the energy crisis that they have experienced in California, that the blackouts in California have nothing to do with the political leadership of the State of California. That the energy blackouts in the State of California have nothing to do with the fact that they have not been able to build a power generation plant in California for years and years and years. The fact that they have an energy crisis in California has nothing to do with the attitude of some people out there in that State that say, do not build in my State, do not build in my backyard. We do not need electrical generation plants. We do not need gas transmission lines in our State. Let the other States generate it and we will buy it from them.

It was interesting to hear that the gentleman in the northwest is blaming what he calls the greedy companies. Well, I have seen plenty of greed in my life, and perhaps that is one of the contributing factors, but do not continue to run away from the fact that it was poor policy in California. I say California versus the northwest, because in the northwest it was not necessarily poor policy. In the northwest, they have a minor problem. The Columbia River is going dry. They have had a drought. They did not get the rain or the moisture that they expected, so they were not able to generate the hydropower which, by the way, is very clean power, a very clean way to generate energy. So the northwest is a little unique.

But let me focus in on California. They did not have a river go dry on them. What happened out there is that they refused to accept the responsibility, especially the political leaders in California, to look to the future, to have a vision for the future, to know that they have to provide energy for their constituents.

Now, I also heard the gentleman say, whacko environmentalists, that those who have criticized the State of California say it is because of whacko environmentalists. Well, there are some whacko environmentalists, there are some whacko developers. But putting that aside, the fact is that California has got a lot of balanced, reasonable environmentalists who understand the fact that they need clean generation of power. But the leadership in California, whether it is at the local level or the State level or the governor's level, have refused to allow it to occur. They kind of brought it upon themselves.

Mr. Speaker, I know that the gentleman from California says he was tired of hearing people say, California brought it upon themselves. Well, let me say how interesting it is that out of 50 States, California stands alone. Do they in California not think that the political leaders in California had a little something to do with the problems that they are facing out there?

Now, my colleague mentioned, well, several of his colleagues have said, the heck with California, that is their problem, let them suffer. That is not the attitude of this Congressman. I think California is a very important State in our Nation. I do not think we can just walk away from California. But it is awful frustrating for those of us who want to help the State of California to see that there are those in California who are too stubborn or too lazy or have an ideological philosophy that they will not even pull themselves up by their own bootstraps, that some in California will not provide self-help. That is what the problem is. We cannot walk away from California. This is a nation. This is a nation of 50 States. We are like brothers and sisters. We are tied together. It is a good union of being tied together.

But the fact is, when somebody is not pulling their load, we have to be frank about it and say, you are not pulling your load. It is like pulling a wagon up a hill. If we have somebody that is supposed to be pulling and they continually jump in the back and ride the wagon and you say to them, hey, Johnny, you got to get out of the wagon, you got to help pull it. Johnny gets out and says well, the whole reason I have to get out of this wagon is because the rest of you are not pulling hard enough. That is exactly what California is saying and that is exactly what some of my colleagues from California, especially the gentleman who spoke earlier, and that is a good analogy. We have said to the gentleman from California, look, we are not going to let the wagon go, we still have to get this wagon to the top of the hill, but you have to get out of the wagon and help pull the wagon up the hill. Do not just sit there and complain about how abused you are because the rest of us asked you to get out of the wagon to help us pull the wagon up the hill. Get out of the wagon, get off your duff and help the rest of us.

Mr. Speaker, ever since I was young my folks took us camping. My district is the Rocky Mountains of Colorado, born and raised, multi-generations in Colorado. My folks had a little rule. That is, if you went camping with them and you wanted to enjoy the campfire in the early mornings when it was quite chilly, as we know it gets, my district is the highest in the Nation, so it gets cool there in the mornings, or cold. So if you want to enjoy the camp fire, guess what you got to do? You got to help gather the firewood.

In California, it is the same thing. If you want to have enough energy, not just for this generation, but for future generations, you got to help gather the firewood. You got to help build electrical generation facilities. You have to plan natural gas transmission lines in your State. You have to be serious about conservation. To California's credit, let me say that this energy problem that we have, conservation

can make a big dent in it, and California does deserve credit. In the last couple of months, the citizens of California have been responsive to conservation issues, although I am concerned that as this energy problem begins to resolve itself, people will put conservation along the side. I think in this Nation, all of us, every American, needs to adopt conservation on a permanent adoption basis.

□ 2245

Conservation is important. But California, do not expect the rest of us not to be frustrated if they are not going to help themselves get out of this mess. Do not continue to blame the President. That is what Gray Davis, the Governor out there, did for some period of time. When he found out that was not working, he blamed the greedy companies down in California. Then he threatened to seize the companies, like it was some type of socialistic government that we operate in this country. Everything except themselves they have blamed for this crisis.

I am saying to the leaders and I am saying to the Governor of the State of California and I am saying to my good colleagues here on the floor from California who are taking these issues up about how badly treated California is, we want to help, but they have to help, too. Simply going up and saying, "In 2 weeks I am going to show up in San Diego and cut the ribbon for a power generation company, now pat me on the back, and by the way, you are responsible for our power crisis," that does not cut it, California. We want to help, but they have to help themselves.

How do they help themselves? The entire Nation can help itself with conservation and alternative fuels, those things. But alternative fuels really are something of the future. Today if we took all of the alternative energy in the world, all of the alternative energy in the world, and we put it all into the United States of America, we are talking about 3 percent of our power needs, 3 percent of our energy needs.

So clearly, alternative energy is going to be what the generation behind myself, my children's generation, my three kids and their generation, they are going to be primarily dependent on that like we are dependent on fossil fuels for our generation, and the two generations preceding us were dependent upon it.

That is going to be important. But in the meantime, what do we do for the current generation? We have to do a couple of things. California has to allow generation facilities to be built on a reasonable basis.

The gentleman from California, as supported by the gentleman from Oregon, seemed to suggest that we set aside, or people on both sides of the aisle say that the suggestion is that we set aside their environmental regulations and safeguards and build generation facilities wherever we want. They want to sound like heroes, that, "We

are not going to let these environmental regulations be set aside. Why should we destroy our environment, like everybody outside of California wants us to do?"

That is absurd on its face. We can build generation facilities that are balanced. We can build generation facilities that have an acceptable impact on the environment. I am not asking, and I do not think many of my colleagues, are asking for the State of California to drop all of their environmental laws. I do not know anybody in here who really is calling the mainstream environmental community in California wackos. I do not think they are wackos at all, and that is a direct quote from the gentleman from California who had spoken previously, about an hour ago.

What we are saying to California is, hey, there is a balance with the environmental regulation. There is a balance with the zoning. They are going to have to have a power line in somebody's backyard in order for everybody's backyard to enjoy power. They have to be reasonable.

It is unreasonable for California to be the only State in the last 10, 15, 20 years that has not allowed an electrical generation power facility to be built in their State. California, is it not a little odd that they are one out of 50? Is it not a little odd that they are now the one out of 50 that is suffering the crisis out there?

The rest of the country is not in an energy crisis. Now, we have gotten a very clear warning, no doubt about it, but we are not in an energy crisis. Why? Because the other States have taken a more reasonable approach than has the political leadership of the State of California.

I am telling the Members, in my opinion, the Governor of California has taken absolutely the wrong direction on how to solve the problem. First of all, about 2 or 3 or 4 weeks ago, maybe 5 weeks ago, at the height of the market, the Governor finally decides he is going to sign long-term contracts, so he has bound the people of California into long-term contracts at the highest possible price that we have seen in any number of years for electrical power. So if they think they are going to get rate relief in California, citizens of California, through my colleagues here, they are not.

The second thing is, the Governor of California has tried to say to the people, let us put on price caps. In other words, they say, let us artificially lower the price of the power. Let us not have them pay what the power actually costs to produce, the price that allows for some margin for reinvestment for the next generation, but let us subsidize the power price by either selling bonds, which is what the Governor of California has done, he has indebted in billions, by billions of dollars future generations to pay for this generation's power.

If I was talking to the Governor, I would say that that is the wrong ap-

proach. First of all, this generation ought to pay for this generation's power. Furthermore, this generation has an obligation to exercise some type of leadership, some type of responsibility, some type of vision for the next generation. We need to start planning for their energy needs.

California can join in and do it with us. Let me reiterate, I do not think California should be left alone. California, if it were a country of its own, would be the sixth most powerful country economically in the world. California has a lot of American citizens. It is a big part of our Union. It would be a deep, deep mistake for anybody on this House floor to turn their back and walk away from California.

But it is not a mistake for anybody on this floor to look at our colleagues from the State of California and say, quit blaming everybody else, Governor. Quit blaming everybody else, newspaper editorials out there. Accept some of the blame. Consider and accept the fact that they have to have self-help, and let us move forward as a team.

That is my message to California: We want to help them pull the wagon up the hill, but they need to help us pull the wagon up the hill. For 10 or 15 years they have gotten a free ride by riding in the back of the wagon. Now all of a sudden it is time for them to come up and help the rest of us. When they do, they are going to find out, just like I found out, when we help gather firewood at the campsite we get to sit by the campfire. But if they are not going to help gather firewood when they have the capability to gather firewood, then they should not sit by the campfire and enjoy the benefits of that fire.

Let me talk just for a moment about conservation, because while we are on energy, I think it is important that we discuss conservation.

I had a fascinating thing happen to me not long ago. I was talking to a young person. I would guess the person was 23, 24 years old, and seemed to me to be very, very bright, very capable. I got to talking, as I often do with that generation, and saying, what are you going to do? What is your career orientation?

This particular individual said to me, well, my orientation, my career, is how do we get energy out of the ocean. How do we get energy out of movement? Every time there is movement, as those who have studied physics and so on know, every time there is movement, there is energy.

In this particular thing, she said, I think there is energy in movement. How do we become more expedient, more efficient at being able to take movement, seize energy from it, and utilize it for or energy needs?

It was not long after I visited with this young person that I ran into a gentleman. He was in the energy field. I was telling him about it. He reached in his pocket and he said, let me show you what she is talking about. I have one right here. See this?

Members are not going to be able to see my demonstration, other than the fact that they are going to have to take my word that it is occurring. If the Chamber, Mr. Speaker, was dark, we could see the demonstration.

This is simply a strip of material encased in a sheet of plastic. It has two wires going to a miniature light bulb right here on top. This is the miniature light bulb. What this person did to me, he said, this could capture energy from the waves. He began to go like this, showing movement. Now, Members are not able to see this because of the distance away from this, but I can tell the Members that as this moves up and down, this little light right here goes on. That is what is generating electricity, this simple movement.

This gentleman said, just imagine if we could put this in the ocean, where we have natural, continuous movement, we could generate electricity. I thought that little thing right there was fascinating. I think that is what is the ticket for the future. That is what our generation has an obligation to try and help the future generation, encourage that generation, and then the generations that are not yet born to become dependent upon, to be more creative than using fossil fuels.

But at the same time, we as a generation have an obligation to accept the responsibility that fossil fuels are what we primarily depend upon right now.

I heard my colleagues earlier criticizing the Bush administration about the energy policy. Ironically, I would mention that the Clinton administration and Clinton and Gore had no energy policy for 8 years, had no vision into the future about what to do in regard to energy. The only one who has come up recently, stepping forward, stepping out of the line to take a leadership role, has been President Bush.

I notice that they criticize right off the bat the fact that the President, in his budget, has cut some funds for some research. Let me tell the Members, this is an old-time Washington, D.C. trick. Every program in the Federal budget has a good name to it. It is either for the children or it is for the future or it is alternative energy.

Why does every program have a good name to it? Because it is hard to cut it. It is hard to take money out of it. Once we create a program back in Washington, D.C., we can pretty well be assured that program has a life, a long life of being able to use taxpayer dollars.

The first thing that happens back here with the special interests, and special interests that go the entire band of interests, these special interest groups, the first thing they do when they get a program, and this includes Federal agencies, the first thing they do when they get a program put into place is to put a protective shield around it, in case somebody ever comes and says, look, what is the bottom line? Tell me, what are we doing for accountability? Tell me what the results

are. Oh, we would like to do an audit to see if you are doing what you said you are going to do. What kind of results have you given us for this money?

Then they can immediately deploy their weapons, the weapons of special interest. That is to say, how dare you ask a question about whether or not, for example, money is being spent efficiently on the school lunch program? You must want children to starve. It is the same kind of thing we are seeing here. We have research programs that we have funded for years, year after year after year on energy, and the bottom line is the results are not there. They are not there.

The minute we go up to them, as the President has done, and said, look, we are going to have to not take the money away and use it for some other purposes, use it for highways or something, we are going to put this money and put it into research we think is going to make a difference, the first thing they do is run to the local or national media and say, my gosh, the President is proposing that we cut research. How terrible, in an energy crisis. This is a President who only wants oil drilling. He wants to cut our research dollars.

At best, at best that is a misleading statement. That is giving them the benefit, here. In fact, most of these programs, when we go after accountability, they are well-designed to do whatever is necessary to protect that program and keep that program alive.

Let me talk for a moment about the energy policy of this country. I mentioned earlier that President Clinton, the former President and the Vice President, they had no energy policy. We need an energy policy. What happened in California, what happened up in the Northwest, now, the Northwest was primarily because of the Columbia River, but what happened in the Northwest was a warning shot to all 50 States. It was a warning shot saying to us, hey, one of these days we are going to face a real energy crisis. One of these days, we had better be prepared for it, because we are not going to get a second chance. We have to be prepared with energy alternatives.

What do we need to do that? We need to have some kind of energy policy. That is exactly what the President has done. Now, Members may not agree with the policy. Members may not agree with elements of the policy. But I think every person in this country should agree with the fact that we need a policy.

Now, it is debate on this House floor, it is debate that really should start in the kitchen of every household of this Nation, as to what kind of energy policy should this country have; what kind of components should we put together so that our Nation as a unified group of 50 States has a policy that will allow us to get through future energy crises, that will allow us the kind of vision, leadership, and responsibility that is necessary for future genera-

tions, that will allow us to propel our economy and keep it strong, that will allow us to do all of these things that energy allows us to do?

Let us look at some of the elements that I think are important for an energy policy. First of all, there is discussion and debate. What President Bush has done is a favor to all of us by stepping forward and putting an energy policy on the table.

□ 2300

And by saying we ought to put conservation on the table, and we ought to put alternative energy on the table. We have to talk about supply. We have to talk about exploration. Put it on the table. We have to talk about what areas of the country should or should not be explored for fossil fuel or should or should not be explored for other type of energy recovery. At least the discussion has begun.

Now, that does not mean that we have to adopt everything they have put on the table. That is not what it means. But what it does mean is that we have an opportunity now to start to put this policy together. So discussion is an important benefit of what the President's energy policy has put forward.

Now, let us talk about some of the other elements that are obviously very important for any energy policy. First of all, we have to ask what is it that every American could do? What could every American out there do to help our Nation on an energy policy, to help our Nation through these energy problems, to help our Nation assure future generations that an energy crisis is not going to be something they have to worry about?

The first thing every American can do, every American that is capable of moving and thinking, is conservation. Even simple conservation. Now, there is a lot of conservation that can take place in our Nation without an inconvenience to our lifestyles. Let me give a couple of examples. Turn out the lights when we leave the room. Now, that sounds kind of simplistic. Sounds like, gosh, that is so basic, of course we turn off the lights. But what difference does it make if I walk out of the room over here and I have the lights off for 2 minutes? I am going to be back there in 2 minutes anyway. Imagine the difference if every American that is using lights right now as I speak shut off their lights for 2 minutes. How much energy would we save? How much conservation is that? It is significant.

And let us put that together with a little less idling of our cars; maybe turning our air conditioning a little higher, at 70 degrees instead of having it set at 68 degrees; maybe in the winter having the heat set at 68 degrees instead of 75 degrees; maybe just simply checking our ceiling fans to make sure they are turning in a clockwise direction or motion so that they draw the cool air up and help cool our homes; maybe going to our car owner's manual

and determining that we only need to change the oil of the engine of our car every 6,000 miles instead of every 3,000 miles, as the people out there that market oil products are trying to get us to do. There are a lot of ways that average Americans, every American, can help conserve energy, and that is a very critical part of an energy package.

I think it is important for all of us to assume that we have an obligation to help with that. All of us have that obligation. But that is only a part of the energy package that we need for this country. What other element should be in that energy package? Well, of course, alternative energy.

As I mentioned, I was fascinated by this little device, this device that I showed my colleagues earlier, which seizes energy from motion. That simple motion turns this little light on. That motion, through the physics and all the other engineering, we need to have that. We need to have research. But when we put research aside for alternative energy, we need to be able to have accountability from the people that we give this money to. We need to know that our research is at least moving us in the right direction. We need to know that the people doing this research have oversight. Because we do have an obligation not just to throw money at anybody that says I have an idea for future alternative energy, so give me money, Federal taxpayers.

There are a lot of scams that take place out there, and most of the people getting scammed in this country are taxpayers. And most of the scamming is done by special interest groups who know how to give a program a great name and then take gobs and gobs of money without results. So while I say research is very important, it has to be research that means something. It has to be research that is going to come up with a result or at least move us towards the path of a result.

So we know we need to have conservation. We know we need to have research for alternative fuels. We also need to face the fact, as I said earlier in my comments, that if we took all of the alternative energy in the world, all of it, whether it is wind power, whether solar power, whether it is some other type of generational electrical power, even like this little device, if we took all of it around the world and directed all of it to the United States of America, it would only supply 3 percent of our needs.

So we need to face the fact that as we put this energy policy on the table and we are crafting what a future energy policy should look like, we need to face the fact that we are going to have to drill for oil. We have to come up with additional fossil fuel until that point in time that we have conserved and reached alternative energies so that we can lessen our dependence on fossil fuels. If we do not do that, the demand for fossil fuels still exists.

So how do we fill that gap? I will show my colleagues. On this chart

right here, this is oil field production. This is the oil that we are now bringing out at the 1990–2000 growth rates. It is flat. It is actually not flat, as we can see from the angle of my pointer. It actually is declining. Our oil production is declining. Yet if we look at the red line to my left, we will see a line that is labeled oil consumption, and we see that that is going at an angle up and the oil production, field production, is at an angle going down. That means we have a projected shortfall. That is the blue.

How do we make up the difference? How can we possibly have oil consumption up here when we have energy production down here? Does not make sense, does it? Well, it does. Because what fills that blue spot on this chart, what goes in there and fills that big hole is foreign oil. Foreign oil. Our dependency on foreign oil.

Remember the other energy crisis? Many are too young to remember, but the energy crisis in the early 1970s is when we were 40 or 30 percent dependent on foreign oil. Today we are over 50 percent dependent on foreign oil. This gap right here is becoming larger and larger and larger. We need to begin to close oil consumption through conservation, and we need to bring up our energy resources through not just alternative energy but also through our own resources so that we become less dependent on countries like Iraq and so on.

So in my opinion an energy policy needs to be put together by this Congress. And we should commend the President. We do not have to agree with all the elements of an energy policy, but certainly everybody in these chambers should commend the President for at least stepping forward and saying, number one, we need an energy policy, which is a dramatic change from what we have had over the last 8 years under the previous administration; and, number two, we need to put an energy policy together that makes sense on a number of different fronts: Conservation, alternative fuels, research, and further exploration of fossil fuels.

Now, there are some other areas that an energy policy brings up debate on this floor: Nuclear. Nuclear energy. Now, probably some of the most socialistic liberal groups in the world are the Europeans. Guess what, they have a 70 or 80 percent dependency on nuclear plants. The problem with nuclear, of course, is disposal. It burns cleanly, but we have disposal issues. Maybe we ought to put more of our research money into disposal.

Then there is hydropower. That is the energy of movement from water as it drops from a high point to a low point, and we grab that energy as it comes down to spin a turbine to create electricity. The most beautiful thing about hydropower is we do not have to use gasoline. We do not have to fuel it. It is a natural occurrence of energy. We are capturing that natural occurrence

of energy. Hydropower is by far the cleanest energy that we have out there, and it uses a renewable resource.

The energy that we use to run our cars, called gasoline, is not renewable. It has become more efficient, and frankly it has to become more efficient than it is today, but it is not renewable. Hydropower provides us with a renewable resource.

So my concluding remarks regarding energy this evening, before I move on to my other subject, are this: Number one, we heard previously comments from my colleagues from California and the State of Oregon.

□ 2310

My message to the State of California is we are not turning our backs on California. We cannot. You are like a brother or a sister. We have 50 states. We all stick together. But the fact is, California, we cannot afford to have you riding in the back of the wagon anymore. We cannot continue to provide your energy or if we do, you will have to pay the price that we need to get to provide it for you. You need to get out of the wagon and help yourself.

California, you have to help 49 other states that are not in the same predicament you are in for good solid reasons. You have got to help them pull the wagon. You cannot continue, California, to sit in the back of the wagon and point at everybody else and blame them for the fact that you are going to have to get out of the wagon and help pull too.

California, the frustration that some of us have on this House floor is the frustration that you do not want to seem to use self-help. In the last 15 or 20 years you have not wanted any self-help. You have refused to allow generation facilities in your State. You have not allowed gas transmission lines in your State for probably 8 or 10 years. You need some self-help.

California is too important to walk away from, even if they were not the economic power base that they are in this country. Even if it was the smallest State of the union like the State of Wyoming for population, we could not afford to walk away from California because we have an inherent obligation to the citizens of America to help our fellow States. But we also have the right within the realm of fairness to say, hey, if you are going to sit by the camp fire, you help collect the fire wood.

Now, from these chambers we should be open to some type of energy policy. The President has got to start it. He has put some ideas on the table. He does not live or die by those ideas, but he has exercised vision for this country and leadership in saying that at least begin the debate, Congress. Let us put an energy policy together, Congress. We cannot afford, as we have done for the last 8 or 9 years, not to have an energy policy. So at least give credit to the President for stepping forward and putting an energy policy on the table.

Now, it is up to us to add or delete. In the elements of that, number one, look at conservation. Number two, look at exploration of fossil fuels and other ways it can be picked up. Number three, ask the legitimate question: How dependent should we be on foreign oil? Is over 50 percent a safe number? Should we continue to buy in that quantity or should we begin to accept a little of that obligation or a little of that reservoir ourselves to go into our own resources? Those are all questions that I hope we have good healthy debate on.

I know next week in several of the committees, including the Ways and Means Committee on which I sit, we are going to have that kind of debate.

So energy is an important thing in this country.

Let me conclude my energy remarks with one final caution. We have seen in the last three or four weeks, although it may not be seen at the local pump, it should be seen at the local pump. If not, there should be questions asked. But the price of gasoline in this country has dropped dramatically in the last 3 to 4 weeks. We now have a position where demand has dropped in part to conservation and supply has increased, so price has dropped.

I am a little concerned that as prices finally begin to drop at the pumps out there as they should, as heating and air conditioning bills begin to drop as they should, as our electrical generation facilities around this Nation become on line, and by the way, if every generation plant currently on the drawing board today is constructed we will have a new one line every day 5 days a week for the next 5 years so we will have adequate electricity, we are going to be put back into that comfort zone. We will not only not be facing an energy crisis, we will have energy comfort.

As we go into that it would be a very serious mistake, probably for our generation, certainly for the next generation, to believe that, one, we do not need to conserve; that, two, we do not need to look at alternative energy for the future; and that, three, we do not have some kind of obligation to continue to meet this generation's needs by looking at our resources located within the boundaries of this country.

Let me move on from that.

Mr. Speaker, I had a discussion last night about public lands in the West, and I had some questions come up today which I thought would be worthy of clarification.

As many of my colleagues know, this is one of my favorite charts. Why? Take a look at this. This chart shows the people of America that there are distinctions, there are differences between the eastern United States and the western United States. Let me just point out a couple of them.

First of all, water. The State of Colorado, and my district is this color, the poster here to the left. My district is about 64,000 square miles. My district is larger than the entire State of Florida. This is the highest point in the

United States right here. As a result, we have water and lots of snow. Our State provides water, just the Colorado River, which goes like this, that river alone provides drinking water for 25 million people. But that water comes from snow melt. Colorado, this State in the center of the United States, has no water. It is the only State in the lower 48, Colorado, that has no free flowing water that comes into its State for its use. The only State out of the lower 48.

When one takes a look at water in the West, you have the western United States, a chunk about like this, that is over half of the United States, yet that area that I have just pointed out that I have the pointer on, while it consists of over half the land of the United States, it only has 14 percent of the water in the United States. We do not have much rainfall in the West. In the East, people sue each other to shove water, make sure that water is diverted over to their neighbor's property.

In the West, out in the West, life is written in water. Water is like blood in the West. We are an arid region. I had not seen a heavy rain until I came East. Our rain in Colorado is cold and does not last a long time. Once in awhile we get some heavy storms, but generally we do not get much rain. We depend very heavily in the West on water storage because for about 6 to 8 weeks, we get all of the water we could possibly ask for generally, and that is in the spring runoff as the high snows begin to melt and come down. But the rest of the year we do not have that kind of water. Even that 6 weeks, it is not on a consistent basis. Some years we have more snow, and some years we have less snow.

So in the West, we are dependent on water storage. In the West we have Hoover Dam with Lake Mead and we have the Glen Canyon Dam with Lake Powell that provides 80 percent of our water storage. Our water storage is necessary to get us from year to year. It is not nearly as critical in the East as it is in the West. In fact, primarily a lot of your water storage facilities in the East are flood control. You have got too much water.

Our water storage facilities in the West are also flood control, but primarily utilized to store these waters. That is the difference between the East and the West. Let me tell you another difference between the East and the West, and that is public lands. Follow my pointer over here to the left. In the early days of our country, our population really was on the East Coast like this up in this area. And our Nation began to acquire through the Louisiana Purchase and the Missouri buys and things like that large chunks of land out here. In the East our political leaders decided as we grow this great Nation of ours, we have to figure out how to get ahold of this land and put people out on this land. You see back then, simply having a title, having a piece of paper that said you owned the land, it did not mean a hoot.

□ 2320

What you needed to do if you wanted to own the land is you needed to possess it probably with a six shooter on your side. That is where the old saying came from, "Possession is nine-tenths of the law."

So they came up with a problem, how do we influence people to move to the West? West being just Kentucky, out here in the Virginias. How do we get them to move west? Somebody came up with the idea, "Let's do what we did in 1776."

What did they do in 1776? We all remember that date. What did they do in 1776? Believe it or not, the government decided, hey, let's give land to deserters, or people who will defect, soldiers who will defect from the British army. As a reward we'll give them land if they will be defectors. So let's deploy the same type of strategy, not for defectors but since land seemed to work pretty well then, let's give away land. Let's tell people that if they move to the West, we will give them 160 acres. We'll call it the Homestead Act.

Here is kind of a demonstration of it. In 1862, this is later on, because for a while, we could not get the Homestead Act because the North and the South were constantly fighting because they did not want too much of a population in one area that might go slavery or might be opposed to slavery. But in 1862 the U.S. Congress passed the first of many homestead laws that opened settlement of the West. The law provided that anyone was entitled, either the head of a family, 21 years old or a veteran of 14 days of active service in the U.S. Armed Forces, and who was a citizen or had filed a declaration intending to become a citizen could acquire a tract of land in public domain not exceeding 160 acres. It included federally owned lands in all the States except the original 13, Maine, Vermont, West Virginia, Kentucky, Tennessee and Texas. The land was often desolate without trees, wood or adequate water. Many homesteaders' homes were made of sod bricks from their land. It was a tough life. How do you get people to go out there and live a tough life? You gave them land.

Well, there happened to be a problem. As people began to come out here, they took up those offers of homesteading and they settled. This is where they settled. All of a sudden when they hit, including the eastern district of the Third Congressional District of Colorado, word got back to Washington, D.C., these people aren't settling here. They're either turning back and going back into the main part of the United States or they're trying to go up and around and come out here on the coast of California where you see this large white patch, but they are not settling in this area. That set off alarm bells in Washington.

Remember what I said. In order for us to grow this Nation, we had to have people in possession. So this great Nation of ours that owned these large,

hundreds of millions of acres out here but nobody was on them to defend them. Nobody was possessing them. So in Washington, the alarm bells went off. We have got to get people into these lands. Somebody said, well, 160 acres in eastern Colorado or Nebraska or Kansas or out here in Missouri, 160 acres is enough to support a family.

They said, well, in the mountains, at those high elevations, in a lot of cases, 160 acres, it won't even feed a cow.

What do we do? Somebody says, I'll tell you what we do. Let's give the people 3,000 acres. Let's give them several thousand acres, compared to the 160 acres where the ground is much more fertile and where you can support a family.

Somebody else said, we can't do that politically. There's no way that we can give individuals thousands of acres each. Somebody else came up with an idea and they said, you know what we ought to do, just for formality, let's go ahead and keep the title to all this land in the Federal Government, let's just allow the people to use the land. That is where the concept of public lands came from, and that is where the concept of multiple use came from and that is where the sign that I grew up, when I would go into the forest or Federal lands and, by the way, in my district almost every community in my district is completely surrounded by public lands, when we went on those public lands, there was a large sign there, "You are now entering the Roosevelt National Forest, a land of many uses." A land of many uses. That is just what I have here to the left of my chart.

What has happened is of late, we have organizations like the National Sierra Club who would like to take down the water storage project at Lake Powell which consists of about 40 percent of our water storage in the West. We have groups like Earth First that are coming out and trying to educate people out here in the East that in the West all this land, the reason it was never put into private ownership was so that it could be conserved for all future generations and not to be used by the people in the West and really we ought to get rid of the concept of multiple use.

What they do not tell you is there were some lands, like right up there, the great Yellowstone National Park, Teton National Park, fabulous areas. Everybody should go see those areas. Those were set aside specifically as national parks and so on. But this land out here was never intended to be a land with a no trespassing sign on it. It was thought to be a land that could support life, a land of which the people could have multiple uses, whether it was recreation, whether as we know today protection of the environment, whether it was farming or skiing or having a highway or having a power line or having your home or being able to go out and hunt or fish, just watch, be a wildlife watcher. That is a big difference between the East and the West.

In the East they do not know what public land is in a lot of States. In the East not a lot of people understand the issues and the differences between water in the East and water in the West. In the East if you are going to build a power line or something like that, you go to your county planning board. Here in the West, our planning board is right back here in Washington, D.C. So you can see why the people of the West get a little sensitive when people in the East start dictating the terms of which the people in the West must live under.

And so my purpose here tonight, after my discussion last night, was not an attack on the East obviously, but to help my dear colleagues from the East, so that you can talk to your constituents and say, you know, life in the West really is different. I mean, they are Americans, we are one country, but we need to take into consideration public lands and private lands. We need to take into consideration the different water issues of the West, compared with the water issues of the East. We need to take into consideration the fact that in the West, they deal with much different geographic differences, or elevations even, than we do in the East. And as you begin to look at those things, as you begin to hear our side of the story in the West, a lot of you begin to say, wow, I did not realize that. I did not know that. Gosh, that map that you showed us this evening really does show something that we ought to think about, something we ought to consider when we make legislation off this fine floor of the House of Representatives.

So my purpose again to reiterate tonight is simply to demonstrate that there are differences that we must consider as we have legislation dealing with everything from water to public lands.

Mr. Speaker, let me very quickly end my remarks as I started my remarks, and, that is, I wish to honor this evening four firefighters who lost their lives yesterday in service to their country. Those firefighters were Tom L. Craven, 30 years old, of Ellensburg; Karen L. Fitzpatrick, 18 years old, of Yakima; Devin A. Weaver, Devin was 21 years old, of Yakima; and Jessica L. Johnson, who was 19 years old, of Yakima.

If some of you colleagues have just come in towards the end of my remarks, let me tell you that 2 days ago, these four young people were called to service to fight a fire, a fire that started at five acres and within minutes moved to 2,500 acres. From five to 2,500. These firefighters and some of the others that managed to survive on that fire experienced the horror every firefighter has, the bad dream that every firefighter has, and that is called a blowout. These four people fit the classification of the definition of the word hero as we see it in our dictionary, as we feel it in our mind, as we think about it in our emotions.

In my concluding remarks tonight, I would ask that this body and every citizen in America, all your constituents, extend their sympathies and their prayers to the families of these firefighters who lost their young loved ones, and also, it also gives us a little time for consideration. The next time you see a fireman, whether it is a volunteer fireman, professional fireman, a police officer, an EMT or just the local volunteer from the community that helps us take on the battle of fires which we face every summer, pat them on the back, tell them thanks, tell them we care about them.

But tonight, colleagues, before you go to sleep, if you say prayers, and I do, if you say prayers, say just a little prayer for those firefighters who gave their lives in the last 24 hours as the duty of their Nation called.

□ 2330

They answered that call. They fulfilled their duty and they are now part of history. I ask for your consideration and your prayers.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 31 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 0123

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. DREIER) at 1 o'clock and 23 minutes a.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2356, BIPARTISAN CAMPAIGN REFORM ACT OF 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-135) on the resolution (H. Res. 188) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2356) to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to provide bipartisan campaign reform, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 36, CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT AUTHORIZING CONGRESS TO PROHIBIT PHYSICAL DESECRATION OF FLAG OF UNITED STATES

Mr. REYNOLDS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-136) on the resolution (H. Res. 189) providing for consideration of the bill (H.J. Res. 36) proposing an amendment to the Con-

stitution of the United States authorizing the Congress to prohibit the physical desecration of the flag of the United States, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CAPUANO (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for July 10 and today on account of illness.

Mr. LEWIS of California (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for July 10 and the balance of the week on account of personal business in California.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. MCNULTY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. SCHIFF, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. GREEN of Texas, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. WATSON of California, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. ROSS, for 5 minutes, today.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. WALDEN of Oregon) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WALDEN of Oregon, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. HORN, for 5 minutes, today.

Mr. WELDON of Florida, for 5 minutes, today. (The following Member (at his own request) to revise and extend his remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. WAXMAN, for 5 minutes, today.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until Thursday, July 12, 2001, at 10 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 8 of rule XII, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2817. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Aminoethoxyvinylglycine (AVG); Time-Limited Pesticide Tolerances [OPP-301147; FRL-6790-7] (RIN: 2070-AB78) received July 6, 2001, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2818. A letter from the Principal Deputy Associate Administrator, Environmental