

make a buck off an issue, Birdie poured her heart and soul into those issues and sought nothing in return.

Her family, her mother, her sisters, her children, and grandson all meant everything to Birdie. In fact, I think she would have liked to adopt me because sometimes she thought I needed a mom in town, and she was probably right.

Each time that she came in to see me in my office to offer her advice and wisdom, she would tap lightly on my door. No one else ever did that. I knew that I was either in trouble for a vote I had cast on the floor that day contrary to her suggestions, or I was in store for a witty argument on an upcoming vote in this body.

There will be many days and many nights ahead when I will miss that tapping at my door, but I will have many years of memories, many years of good counsel and many years of friendship upon which to reflect and rely.

Washington is a city of monuments hewn of stone and sewn with mortar. We can admire these great people and we should, but Washington is also the city that spreads forth the ray of hope for our Nation and our world. Birdie Kyle spent her life igniting that hope.

I was honored to know and work with Birdie. Without her, I would not have been as good a representative nor as good a person as I am. Many of us in this body can say that about our staff.

About right now, somebody up there in heaven is getting a morning briefing from Birdie, and I am sure it is not a pretty sight with all that needs to be righted in the world. We all know that heaven is in good hands with Birdie Kyle up there at the helm.

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

(Mr. CUMMINGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

□ 1915

SALVATION ARMY DISCRIMINATING AGAINST GAYS AND LESBIANS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PENCE). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor this evening because of a shocking story that appeared on the front page of the Washington Post this morning about a secret deal between, of all people, of all organizations, the Salvation Army, to support charitable choice in exchange for the issuance of a White House regulation, OMB Circular No. A-102, that would deny assistance to States or localities that require religious charities to adhere to their nondiscrimination laws as they apply to gay men and women. Now, of course,

these nondiscrimination laws have to do with the activities of these religious charities that do not relate to their religions.

A political deal should be beneath the dignity of the Salvation Army, given its long Christian heritage, not to mention the President of the United States. It is a deal to discriminate under the table.

According to the lead document, this cannot be done in the legislative process very easily, so they had to do it by regulation. Charitable choice already contains a fatal flaw, because, as put forward by the administration, it would allow a religious organization to discriminate using government money by requiring people it hires to do a government task to be of their religion. That is a direct violation of Title VI and of the Constitution of the United States.

I am a former Chair of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission. I strongly support an exemption in the law that I administered, Title VII, which allows a religious denomination an exemption to the antidiscrimination law in hiring people of their own religion with their own money. But we cannot give the Baptists and the Lutherans and the Catholics and the Jews our money and say you can discriminate when you perform services in our name. That is already a problem with the bill.

But in order to make it perfectly clear, in case that does not survive, that at least people who are gay and lesbian should not be discriminated against, this would be done by regulation.

Mr. Speaker, why the Salvation Army would engage in this deal is really perplexing. The Salvation Army already gets \$300 million in funds from the Federal Government to do their wonderful work. They get it because they abide by government regulations that say when you use government money, you cannot proselytize, you cannot engage in religion, because this is America, and this is what we have stood for, for everybody. So they already get money, just like Catholic charities and just like Lutheran charities and just like Jewish charities all get money, and they have accepted it, and I hope they will continue to get it on the basis that everybody else who does the government's work accepts it, and that is as long as we are doing the government's work, then your money is the public money, and we cannot discriminate against anybody when giving those services.

This body has already a long history of discriminating against gays and lesbians in the District of Columbia, because whenever there is anything in our law that allows equal protection for people of a different sexual orientation, then somebody hops up here and tries, and often succeeds, in overturning the law. Now we are trying to do to do what you do to the District of Columbia to hundreds of localities and States in the United States.

I hope everybody understands what it feels like to intrude in the affairs of local jurisdictions in a federalist society, a society where we say, look, different strokes for different folks. Some of us behave one way with respect to our laws, others another way. Some people have chosen to protect gay men and lesbians against discrimination, and I say God bless them. In the 21st century we should not be discriminating against any Americans based on a characteristic that has nothing to do with performance. Sexual orientation has nothing to do with performance, and the last people, the last organizations who should be engaged in such discrimination are organizations that go by the name "Christian," and the Salvation Army should be ashamed of itself that it has been caught red-handed on the front page of the Washington Post in the column where you put war and peace. Thank God that they were exposed.

NATURAL RESOURCES

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

Mr. MCINNIS. Mr. Speaker, I am a little surprised by the previous speaker and her unrelenting attack against the Salvation Army. She apparently got the merits for this attack from one newspaper article. I have heard the gentlewoman previously speak from here. I think she is well-educated. She comes generally with numerous sources when she speaks. That is why I am very surprised that she takes one newspaper article and launches an attack against the Salvation Army, which I would like to say to the gentlewoman has helped millions and millions of people throughout the history of this country. I think such an attack is unfounded, and I think you should hear the other side of the story.

I would advise the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia to immediately go to a TV, turn on CNN on the half-hour, or some other broadcast, and she will find that the other side of the story has come out. In fact, I just spent some time, I was not looking for the story, I was grabbing a snack and watching the other side of the story being played out, and once the gentlewoman sees that, she will moderate the comments against the Salvation Army.

I do not disagree with her point, I want to make this clear to the gentlewoman. I do not think any kind of secret deal should be made. But I do not think the Salvation Army went out and made a secret deal to discriminate against people, contrary to the laws of the United States. And I think that in all fairness to the Salvation Army, as well as the President of the United States, that both sides of the story should be read, both sides of the story

should be analyzed, and then the concluding remarks that the gentlewoman has could then be made on the House floor.

Now, that is not the purpose of my comments this evening. My real focus this evening is on natural resources. But before we go to natural resources, I want to spend a couple of moments also on the comments of another speaker.

Unfortunately, as my colleagues know, we have one speaker at a time. We only have one speaker at a time that gets the opportunity up here. So I have heard some of these, and I heard another attack regarding the energy situation in the State of California. So I want to reiterate a couple of points that I think are important for the energy situation that we have in California.

Remember that the energy crisis that exists in California does not exist in 50 States. In fact, in 49 of the 50 States, they are not having the kind of problems that California is having. In other words, the problems in California are as a result of a combination of a number of different factors that have come into play, not the least of which is that the State of California has refused to help itself, has refused to help itself, by allowing power plants to be built over the last 10 years, by allowing natural gas transmission lines to go into their State, by allowing electrical transmission lines to go into their State.

California has paid a very dear price. Of all 50 States out there, of all 50 States, California has been the lead State opposing any kind of energy transmission in their State, opposing power plants. They are the ones where the old saying, "Not in my backyard," it is out of that State that came.

So I do not think a speaker, I do not think one should stand up here and make California look like some poor innocent victim in the Western United States who somehow is picked out of 50 States and is the only State in the kind of crisis they are in, and then have one stand up here and accuse the power companies of theft. I do not know whether there has been theft or not, but let me tell you, the problem is much broader than a power company like Duke Energy.

The problem that you have got out there is you have to face a couple realities. Number one, conservation is absolutely critical, and it is going to be a critical component about how California, and, frankly, the rest of the Nation, can avoid getting into the same spot that California got into by adopting some pretty simple methods of conservation.

Conservation does not mean you have to suffer in your life-style. There are a lot of very simple things that you can do in your life-style that do not give you a negative impact, that do not serve as an inconvenience for you. Just think of them: Shut the lights off when you leave the room; make sure your

fan is turning in a clockwise fashion in the summer; make sure you change your oil when the owner's manual tells you to change the oil on your car, instead of being marketed into changing your oil every 3,000 miles by the quick-lubes. There are a lot of things we can consider. Conservation is very critical for California.

The second thing that is very critical for California is you have got to get over that habit, I guess you would say, or almost an idealism that you have locked into, and that is "not in my backyard." In other words, let the other 49 States build the power plants, let the other 49 States worry about electrical transmission lines, let the other 49 States worry about natural gas exploration and oil exploration, et cetera, et cetera. You cannot do that, California. California, you are going to have to help yourself. You are going to have to help pull yourself up by the bootstraps.

Now, let me say, I am a fan of California. I like the State of California, and California is a State. We have 50 States. We are unified like brothers and sisters. We should not abandon California. I do not think we should stand up here and bash California.

But we need to be frank with each other. California, quit pointing the finger at everybody else. California, quit saying it is everybody else's fault. You know what you need to do is help pull yourself up by your own bootstraps. And we should help, too. I do not think California should be left to die on the vine out there, so to speak.

California, after all, if it were a country, it would be the seventh most powerful country in the world. It is huge in economics for this country, and every State of the Union is dependent upon good economic health in the State of California. But I think it is grossly unfair for any of my colleagues to stand up here and make it sound like it is everybody's fault but California's, and that everybody ought to pitch in but California, and that California has been abused here and California has been abused there.

There are a lot of good minds in California, and a lot of those people will say, you know, we have to have conservation, number one; and, number two, we have got to have power plants.

The fact is we need electricity in our everyday lives. We need oil. We need gas. We need it in a balanced fashion. And, to California's credit, although in many cases they may have gone overboard, in many cases California has been the leading State in demanding that the energy production be clean production, in demanding that we have higher efficiencies, and, to California's credit, just here in the last month or 2 months, California is responding to conservation. My understanding is their conservation has resulted in about a 10 percent decrease in the demand for energy that that State is having.

So, the only reason I am making my comments, which are a little off the

subject of which I wanted to talk about this evening, water, although when we talk about water, we are going to talk about energy and the renewable energy of water and its resource, my purpose in commenting is I just think somebody has to stand up here when some of my colleagues take this microphone and talk about "poor old California" and how it is everybody else's fault.

You know, California, what you try to do, I will tell you what got California in this mess. They had a new theory of deregulation, and they went out to the customers in California and said, we will keep your price the same, no matter what happens out here in the market. We will buy on the spot market, and, regardless of what happens, the average will always allow us, even though it goes up and down, the average line in there will always allow you to be sold power at the same price. Something for nothing. That is exactly what they promised, something for nothing.

For a little while it worked. Forty-nine other States did not adopt that policy. Forty-nine other States did not think they could get something for nothing. Forty-nine other States allowed power production to be built in their State. Forty-nine other States allowed electrical transmission lines. Forty-nine other States allowed natural gas transmission lines. But California thought they discovered something new, and that is by denial, by guaranteeing flat rates, and by shoving the obligations on the other 49 States, they thought they could sail through this, and they have not been able to.

Now, what is happening out there, I think that the Governor finally, I notice a couple of weeks ago he went over and cut the ribbon for a new power generation facility. Finally they are going to allow some generation to be built in that State. Finally this "not in my own backyard" is going to be adjusted, not eliminated, because I do not think it should be put in every backyard, but it is going to be adjusted, and California is going to get back on its feet.

I do not think California is in for the kind of crisis that some people on this floor think it is going to be in for. It has been a good lesson not just for the State of California, but a good lesson for all 50 States, that, look, we need to plan for our future. We have an obligation to have some kind of vision into the future, to talk about what the energy needs are not only of today's generation, but what we can do for energy for tomorrow's generation, and that means serious discussions on alternative energy, although, as you know right now, do not be led down the path that alternative energy today is the answer.

If you took all the alternative energy in the world, all of the alternative energy in the world, and devoted every bit of it to the United States, it only supplies 3 percent of our needs.

□ 1930

So do not exaggerate what alternative energy can do for us today. But we should focus on what alternative energy can do for us tomorrow. All 50 States should do this. What happened in California was a warning shot to the entire Nation, and that is, we need to have an energy policy. That is exactly what has been missing here in the last few years. During the Clinton administration we had zero energy policy.

I am very interested, by the way, to read the newspapers. I cannot find a newspaper, and maybe there is one out there, maybe the Wall Street Journal, but I cannot find much coverage or any kind of criticism of the Clinton administration for not having an energy policy for the last 8 years. But we can pick up any newspaper on a daily basis and see criticism against the current administration because they are trying to develop an energy policy.

We need to put all of these things on the table. We need to discuss and debate and analyze exactly what it is that we have put on that table. We need to add things or take things off. But in the end we need a product that is called an energy policy that will allow us and instill upon us a vision for the future of this country, that will allow us to avoid the very kind of crisis that California got into, that will allow us less dependency on foreign oil.

But we will not get that without some type of policy, and we will not come to that policy without some kind of debate. But instead, they are criticizing the debate; instead they are criticizing the administration in trying to put an energy policy together to put some ideas on the table and let us have discussions on this floor. Do not continually, colleagues, come to this floor and criticize. Everybody is to blame for California. Do not come to this floor, colleagues, and try and let all of us believe that the answer to this, the sole answer to this, is alternative energy or more conservation. All of those factors have to come together for the answer that we need.

As much as you want to deny it, the fact is we are going to have to have more electrical generations. I think we are going to be responsive to that. In fact, in the rest of the Nation, in the other 49 States we are going to have a number of States that will have an electrical glut in about a year. Part of the problem is we do not have the electrical transmission lines to move that electricity. But my point is this, and that is that it is unfair for my good colleague from the State of California to speak at this microphone and act as if California's problems belong to the energy companies in the other 49 States. This was a problem that was brought upon themselves. It is a problem that all of us should help them get out of, but they have got to lead. They have got to have a little self-help. They have got to pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. And for the rest of us, colleagues, we have to sit down and

work with the administration and come up with an energy policy that gives us vision for the future.

Let me move from that subject to another subject. A subject that is near and dear to my heart. It is going to be a boring subject to my colleagues. I know that many of you will probably find yourself snoring or not find this of particular interest, because it is about water.

Water is one of the most wonderful things of our life. It is one of the more wonderful creations of God, if one believes in God, which I do. It is something that obviously we all know sustains life. It sustains a number of different factors in life.

Water is pretty boring. Why? Because we have been blessed in most cases with plenty of water. As long as water runs out of the faucet, as long as the toilet flushes, as long as there is drinking water out of the sink it is not such a big issue. It is when it stops that all of the sudden it becomes a big issue.

Just the same as energy, I think we need to have a vision for water in the future. Frankly, we have had from the generations and generations of people that have preceded us, we have seen vision for water. We have seen different types of utilizations of water and different planning for water for future generations. But in order for us to continue that kind of vision, we need to understand what water is about and what it has that is so valuable to our everyday lives.

So I thought I would start out and visit just a little about the importance of our water.

Let me say, first of all, in the State capital, my district is obviously in Colorado, my district is the highest district in the Nation, so I am at the highest elevation in the Nation. Up in my district, it snows year-round up on top of those mountain peaks. It is cold up there. It gets high. That is where a lot of this Nation's water comes from, are off the mountain peaks in my congressional district. So I think I know a little about water.

In our State capitol of the State of Colorado, if any of my colleagues ever have an opportunity to go visit, go take a look at it. It is a beautiful building to start off with, but it has a number of different murals throughout the capitol building. Do you know what you see in every mural in the State capitol building in Colorado? Somewhere in that mural, you will see water, because water is the lifeblood in the West. Water is the lifeblood everywhere; but in the West, we are in a unique part of this Nation. There is a distinct difference between the eastern United States and the western United States.

Mr. Speaker, one-half of the Nation is blessed with a lot of water. In fact, in the eastern United States, you see lawsuits or disagreements about: hey, put that water on my neighbor's land. I do not want that water. In the West, the suits are just the opposite. In the

West, there are range wars fought, not only over sheep and cattle, but over water. They say water out there in the West does run like blood, and it is fought over with blood, and that it is as valuable as blood. That is the importance of water in the West; and there is a distinction, as I said.

But in the State capitol there in Colorado, there is this language: "Here is a land where life is written in Water. The West is where the Water was and is Father and Son of old Mother and Daughter following Rivers up immensities of Range and Desert, thirsting the Sundown ever crossing a hill to climb a hill still Drier, naming tonight a City by some River a different Name from last night's camping Fire. Look to the Green within the Mountain cup; Look to the Prairie parched for Water lack; Look to the Sun that pulls the Oceans up; Look to the Cloud that gives the oceans back. Look to your Heart and may your Wisdom grow to power of Lightning and to peace of Snow." That is Thomas Hornsby Ferril.

That is a saying in our capitol. That is why water is so critical.

Let us look over a few statistics that are important. First of all, the interesting thing that I found about water, if we look at all of the water in the world, all of the water in the world, 97 percent of the water is the salt water; 97 percent. So only 3 percent of the water we have in the world is drinking-type of water, is nonsalt water, is clear water. And of the remaining 3 percent, if we took 75 percent of that 3 percent, that is all tied up in the ice caps up in the polar ice caps. So when we take a look at the amount of water worldwide, without the technological advances that perhaps the future will bring us for salinity and desalinization, we find that there is not really a large amount of water that we can use out of that big pot of water out there.

When we take a look at our country, we can see that stream flow in the United States; and as I said earlier, there is a difference between the eastern United States and the western United States, but 73 percent of the stream flow in the United States is in the eastern United States. It is not in the western United States. So we have 73 percent in the East, and then in the Pacific Northwest we have another 12 percent, and then the rest of the West, which makes up over half of the Nation. Remember, the West is vast in quantity of land. If we take the West, minus the Pacific Northwest, which consists of more than half of the Nation, we have 14 percent of the Nation's water. So in other words, more than half of the Nation has 14 percent of the water to provide life. That is pretty amazing.

So we should understand that it is important that our water does not come on a consistent basis and it does not come in the same amount of quantity every year, year after year. In fact, day after day, the quantity of water that we have varies in the West,

and it is not at all consistent. Some years we have great snowfall; but it gets too warm in the spring too early, and it runs off before we can use it. Some winters we do not get great snowfall, so we have drought. In much of the West right now we are facing drought conditions.

The critical issue to remember about the West when we talk about water is that in the West, we have to store our water. We are going to talk about the mighty Colorado River. The State of Colorado is called the "Mother State of Rivers," and we will go into that. It has four major rivers that come out of Colorado. In fact, the Colorado River out of the State of Colorado provides drinking water for 25 million people, 25 million people. So my good friends in Phoenix or Las Vegas or Tucson, you are totally dependent upon the Colorado River. In Los Angeles, you are almost totally dependent on the Colorado River.

The thing to keep in mind is that in the West, since we do not have consistent rainfall, we have very low rainfall. In fact, in the State of Colorado, we get about 16 inches a year, 16 inches a year. In some of the communities here, they get 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 18 inches in a heavy rain storm in a day, and that is pretty remarkable. So in the West, we have to be able to store our water, because when we do have a lot of water, we do have a lot of water during one period of time generally, and that is called spring runoff. When the high snows come into the mountains in the wintertime and it accumulates and accumulates and accumulates, and then in the springtime, when the flowers start to pop up, everything starts to green, the snow starts to melt, and very rapidly, and for about 30 to 90 days, for about 30 to 90 days, really probably 30 to 60 days, we have all the water we need in the West. It is called the spring runoff. We have all the water we need. But the problem is, for the balance of the year, we do not. That is in part one of the reasons we need to store our water in the West, why we need to have dams in the West.

Now, in the East there are some radical environmental organizations, Earth First and some of the groups like that. Frankly, the national Sierra Club, which has never supported a water storage project in the history of that organization, they would like to make people in the East believe that in the West, a dam is an abuse of the environment, that these dams are nothing but atrocious toys for construction companies. We are totally dependent in the West.

Mr. Speaker, any family or friends that we have in the West, they are totally dependent on our capability to store water. By the way, you know when the first dam was that we could find on the Colorado River? One thousand years ago. One thousand years ago the Anasazi Indians down at Mesa Verde, Mesa Table, Verde Green, the Green Table, down in Mesa Verde we

found proof that the Anasazi Indians were the first ones to come up with a dam; and they had reservoirs and they had canals, and then the Indian tribe, the Anasazis went extinct. We think the reason they went extinct was because they did not have enough runoff to store the water. So after hundreds of years, a period of time, the Anasazi goes out, we think the reason they became extinct was because of the lack of water.

So those are some very interesting things. Let us look very quickly here, I covered here pretty much, so I think this is the critical point here: there is only 14 percent of the total stream flow to be shared by 14 States which make up over half of the Nation's land use.

Now, let us talk, just for a moment, because I think this next chart I want to show really was stunning to me. I found it fascinating. I had no idea how much water is required in our everyday life. I am not talking about showers or using the restroom or drinking water. I am talking about water for agriculture.

□ 1945

This is about water for agriculture. I watched with some interest the fact that out in the West the Federal Government has shut down farmers because they need to protect the sucker fish. I do not know enough about the dispute to argue on either side of that, but it has been on the national news the last few days. Watch and see how critical that issue becomes. It is critical for life out there in the West.

Look at this chart. See if the Members are as interested in this as I am. Direct use of the water. This is water we would use every day. The average person uses two gallons to drink and cook in, two gallons of water.

Imagine, at the grocery store, we all have an idea what a gallon of milk jug looks like. Two of those are necessary just for the drinking and cooking. For flushing the toilet for one's own personal use, we need about five to seven of those gallons of water.

We have the grocery cart. We have two gallons for drinking and cooking. Now we have to put six, between five and seven, so say six more gallons for the use of the toilet. If we do wash that day we will have to put 20 more gallons into the shopping cart.

Now it is time for a second shopping cart. If we use the dishwasher that day, we will need 25 more gallons into that shopping cart. Then, if we take a shower because we sweated so much from putting all of that water into the shopping carts, it is another nine gallons.

Now take a look at what growing food takes, because growing food is what uses the most water. But what is the most beautiful aspect of water? What is the key ingredient of water? It is a renewable resource. One person's waste is another person's water.

I remember years ago in Colorado when they came out and said that what we need to do, they demand that we go

and lay concrete in all the ditches; line the ditches, because that water seeping into the ground is a huge waste of water.

Do Members know what happens when we line a ditch and stop the seepage of the water within that ditch? We may be drying up a spring of somebody 3 miles away. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, we do not have the technology today to look underneath the Earth and see where every little vein of water goes and how it connects.

The generations that will follow us will find it fascinating, because they will have the technological apparatus to take a look and say, gosh, this ditch provides for this spring, which is 10 miles away, and this aquifer, which has been under the ground for thousands of years, it provides a stream to this aquifer which connects over here and pops up in a spring somewhere. Those are the kinds of things that this future generation will be able to see that we cannot see today.

But what we do know today is that water is, number one, renewable. It is not like gasoline, where we use a gallon of gasoline and it is gone forever. It is not like natural gas, where we turn on the heater and bring the natural gas through. It is gone forever. It is not like nuclear with uranium, it is gone. Water is renewable, and that is why it is so important.

Take a look. Most of the use of water is in agriculture. Now, it is interesting to me. In fact, I had the privilege, really the privilege, of being up in Jackson Hole, Wyoming. I happen to think I have the prettiest district in the Nation. I have resorts, Aspen, Durango, I have all the Rockies, almost all the mountains in Colorado, but Jackson Hole comes pretty close.

I was up in Jackson Hole. It was just beautiful, gorgeous. Of course, there is the national park, Yellowstone, the Teton National Park. I would love to discuss, and I intend to one of these nights soon, talk about the national parks and how important the national parks are for our Nation, and how many millions of people enjoy our national parks every year.

But what was interesting is that we were looking out at Jackson Lake, which is north of Jackson Hole. As we were looking out there, they have a dam on Jackson Lake. That is what created the lake was the dam. I was listening. Somebody said, "Well, the unfortunate thing about this dam is that the Idaho farmers, the Idaho farmers get the top 36 feet. They get the first 36 feet of storage. It is let out into the Snake River and it goes to the farmers in Idaho. That is really bad."

I thought, bad? This person is probably going to eat a potato for lunch. This person was probably going to eat lots of agricultural products during her day that were provided by water. Agriculture is not a bad thing, but we have to make the connection. We could not have a lot of agriculture in the West if we did not have the water storage to provide for it.

In fact, what we would do is have very, very little agriculture in the West, very little way to sustain life in the West. The same thing with the Anasazi 1,000 years ago. When they ran out of the capability to have water for storage, the storage would not hold enough for them, they became extinct. That is why water is so important. That is why, when we look at a dam, we should look at what all it provides.

Take a look at agriculture. This is amazing. One loaf of bread, I will bet Members did not know this, one loaf of bread, from the time we cultivate the soil to raise the wheat and to be able to process the wheat, to be able to turn it into a loaf of bread, we will have gone through 150 gallons of water, 150 gallons of water. That is what is necessary to have the final product of one loaf of bread.

One egg, this is almost unbelievable, 120 gallons for one egg. We have to raise the chicken, give the chicken water, the chicken has to have the water on a regular basis, the egg has to be cleaned and processed, there is water within the egg, et cetera, et cetera. It is 120 gallons.

To produce one quart of milk, we have to have 223 gallons of water; for one quart of milk, one quart, 223 gallons; for a pound of tomatoes, 125 gallons; a pound of oranges, 47 gallons; a pound of potatoes, 23 gallons.

So here is what happens, just so we have a comparison here. If we put 50 glasses of water, 50 of these glasses of water out, of these, how were they used? Forty-four glasses of that would be used for agriculture, for our food products, 44 of those 50 glasses. Three glasses would be used by industry, two glasses would be used by cities, and half a glass would be used in the country for rural areas. Water is critical. Mr. Speaker, this gives us somewhat of an idea of just how important it is for all of us in our everyday life.

Let me focus us back, Mr. Speaker, to the State of Colorado, because Colorado is a very unique State. As I said, it is the highest point in the Nation. It is also the only State in the Nation out of 50 States whereupon all of its water runs out. It has no incoming water for its use that comes into the State of Colorado. It all goes out. This gives an idea of the quantity of water that goes out of Colorado, the average annual outflow of major rivers through 1985.

Now, this chart is old, so these numbers are off a little, but they are not off by a lot. They are still pretty close. These are acre feet. An acre foot is how much water it would take to put one foot of water on an acre of land for 1 year, 4,540,000 acre feet right out of the Colorado River.

Up here off the Yampa River in the green, 1,576,000. Every point that we see here, here is the South Platte that goes into Nebraska, almost 400,000 acre feet of water. Down here on the Arkansas River, 133,000 acre feet. Over here on the Animas River, 700,000 acre feet. Here, of course, is the mighty Colorado.

This chart right here, Mr. Speaker, gives us an idea of the State of Colorado, which is a critical State for the West. Of all of the States in the West, I cannot think of any State that is more important for the water supply of the West. Remember, this is not just water for agriculture but it is water for hydropower, hydroelectric, whether Lake Mead or Lake Powell, Glen Canyon or the Hoover Dam, water for recreation, et cetera. Here Colorado is the key State because of its high elevation, because of its snowfall, which provides the flow of water.

Colorado is really divided here into four major water basins: the Missouri; here we have the South Platte River; the Arkansas, we have the Arkansas River that goes through here. We also have down in here the Rio Grande, the Rio Grande River, which goes down near Alamosa, Colorado. Here on the Western side of the State we have the mighty Colorado River.

Remember that, regarding the rivers in the West, as well as in the East, in the old days we used to have to live close to the rivers, but as man has evolved with technology, we can live further and further away from the rivers. So while the Colorado River, of which 70 percent of the water within that river basin is provided by the State of Colorado, and by the way, the Colorado River is one of the longest rivers in the Nation, but because of the technology, that water is moved.

For example, in Colorado it is moved from the western part of the State, my district, which has 80 percent of the water resources. There is a good quantity of water that is moved from our part of the State to the eastern part of the State, which has 80 percent of the population.

It is the same thing in Arizona. We have the Central Arizona Water Project, where we move water away from the basin into the cities, like Phoenix and Tucson or Los Angeles. We have the water project down in Los Angeles. So we move water from these basins. We have to have the capability to divert.

This real quickly just gives us an idea. I mentioned that the Colorado River is one of the longest rivers in the Nation. This gives us an idea.

Now, out here we have the Gulf of California, but in actuality most of the water that is left, when it enters Mexico near Baja, it is used by the country of Mexico.

It is interesting that when the Colorado River was first divided up, they figured there were about 15 million acre feet of water a year that came down the Colorado River, 15 million acre feet. So they divided it, and in about 1922 they had what they called the Colorado River Compact. That is a very important compact for the West, and probably of all the water compacts in the West, that is the most critical. It divided what we called the Upper Basin States and the Lower Basin States. The Upper Basin got 7½ million

acre feet, and the Lower Basin got 7½ million acre feet of water every year.

But unfortunately, when those calculations were made, they were made when we had a very unusual year. We had the highest flow in any number of years. They were recorded at the highest record of flow. So in fact, we really do not produce 15 million acre feet of water on an average year out of the Colorado, which means that a lot of the Colorado River water is overappropriated.

Now, on top of the 15 million acre feet, here is an interesting story for us. In World War II, the United States was concerned, as was the country of Mexico, that the Japanese would try and invade the United States through the country of Mexico. So the Mexican authorities and the United States, the American authorities, got together. Mexico wanted the defense of their country. The Americans did not want the Japanese in Mexico, so the Americans agreed to supply reinforcements or troops to the country of Mexico to defend Mexico if the Japanese invaded.

The Mexican government, being the better negotiator of the two, said that we should want to keep the Japanese out of their country, and it is nice of us to protect them, but we ought to give them something for it, like 1½ million acre feet of the Colorado River.

So that is exactly what happened. In 1944, the United States government agreed to give the country of Mexico 1.5 million acre feet, 750,000 from the Lower Basin States, 750,000 from the Upper Basin States, of the surplus waters. Of course, there is a dispute over "surplus," which is going on between the Upper Basin States and Lower Basin States.

They are getting too technical right now, my comments, but suffice it to say that the Colorado River Compact is really the point I want to make here. That is what has taken one of the longest rivers of the Nation and has divided it between the States that benefit from it. The Colorado River supplies drinking water for about 25 million people.

One of the first people to explore, and we have all heard this name before, was John Wesley Powell. He explored. This, of course, had been discovered before by the Spanish, by the Anasazis, et cetera, et cetera, but John Wesley Powell and his party mapped and explored the Colorado River.

They used wooden boats, and Mr. Speaker, I am sure some of my colleagues have rafted in Colorado. We think we have some of the best rafting, if not the best rafting, in the Nation. It is pretty scary. Imagine before those rivers were controlled by dams, before we had flood control, imagine the kind of rafts back then. They were big wooden barges, as we would see them today. That is what he went down on.

Think of the disease and unknown territory. In fact, some of them probably still believed the Earth was flat. It was a pretty challenging thing. You died at a young age if you wanted to go

out and explore the West. But John Powell and his parties did exactly that. In 1869 he described the roil and boil of the rivers that pass through the treacherous passages, like the Grand Canyon, and the hard labor of the boat crews just to keep it going.

But John Wesley Powell mapped the Colorado River, and talked in his journal, in his diaries, and explained much of what he saw in the Colorado River. The result of the Colorado River, by the way, is what has provided absolute beauty, the Grand Canyon and the canyons in Utah.

Mr. Speaker, if Members have never been out to the West, go to Colorado first, and of course spend money in the Third District, but go little further West and go into Utah and see those gorgeous canyons. Go into Arizona and see exactly what this mighty river has carved over all of these hundreds and thousands of years.

Here is a good example. The Colorado River carved many of the gorges and canyons in the Colorado plateau. Dead Horse Point State Park in eastern Utah preserves the natural state of Meander Canyon, aptly named for the fantastic twists and turns the river etched into the soft sedimentary rock of the plateau.

When Members stand from this position, where my pointer is, and they look out, these are huge canyon walls. We can see where the river is from the green that goes through, that cuts through all of this. This was all cut by the Colorado River.

□ 2000

It is a fabulous study, our history of this Nation and what it has provided for us. But it is also critical for the life-style of the people out there.

Now, my colleagues will find that there is focused attention on the West. Remember that almost all of the Nation's public lands are in the Western United States. They are not in the Eastern United States. Let me very quickly kind of give a brief history on how that occurred.

When we first settled our country, most of our population was on the eastern seaboard, and this country, this United States of America, wanted to grow. But back then, to grow, you had to buy land. And if you bought the land, the title did not mean much. If you had a deed, you had a deed that said, hey, you own the State of Colorado or you own out there in the West this chunk of land, these millions of acres, but it did not mean much. The only way that you could obtain your land after you bought it was to get out there with a six-shooter on your side and possess the land. That is where the saying came from, the old saying that "possession is nine-tenth's of the law."

That is exactly what happened that created public lands in the West and almost no public lands in the East. Why? Because our leaders in Washington, D.C. knew we needed to settle the frontier. We had gotten the Louisiana Pur-

chase, we had gotten a number of other lands, and we needed to somehow give incentive to the population in the east to go west. "Go west, young man, go west," as the saying went. So they decided to have land grants. They decided to have the Homestead Act, where if a person went out to Kentucky, and that was west to them, Kentucky was west, or go out to Missouri and Kansas and even to eastern Colorado, 160 acres back then could provide for a family. So they gave this land to the citizens of the United States who would go out and occupy the land, or possess the land on behalf of the United States of America. And after so many years, 5 or 6 years of working that land, you would own the land.

Well, the problem was when they got to the Colorado Rockies, guess what happened? One hundred sixty acres did not even feed a cow. So they came back to Washington and said people are going west but when they hit the mountains they are going around trying to figure a way to get to the ocean side, the Pacific Ocean, but they are not staying in the mountains. How do we get them there? Somebody said maybe we should give them an equivalent amount of land. We give 160 acres in Kansas or even in eastern Colorado, let us give them what it would take, the equivalent amount of land, let us say 3,000 acres in the mountains. Somebody else said, no, no, we cannot politically do that. There is no way we could give out 3,000 acres to a particular individual and survive politically.

So somebody came up with the idea, well, let us just go ahead in the west and let us let the government go ahead and hold the title in our name, the government's name, and let the people use the land. Let us have a concept called multiple use, "a land of many uses." Let us have the West be a land of many uses. That is how we can get around that. We can get people to settle there. We will say, look, you do not get to put the land in your name, but you get to use it for yourself.

Now, in recent times, that has been misinterpreted in many cases by some of the more extreme environmental radicals in the country, who say, look, the land in the West was intended to be set aside for all future generations. While we are comfortable here in the East, they should set that land, those public lands in the West, aside. And they are doing the same kind of thing for the water.

Clearly, we have to have a balance. And thank goodness we had somebody like Theodore Roosevelt, who took a look at Yellowstone and with awe and a great deal of thought and, frankly, a great deal of brilliance put that into a national park. We have wonderful national parks on those public lands. We are pretty proud of those public lands. My district has huge amounts of public lands. But we have to be able to utilize those public lands, and it is the same thing with our rivers.

We have to have dams in the West. My point in speaking tonight is not to

just have my colleagues walk out of here with some book knowledge on the topic of water, but to understand the difference between the Western United States and the Eastern United States when it comes to water and the necessity of water resources and the necessity to store water and the necessity to use hydropower.

By the way, in all of our discussions, especially of the last few months, when we have had debates and so on about the energy crisis, remember the cleanest energy producer out there is water. We do not need fuel to put water into a hydroelectric facility. All we do is take the energy of the water as it drops, turn a turbine, and we create electricity and then we can move the electricity.

My real focus here this evening in front of my colleagues, especially those from the East, is to ask you to remember that life is different in the West. Sure, we are all American citizens and we are not saying we are being picked upon but we are saying there is a difference. There is a difference between night and day. A part of it is caused by the fact that most of the public lands are in the West. They are not here in the East. It is very easy, colleagues, to put regulations on us in the West, on public lands, because those in the East feel no pain. The East does not have any public lands. Well, there are the Appalachians, and a chunk down there in the Everglades, but, in essence, when we talk about public lands in the East, we are talking about the local courthouse or the property around the courthouse.

When we talk about lands in the West, we are talking about 98 percent of some of our States, like Alaska. In my State alone, in my district alone, now get ahold of this, in my district I have over 22 million acres of public lands. And there is water on there. And that water is absolutely essential, one, for diversion, and, two, for the protection of the environment that we have. But my focus here this evening is that I hope, as my colleagues leave and that as I conclude my remarks, that everyone understands how important water is in the West; that we are arid out there in the West.

We have over half of the Nation's land in the Western United States, over half of it, and we have 14 percent of the water. That means that I think my colleagues have to approach us with a little more open mind. When we talk about water storage projects in the West, when we are trying to stop a bill, for example, backed by the national Sierra Club, that we understand their number one goal is to take down Lake Powell. Now, Lake Powell and Lake Meade, those dams provide 80 percent of the water storage for the West, yet the national Sierra Club wants to take out almost half, almost half of our water storage in the West because they do not like dams.

That is their number one goal. I am not making this up. It is in their publications. Their president's number one

goal is to tear down Lake Powell, the second largest recreational, just behind Lake Mead for recreation, the second largest recreational facility in the West, despite the hydropower that it produces, the amount of water it stores for us out there. So, colleagues, when the national Sierra Club comes and talks to you and wants you to sign on to taking down Lake Powell, please, please understand that life in the West, when it comes to water, when it comes to public lands is different than back here. Listen to our side of the story before you sign on to any of these bills that take fairly dramatic steps not in your area of the Nation but in our area of the Nation.

Before you sign on as a sponsor or cosponsor, take a look at the impact it creates on us. Take a look at what it does to your colleagues; take a look at the history of the Nation. I have 25 charts here that I can walk through depicting life in the West since the Anasazi Indians and since the Spanish explorers. We can walk through the time of John Wesley Powell and about how the West has managed those resources. And with all due respect, I would venture to say that many of us in this room, many of my colleagues in the room, especially those from the East, have no idea of the kind of lifestyle that is required in the West, and the natural resources and our use of the natural resources and our conservation of the natural resources.

So, please, colleagues, do not let some of these organizations convince you that all of a sudden you are an expert in western water law. Do not let these experts or groups like the national Sierra Club convince you that you should become an expert and cosponsor a bill to take down Lake Powell, which is exactly what they want to do, or to stop the Animus La Plata water project, which was promised to the Native Americans 30 or 40 years ago. Those issues are critical for us out there. This is a Nation where the Eastern United States should understand the problems of the West and understand that the water situation here is different than our water situation back there in the West.

My whole point here tonight is to tell my colleagues that in the West, as they say, our life is written in water and water is so, so critical. It has all come together. It all comes together when we begin to understand the geographical conditions, the historical conditions, the political conditions. Then we begin to say, you know, there is another side to this story that is important for all of us to understand.

Mr. Speaker, let me wrap up this portion of my comments about water by just simply reiterating one point, and that is that there is a difference between the Eastern United States and the Western United States when it comes to natural resources. There is a difference between the Eastern United States and the Western United States when it comes to public lands. There

are very few public lands in the Eastern United States. There are vast quantities of public lands in the West.

The concept of multiple use, a land of many uses, that is how I grew up. When you would enter the government lands, which we are completely surrounded in my district, I have over 100 communities, I have a district larger than the State of Florida, and every community except one is completely surrounded by public lands, and when we enter the national forest and so on, if any of my colleagues have ever been out to the national parks or public lands, it says something like, "you are now entering the White River National Forest." And there used to be a sign under that that said, "a land of many uses." A land of many uses.

Now we are seeing groups like the national Sierra Club or Earth First or more radical environmental groups coming out and saying they want to take that sign, "the land of many uses," they want to take it off and put on a sign that says "no trespassing." And it is the same thing with our water. The quickest way to drive people out of the West is to cut off their water. And it is not complicated. In the Eastern United States it would be very complicated to shut off the water. You have a lot of it. It rains all the time. In the West, all we have to do is take down a couple of dams.

Go ahead, let the national Sierra Club take down Lake Powell. You take down Lake Powell, and you will shut off a large portion of the west. You would take away life, the human population, and, by the way, a great deal of vegetation and animal population out there because we have been able to utilize that water and store that water so we can use it beyond the spring runoff. So keep in mind in the west life is written in water.

Let me use my final concluding remarks on a topic that is obviously totally unrelated, but I want to go back to my remarks at the beginning of this and that is on this energy thing. By the way, I heard some comments earlier today that we have no free market in the energy, that we need to have the government run the energy business in this country. Nothing would be worse than inviting the government into our front doors to begin running our energy companies for us. Nothing would be worse than allowing the government to intercede in the private marketplace.

Now, I am not speaking about stopping antitrust, where intercession is necessary. According to Adam Smith, and he is right, a monopoly is a dangerous tool to management. But to intercede and to actually become almost socialistic like, where we would have the government supply the power and the gasoline, and we would have the government guarantee it will all come at a reasonable price, we should not buy into this concept that the government is going to be able to give us something for nothing.

Take a look, for example, at the government's intercession in lots of other different programs. In almost every case, when the government takes over or begins to think that it can do better than the private marketplace, we end up with lots of regulation, we end up with subsidies, and we never get something for nothing. This energy is a problem that we all have to work through.

The way we work through it is we put several components together. One of those critical components is conservation. Now, not every citizen can go out and find natural gas, not every citizen is going to be able to build a transmission line out there, and not every citizen can build a generation plant, but one thing that every citizen in our Nation can do is to help conserve. And if we want to keep the government out of our lives, we only need to help conserve energy. Because the more energy that we waste, the more energy shortages we then have, the more temptation there is to have the government come in as a quick fix, as some kind of waving of the magic wand that the government is going to be able to deliver to us any kind of product at a cheaper price. The private marketplace does pretty good if we can all help.

So to conclude this portion of my remarks, let me say that I think it is incumbent upon every citizen in this country, and I speak through my colleagues, that we have to go out into our districts and encourage our constituents. Because if there is one thing that every citizen in this country can do to help alleviate the energy crisis, that exists primarily in California but is a warning shot to the rest of the Nation, it is to conserve.

□ 2015

And we can all do it by simply shutting off our lights, changing our car oil when the owner's manual says it instead of when the lube market tells you to do it. I am optimistic about future energy of this country. Slowly but surely we are building an energy policy, and conservation is going to be an important part of it. You cannot conserve your way out of the situation that we are in.

Alternative energy is an important part, but do not overlay it. As I said earlier, if you took all of the alternative energy in the world and delivered it all to the United States, it would only supply 3 percent. Certainly this young generation behind us, their brilliant minds will be able to make that much, much larger because they will find ways to take energy out of water.

The first and most immediate thing we can do is come up with an energy policy as a government. We can urge our constituents to conserve. But the worst thing we can do is propose that the government put on price controls, that they take over industries, that

they seize power plants and the government becomes your local electric utility. It would be the most inefficient operation in the history of our government. Do not let them do it. You cannot get something for nothing out of this government. If it is the government running it, you usually pay a higher price than if you as a community can have the private sector with checks and balances. I have spoken primarily about energy, about water.

Mr. Speaker, one last shot on water and then I am done. That is keep in mind in the East and West of this Nation, there are differences in water and differences in public lands. I would urge all of my colleagues in the East and all of their constituents in the East to please take the time before signing on a petition to take on Lake Powell or kick people off public lands, take a look at both sides of the story. If you take a look historically, politically, environmentally at both sides of the story, I think you will have a better understanding of what I have said tonight and a much deeper appreciation for our message from the West.

HIV/AIDS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. REHBERG). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Mrs. CLAYTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mrs. CLAYTON. Mr. Speaker, oftentimes we act on perceptions rather than reality, and when we discuss HIV and AIDS, indeed that has been one based on perception. Oftentimes we have felt, those of us who live in the rural South, have felt that AIDS was an issue of the North. Those of us who lived in small towns felt it was an issue of the big cities. Heterosexual persons thought this was only an issue for gays or that it was indeed white male gays. What we are finding is that those perceptions were ill-founded, and that the disease has affected all phases of the United States, particularly the South.

HIV/AIDS is becoming more prevalent in rural areas and in the South. AIDS cases in rural areas represent only about 5 percent of all reported HIV cases in 1995. Only 5 percent. However, the pattern of HIV infection suggests that the epidemic is spreading in rural areas throughout the United States. HIV in the rural South is growing at one of the fastest rates in the Nation. The Southeast as a whole has the highest number of those infected. The southern region of the United States accounts for the largest proportion; that is, 34 percent, 34 percent of 641,886 AIDS cases. The latest figures we have is for 1997, and 54 percent of the 56,689 cases are among persons residing in rural areas.

However, according to a Boston Globe article, which I include for the RECORD, according to this article it references that in six Southern States, in-

cluding my State, North Carolina, and South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, and Mississippi as well as Louisiana, 70 percent of those with HIV are African American, and 25 percent are women, according to a Duke University study.

But more importantly, here is what it says. Both of these figures are higher than the national average, but few are saying anything about it, keeping the disease nearly invisible as it spreads. It is a deadly, silent disease. It is the silence that worries many of the AIDS activists who are fearful that as the silence continues, the government will not know that they have a problem.

The text of the article is as follows:

[From the Boston Globe, June 1, 2001]

IN THE SOUTH, DEADLY SILENCE

SHAME AND FEAR CONTRIBUTE TO RAPID SPREAD OF HIV IN RURAL AREAS

(By John Donnelly)

SCOTLAND NECK, NC.—In the short, grim history of AIDS, this rural town surrounded by cotton and tobacco fields would probably go unnoticed. The virus hasn't killed people here in great numbers, as it has in Africa, nor has it devastated a whole sector of the population, as it did to gay men in the cities of America in the 1980s.

But as observers reflect on the two decades since the first public mention of a disease that was later named Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome, the overarching reality is that the virus has stealthily managed to infect roughly 60 million people all over the world, including here on Roanoke Street, inside the four-room house of the Davis family, in the person of one Jeff Davis.

And that remains, largely, a secret here.

"I keep it pretty quiet," said Davis, 26, his skinny 6-foot-3 frame sprawled out over a worn-out sofa as his mother hovered nearby. "I'm not sure people would like being around people like me. If they find out I'm HIV-positive and their reaction was bad, I don't think I could take it." HIV in the rural South is growing at one of the fastest rates in the nation. The Southeast, as a whole, has the highest numbers of those infected. In six Southern states—North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, and Louisiana—70 percent of those with HIV are African-American and 25 percent are women, a Duke University study found. Both figures are higher than national averages.

But few say anything, keeping the disease nearly invisible as it spreads. It is this silence that worries many AIDS activists, who are fearful that as the US government grapples with the out-of-control pandemic in parts of sub-Saharan Africa, it will neglect the increasingly costly programs to treat infected citizens at home. In at least a dozen states, there are waiting lists of people infected with HIV who want to get the drugs.

At home, the Bush administration's initial position has been to put a lid on treatment funds. It has proposed no increase next year for the \$1.8 billion Ryan White Care Act, which pays for AIDS cocktails for Americans not covered by Medicaid or other insurance programs. Abroad, the administration has put \$200 million in additional HIV money into a newly created Global AIDS and Health Fund, a sum belittled by many advocates as a trivial response to a problem that Secretary of State Colin L. Powell calls a war without equal. "It's our responsibility as a world leader to fight AIDS at home and around the world," said Ernest C. Hopkins, director of federal affairs for the San Francisco AIDS Foundation. "Furthermore, the crime of someone in rural North Carolina

not getting treatment is far more egregious than the reality of that happening in sub-Saharan Africa, where countries spend a few dollars per capita on health care. This is an incredibly resourced nation, and yet there are people here who are basically being written off."

In the past 20 years, AIDS has killed 438,795 people in America, 23 million worldwide. In the United States, an estimated 1 million people are now infected with HIV or have full-blown AIDS, but only about a third of them are receiving treatment. The federal Centers for Disease Control and Prevention estimates that another third of a million have been diagnosed but either aren't medically eligible for treatment or can't pay for it, while the remaining third don't know they are infected or refuse to be tested.

AIDS has remained largely an urban epidemic in America, but infection rates have been rising rapidly in rural areas. Interstate highways act like spigots that flush the disease deep into the back country. Sex workers set up shop along the highways. And from rural Southern towns, as elsewhere, people like Davis travel to neon-bedecked bars or strip joints located near interstate highway ramps, pay for sex, and bring the virus back home. Some, like Duke public health specialist Kathryn Whetten-Goldstein, "see echoes of Africa in HIV in the South," because of the barriers to care as well as the way the virus is increasingly transmitted through heterosexual contact. In the rural South, about 45 percent of women with HIV were infected by having sex with infected men, compared with 15 percent nationally; in Africa, as much as 80 percent of the transmission is heterosexual.

"When you think about the epidemics being similar," said CDC epidemiologist Amy Lansky, "in the rural areas, particularly in the South, there is a lot more transmission occurring through heterosexual contact than you see as a nation as a whole."

It is an outrage, in Whetten-Goldstein's thinking, because heterosexual transmission carries far less of a stigma than homosexual transmission. And yet, few talk about it, which she believes is rooted in racism.

"If the rates of heterosexual transmission were as high in middle-class white women and men as they are among African-American men and women, policymakers and power holders would be terrified and acting quickly," she said.

But Whetten-Goldstein believes the similarities between the rural South and Africa go deeper than the mode of transmission.

"There's a great stigma here attached to the disease, a sense of fatalism that it doesn't matter what they do and the great distances people have to travel to see a doctor," she said.

In both Africa and the rural South, a lack of education about how the virus is spread has allowed it to flourish. In North Carolina, for instance, state law forbids schools to teach that condoms can help prevent the spread of AIDS; teachers can only talk about abstinence.

And like many places in Africa, the stigma of living with HIV/AIDS is reinforced by attitudes of some fundamentalist Christians. Here, many fervently believe that God is punishing those with AIDS for their sins.

One woman in rural North Carolina who would be identified only as Sylvia said she travels 180 miles to see an AIDS doctor three times a month, even though there is an AIDS specialist 40 miles away. "If you go to the local doctor, everyone knows you have HIV," said Sylvia, a local PTA president and a Cub Scout den mother.

"It's a modern-day leprosy here," said Dr. Mario G. Fiorilli, the only AIDS doctor in Halifax County in northeastern North Carolina. The great differences between the