

many of the same sort of traditional fossil fuel air pollutants. Nuclear energy is not a silver bullet.

We have heard some arguing that somehow the environmentalists have locked up all the land. We cannot have access. Wait a minute. Right now the oil and gas industry has access to huge tracts of BLM lands. Only 3.5 percent of the BLM land in Colorado is off limits to exploration; only 2 percent in Montana; only 2.5 percent in Wyoming; 4 percent in New Mexico. It simply is not true that there is no access.

It is interesting watching the little struggle between the President's brother and the people in California and Alaska who are concerned about off-shore drilling, but there is still over 60 percent of the Nation's undiscovered economically recoverable oil and 80 percent of the economically recoverable gas that is located in areas that are accessible. There are opportunities for further exploration. It is the private sector that to this point has chosen not to take advantage of them.

I guess I will conclude my remarks before turning to the gentleman from New Jersey to wrap it up to just make one other point, that there are many opportunities now for low-income people to be able to reduce their energy costs over time.

We have talked about the lunacy of having a massive tax cut that is not going to benefit the vast majority of low- and moderate-income people, but somehow they are going to take this tax cut and pay it for higher energy costs. But if for a moment we can spend upwards of \$2 trillion over the next 11 years, is it not possible that Congress and this administration could design programs to help very low- and moderate-income people pay some of the higher costs through rebates or direct tax credits that go back to them, so they can afford to be more energy efficient, lower their electrical costs today, not tomorrow or 20 years from now, lower those costs today, save them money today, and have additional savings that will accrue to the broader community because we will not have to build an energy plant a week?

It seems to me that this is a simple, commonsense approach; that if we could get it to the floor, I am convinced an overwhelming majority of Republicans and Democrats would agree with the American public to put conservation, wise use, invest in American technology, do that first before we move ahead with things that simply they are opposed to. I think it makes good sense, and I hope that this Congress will listen to what we are being told by the American public.

With that, I will turn to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) for the last word in our special order this evening.

Mr. PALLONE. I thank the gentleman. I do not mean to take the last word, but I just wanted to comment on what the gentleman said, because I

think what he pointed out is that the Democrats' energy policy is a well-rounded, commonsense approach.

We are saying that we want more production in those areas that are available to be done; to drill for oil, to drill for natural gas, in an environmentally sensitive way. It can be done. We are for more production. We are saying we want conservation. We want the use of more renewables. We want more energy efficiency. We have tax credits for energy efficiency, if you buy a car or do something to your home that is more energy efficient.

We basically are very well rounded in our approach in terms of the types of fossil fuels that could be used, and I for the life of me do not understand why we have to take this Bush-Cheney approach that just says drill, drill, drill, and nothing else. Even in our Democratic proposal, we have a supplement to the LIHEAP program for low-income individuals, because we recognize that they are going to need additional help.

If you think about what the Democrats have put forward, more production, more energy efficiency, more use of renewables, trying to provide direct payments to low-income individuals so they can pay for their rising costs, all these things are in there.

But we want this energy policy to be well rounded. We do not want it to just be limited to something that the oil companies want, which is to drill and drill and drill. There is no way that you can possibly look at what the Democrats have in mind and then look at what the President is proposing. The President's proposal is nothing more than a payback to the special interests, to the oil industry. We have seen that.

I know tomorrow it is going to be unveiled. We heard a lot about it, but I am waiting to see what happens, because, as the gentleman says, we want to be bipartisan, and we are hoping that maybe he will incorporate tomorrow some of the conservation and other things that we are talking about tonight. I doubt he will, but I hope he does, because I would like to see a responsible energy policy passed. I just do not see that coming from the White House so far.

With that, I thank my colleague for all he has done and continues to do on these issues.

DIABETES, A DEVASTATING PUBLIC HEALTH ISSUE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CANTOR). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Mr. Speaker, as we observe National Women's Health Week this week, I rise as the Cochair of the Congressional Caucus on Women's Issues to bring attention and highlight a disease that has become a devastating public health issue. That disease is diabetes, and it is wreaking havoc on women, especially African American women.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 2130

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

Primary prevention is critical to reducing morbidity, mortality, and economic costs associated with cardiovascular disease in diabetic women. Diabetes is the single most costly disease in America, totaling about \$105 billion a year. That is why the Women's Caucus submitted an appropriations request for fiscal year 2002 that would fully fund NIH programs and which will provide the resources necessary to address this issue.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to raise their voices, open their hearts, and enhance their commitment in educating our communities

about diabetes and primary prevention. I also ask each one to join in the fight for adequate funding for research.

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

THE ENERGY CRISIS IN THE UNITED STATES

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

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

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

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

The gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), my colleague, says that the answer for this energy crisis in California lies in Washington, D.C. I say to the gentleman, with all due respect, the answer should not come out of Washington, D.C. The answer should come at the local level and at the State level. Frankly, the State of California thought they would show all the other States how deregulation was done. They took the lead on deregulation, and they made a mistake. I say to the gentleman, with all due respect, the gentleman sounds like another gentleman from California. He sounds like defense attorneys. He blames everybody else: it is not my fault; it is their

fault. It is not the fault of California; it is the fault of the Federal Government in Washington, D.C. It is not the fault of California and the State legislature and the Governor of California; it is the fault of the Western States. It is not the fault of the Governor of the State of California and the legislature of California; it is the fault of the oil companies or it is the fault of this and that.

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

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

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

You think what you are trying to do out there in California is defer the pain: we will freeze these prices. That does not bring conservation. The Governor of California and the gentleman from California (Mr. SHERMAN), why do you not just for a moment say, all right, maybe in California we have to change some of the philosophy we have had; maybe we have to come up with the approach that maybe somewhere it is going to have to happen in our backyard; maybe we have to admit that there is a balance out there, a balance, a balance that can be reached with con-

servation as an element, with energy production as an element. I mean there is a balance. In California, frankly, the problem is they have gone to one side of the balance, that somehow all of the production should take place out of the State of California.

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

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

Take a look. Every time the government gets involved, the consumer suffers. Tonight we hear some of my colleagues say, what we should do is go out and freeze the prices. Now, I know that sounds great. Who does not want to do that? But we do not get something for nothing. The best way to destroy conservation is to tell people the prices are not going to go up. I can tell my colleagues right now, the reason my wife and I are conserving, I think fairly extensively in our own personal life, is because our prices have gone up. If we let the market take its place, the market will produce. California has artificially tried to guide the market, first through deregulation, and then through their governor-led sponsorship of no price increase, et cetera, et cetera, et cetera, and look what has happened.

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

Anybody in these Chambers, anybody in these Chambers who does not want