

## HOPE SCHOLARSHIP REFORM BILL

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Madam Speaker, I am proud to join with the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) in introducing the HOPE Scholarship reform bill.

In April, the Institute for Higher Education Policy issued a report, "Rhetoric and Reality: Effects and Consequence of the HOPE Scholarship." The report concluded, quite simply, that low-income students and students from low-income families do not qualify for the HOPE Scholarship.

It stated that if educational costs to the student beyond tuition and fees could be considered for the HOPE Scholarship, and if low-income students were not penalized for receiving other grants, then more low-income students could enjoy the full benefit of the HOPE Scholarship.

Our bill addresses these exact issues. Our bill ensures that students are not penalized for receiving Pell Grants or SEOG grants. It also ensures that the costs of required fees, books, supplies and equipment can be included as part of the eligible HOPE Scholarship expenses. Our bill expands access to higher education, it expands opportunity to higher education, and it expands the affordability of higher education.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the HOPE Scholarship reform bill.

CALIFORNIA ENERGY PROBLEMS  
THE FAULT OF CALIFORNIA

(Mr. KINGSTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KINGSTON. Madam Speaker, anybody that gets frustrated with a utility company, I am completely sympathetic with. But I have to say, I think it is a little immature of the Governor of California to continuously blame power companies for some of their problems out there.

Just think about this: The State of California in the last 10 years had unprecedented prosperity and growth, and during that period of time, they, like any other growing municipality or entity, would add new schools, new roads, new hospitals; but when it came time to approve new power plant construction, oh, no, we cannot do that.

□ 1900

We are going to defy the law of supply and demand. What were they thinking? Grow up. They have to add to their infrastructure power. They cannot have a 25 percent increase in demand and only increase the supply 6 percent. It is as if Governor Davis has the key to the power that they need for

hospitals, for schools, for learning, for lights, and even the gasoline for going places in one's car. It is like he has the key to it and he is throwing it away so that the lowly working folks, in his opinion, the middle class, cannot function.

Madam Speaker, I would say, let the key go and open up the supply, Governor Davis.

## SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JOHNSON of Illinois). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2001, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

CHANGES IN MANAGEMENT OF  
MISSOURI RIVER WILL LEAD TO  
FLOODING, ECONOMIC DEVASTATION,  
AND UNSAFE ENVIRONMENT FOR  
COMMUNITIES

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

Mr. HULSHOF. Mr. Speaker, as a Nation, we are fond of looking back over our country's relatively short history and commemorating noteworthy events. For instance, in a few short years, in 2004, our country will be celebrating the bicentennial anniversary of the Lewis and Clark expedition. Some will take that opportunity and look back with nostalgia and wistfully wish that we could turn the clock back and restore the great Missouri River to its natural condition of 200 years ago.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, some strong political activists, including the newly minted Senate majority leader, have been forcefully advocating for a change in the management of the Missouri River. These individuals or entities are pushing legislation insisting on manipulating higher water flows in the spring months, called a spring rise, and lower flows in the late summer. Now, environmentalists claim that such a controlled flood is necessary to accommodate two endangered and one threatened species.

Those from the Upper Missouri River Basin, like the senior Senator from South Dakota, support this plan because it would help the multimillion dollar recreation industry. Members of this alliance have been reassuring Missourians all along that a controlled flood in the springtime will be no big deal, that somehow our concerns on the lower river basin are inconsequential or invalid.

Well, Mr. Speaker, this arrogance is not just limited to interest groups outside of Washington. I contacted a high-level government official in mid-May regarding continued concerns about flooding, about economic devastation, and constituent safety. The reply I got

from this government official: "A spring rise will only result in some inconvenience."

Well, apparently in the minds of some, the habitat of two birds and one fish take precedence over the homes of 22,500 families who live alongside the Missouri River Basin.

I want to tell my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, what has happened over the last 2½ weeks. On June 1, the Missouri River was at 13 feet, which is normal. Due to heavy rainfall up-river on June the 8, 7 days later, the river stage was at an astounding 29 feet. That is a 16 foot rise in elevation a week. Now, for those of us unfamiliar with river towns or river terminology, flood stage is when a channel is full and damage begins to occur. So in these short 7 days, the Missouri River went from normal levels to 8 feet above flood stage.

Now, fortunately not a lot of damage occurred because there is adequate structural flood protection that is built to withstand flows under the current management plan. But I shudder to think what would have happened if the proposed controlled flood plan had been in effect, because once the decision is made on the up-river to release water from those up-river reservoirs, it cannot be stopped, and it takes 8 to 10 days to finally get down to the point of the confluence at St. Louis. That man-made spring rise, coupled with the heavy rainfall we saw during this 7-day period provided by Mother Nature, would have been, in my estimation, economically devastating and potentially life-threatening.

While the up-river recreation industry would have been congratulating themselves, shaking hands and heading off to the bank, Missourians would have been consoling themselves, holding hands, stranded on top of their rooftops.

To those who would have us return to the romantic times of 1804, let me say that Missouri scientists and biologists from our own State Department of Natural Resources believe that a spring rise in the flow of the Missouri River would not improve the habitat restoration of the pallid sturgeon, of the least tern, and the piping plover. In fact, according to the Army Corps of Engineers, the cost to accommodate these three species through changing the management of the Missouri River system would be \$1 billion over 20 years. We are already helping species restoration through effective and less costly mitigation efforts.

In addition, if low-summer flows, the second component of this plan were instituted, commercial navigation would be severely interrupted not only in the Missouri River, but on the lower Mississippi River region, and hydroelectric power generation would be lost.

Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of Members of this House in Congress have agreed with Missourians on this