

Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), a member of our subcommittee.

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the amendment. The amendment is overly broad and would prohibit all agencies in the Energy and Water bill including the Corps of Engineers, the Department of Energy, and a portion of the Department of the Interior from expending funds for drilling in the Great Lakes. I have concerns that needed grants from these Federal agencies would be cut off as a result of this amendment. This is another attempt by the amendment's author and others to shift decision-making authority over the Great Lakes to the Federal Government, just like the water management issue. They would rather have bureaucrats in Washington to manage our resources than those of us who actually live there. I do not think that is right.

The issue is under the jurisdiction of the State of Michigan and our State legislature and the governments of all the Great Lakes States. This is not just a Michigan issue. The Michigan State legislature has made a decision that this will be handled by State agencies, including the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality, Department of Natural Resources, and the State's Natural Resources Commission.

□ 1730

They have made this decision on their own, free from Federal interference, which is as it should be. In fact, my home State of Michigan is not alone in this sentiment. It is shared by others. In a letter from the Interstate Oil and Gas Compact Commission, and I have a letter here, which has 30 of our Nation's 50 States as members, this letter went to EPA administrator Christie Todd Whitman, who writes, "The member States of the OIGCC regard drilling beneath the Great Lakes and protection of the environment in relation to that drilling to be matters that are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the States and not the United States EPA or other Federal agencies."

This amendment would be counter to the belief of the IOGCC and the majority of States in our Union. Remember again, there are 30 States involved here.

Mr. Chairman, directional drilling should not be confused with offshore drilling. Directional drilling sites are inland. In the State of Michigan, they are prohibited from being closer than 1,500 feet from the shoreline. Conversely, offshore drilling done from ships or rigs directly in the water is prohibited by State law in five of the eight Great Lakes States.

In 1997, the Michigan Environmental Science Board concluded directional drilling posed little or no risk to the contamination to the Great Lakes. Since 1979, there have been no accidents and no significant impact to the

environment or public health. I think the evidence shows clearly that directional drilling is safe and an effective procedure and does not warrant any kind of Federal encroachment. State geologists estimate the production of new oil and gas resources from the Great Lakes could provide, contrary to what one might have heard, as much as \$100 million to the Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund, the State's sole source of funds for land acquisitions, recreational projects, and natural resource development projects.

The revenue produced by leasing of land for drilling is crucial; and without it, state-owned natural resources could be taken without compensation by private wells drilled along the State of Michigan shorelines and the other States as well; on private lands, I might add.

Furthermore, I believe directional drilling can be done in an environmentally safe manner, and it may be one solution, one solution, to some of our energy woes.

This amendment is counter-productive because our Nation, particularly those in California, are currently experiencing an energy supply shortage and prohibiting directional drilling in the Great Lakes would cut off a critical supply source.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is little more than an example of mission creep by which the Federal Government slowly, slowly gains more and more authority. This mission creep amendment should not pass this House. I urge Members to oppose this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) assumed the Chair.

#### SUNDRY MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KIRK).

Mr. KIRK. Mr. Chairman, first I want to commend the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. CALLAHAN) for restoring funding for renewable energy in this bill.

With regard to contamination of Lake Michigan, we have had the Rock Gobie, the Fish Hook Flea, alewife, nuclear waste and PCBs. Lake Michigan has had enough. We killed Lake Erie in the 1960s and nearly killed Lake Michigan. The Great Lakes are home to half of the world's supply of fresh water. It

is one of our Nation's greatest environmental treasures. I strongly support the Bonior-LaTourette bipartisan amendment and am totally committed to Lake Michigan's environment and urge Members to support this worthy goal.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I might point out that the purpose of this debate, what the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) is attempting to do, is to restrict the Corps of Engineers from granting any further permits for this venture.

This is what the Corps of Engineers is all about. The Corps of Engineers is there to protect the environment, to make absolutely certain that everything with respect to any type of activity on the lake is in the best interest of the environment and of the American people and the area.

So I would beg to differ that the permitting process on this is not taking place, because it is. They cannot do it without permits. If the gentleman's amendment is adopted, the Corps would be prevented from issuing the permits, resulting in a halting of further exploration.

I might say that every day we hear in these 1-minutes the Members of the minority talking about the energy crisis, and this is an opportunity to do something about the energy crisis while not doing anything to harm the environment. So I would urge the Members to pay close attention to what this debate is all about.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I would join my Michigan Republican colleagues who have spoken in support of this amendment, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP) and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. HOEKSTRA), also in support of the amendment.

Some say that this is a safe process, slant drilling. Well, I have to say that I am not convinced that the science, in fact, will protect us. No one has ever suggested that the oil perhaps underneath the Great Lakes is an Arab oil field. It will not provide a lot of oil under anyone's estimation. So why should we take the risk?

I grew up on the shores of Lake Michigan, and I can remember as a young boy in the 1960s and even into the 1970s there in fact had been an oil spill on the southern shore of Lake Michigan, and I will say virtually every day, every day in St. Joe, Benton Harbor, my hometown and along the southern shore of Lake Michigan, anyone that went to the beach got oil from the sand on themselves. I do not think there was a house along the street that did not have a little bottle of Mr. Clean on the kitchen step, which was the only stuff that would take that oil off our clothes, off our shoes, name it.

That smell of Mr. Clean stays with me from this day, from those summer days of always getting oil on our feet.

One of the first pieces of legislation I passed as a young Member of this House was oil-spill legislation. I remember almost a catastrophic event in Bay City, Michigan, that would have destroyed, I think, the ecosystem of the Great Lakes for decades, if not more than 100 years.

This is a Great Lakes watershed area that is not like someplace else. When the oil is there, it stays there and it stays there for a long time.

I support this amendment. It is bipartisan. For those of us that have districts along the Great Lakes, I think that all of us, I would hope, would support it. After all, we know our Great Lakes area better than just about anybody else.

This is a wise amendment. I support the amendment. I would hope that my colleagues would also vote for this when we take it up tomorrow. I appreciate the bipartisanship that it certainly has, and I would just compliment my colleagues in support of this amendment to make sure that, in fact, we do not have oil spills throughout the Great Lakes.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I have a lot of good friends on both sides of the aisle that are addressing this issue, and I really get concerned and I struggle with this.

Southern Illinois used to have one of the largest oil fields in the country 50 years ago, decades ago. Guess what? It was all pumped out. To benefit the United States of America, we drilled in southern Illinois. We still have some marginal wells there. They pump about two barrels a day. They are the little seesaw horses that one sees when they drive down the road.

My cornfields and soybean fields are just as important as any lakefront beach property. Sometimes I think we get very selfish. We are in an energy crisis. Fuel is at an all-time high.

We do not want to drill off the Great Lakes. We had a vote yesterday, where we do not want to drill off of Florida. Heavens, no, we do not want to go into ANWR. So my basic question is: Where do we go?

I will say where we go. We are going to the Saudi Arabia sheiks. We are going to pony up our dollars. We are going to be held hostage by Saudi Arabia for our oil.

I just do not understand. We can send people to the Moon. We can send people to Mars. We can go all over this world, and we cannot drill safely?

So I ask us to bring a little common sense to this and to realize that we have some natural resources. We have places that expended our natural resources for the benefit of our country. Now it is time to make sure that we are energy self-sufficient, not reliant on foreign oil. If we want low-cost gas-

oline, we have to do a couple of things. We have to drill. We have to transport and we have to refine and, of course, we have to add ethanol.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), the cosponsor of the amendment.

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, last week the Members of our body voted to send a message to the Bush administration that oil and water do not mix. The House voted overwhelmingly to stop offshore drilling off the coast of Florida by a vote of 247 to 164. Seventy Republicans joined 177 Democrats in a rebuke to the White House drilling policy. Nonetheless, Vice President CHENEY claims that drilling can be conducted without environmental damage. Where does the administration stop in its single-minded desire to appease the oil and gas special interests? How many times do we have to send this message before the administration gets it?

The Bonior-Stupak-Kaptur amendment is a message: hands-off the Great Lakes. The President and Vice President need to understand that the people of the Great Lakes region do not want drilling. In my State, our Republican Governor is opposed to drilling in the Great Lakes. So are both our Republican Senators and our congressional delegation.

Lake Erie, Ohio's lake, is the shallowest of the Great Lakes and thus the most vulnerable to the administration's scheme. The Lake Erie shoreline, including the area in my congressional district, is a delicate ecosystem. Congressman DINGELL and I are working on ways to protect it for generations into the future. To expose that fragile ecosystem to oil and gas drilling makes no sense. It is reckless policy. It is irresponsible. Our freshwater ecosystem is a powerful, competitive advantage for our economy and a priceless national and international resource that belongs to all the people, not to any special interest.

For hundreds of years, even before the Northwest Territory was open, the Great Lakes have defined an entire region of our continent and the world. In the region, we see the Great Lakes as precious jewels. The administration sees another drilling platform. Please support the Bonior-Stupak-Kaptur amendment. Oil and water do not mix.

[From the Anna Arbor News, June 19, 2001]

CHENEY: DRILLING COULD CAUSE NO HARM  
PROTESTERS CHARGE SLANT DRILLS UNDER  
LAKES WON'T REDUCE OIL DEPENDENCE

(By Karessa E. Weir, News Staff Reporter)

GENOA TOWNSHIP.—In his first visit to Michigan since taking office, Vice President Dick Cheney said drilling under the Great Lakes can be done without environmental damage.

As environmentalists protested outside Lake Pointe Manor banquet hall where he

was speaking, Cheney said he supports searching for new sources of fuel. Possibly, he said, that could include the controversial plan to slant drill under the lakes.

"The technology in my judgment is extraordinarily good," Cheney said.

"I'd also like to remind everybody that we have a serious problem in our dependence on foreign (oil) sources."

He added that to meet the country's electricity needs, between 1,300 and 1,900 new generators would have to be built for coal, gas and nuclear energy.

"Those are the three options for the foreseeable future," he said. "The attractive features of coal are that we've got a lot of it . . . and it's cheap."

Cheney was at the banquet hall south of Howell attending a \$1,000-a-plate fund-raiser for Brighton Republican Mike Rogers.

Outside, Dan Farough, program director for the Sierra Club and one of about 25 protesters, said continuing to put more federal money into coal-burning endeavors will hurt Michigan and the country without lowering reliance on imported oil.

"Michigan's lakes already are under an advisory for mercury. Where does he think the mercury comes from? It comes from the emissions of those dirty coal-fire plants," Farough said. "He is pushing drilling in Alaska and in the Great Lakes but even if we kept all of what we could get, it would only lower our imports by 2 percent."

Cheney, flanked by Rogers and Lt. Gov. Dick Posthumus, spent the day in Michigan, first touring General Motors Corp.'s Vehicle Emission Lab in Warren and then attending the fund-raiser.

Cheney also spoke to about 500 people who paid \$25 each to attend a rally at the banquet hall, where he touted the passage of the "largest tax cut in a generation" and efforts to reform Social Security and create a global missile defense system.

"We will not accept that the U.S. is undefended from ballistic missiles," Cheney said.

Inside, the reception to Cheney was warmer.

"He's doing great," said Millie Geisert of Howell. "He's bringing integrity and morality back to our country."

In Warren, Cheney climbed into a fuel-cell vehicle and munched on popcorn produced by the excess energy of a hybrid truck. He said he was impressed by what he saw at the GM facility.

"I am . . . optimistic. With American technology and ingenuity there's no question we can solve any problems down the road," Cheney said.

The tour came a week after GM announced a 25-year collaboration with General Hydrogen Corp., a pioneer in fuel-cell technology. GM hopes the partnership will accelerate the development of fuel-cell vehicles, which create electricity directly from a reaction between hydrogen and oxygen. The vehicles emit only water vapor from their tailpipes.

Rick Wagoner, GM's president and CEO, applauded the Bush administration's energy plan.

"We believe the plan makes sense and believe the auto industry can help implement it," Wagoner said.

Rogers, who defeated state Sen. Dianne Byrum, D-Onondaga, by 110 votes in November, garnered more than \$350,000 for his campaign through the Cheney visit. He faces his first re-election bid in 2002.

The Associated Press contributed to this report.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) for yielding me this time.

Mr. Chairman, in the 20th century the greatest resource issue was oil, but in the 21st century the greatest resource issue in the world will be water.

The freshwater resources of the Great Lakes are as precious to the U.S. as oil is to the Middle East. It is our health. It is our wealth. It is our economic future. It is our environmental future. Clean water is a basic right in a democratic society. The oil companies should not be permitted to privatize the Great Lakes.

The Bible tells a story of Esau, who sold his birthright for a mess of pottage. Let us not sell America's birthright to one of the greatest supplies of fresh water in the world for a mess of oily pottage in the false name of energy security.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from the great State of Minnesota (Mr. LUTHER).

□ 1745

Mr. LUTHER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), and the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR) for their outstanding leadership on this issue.

I am from Minnesota, a State with a proud heritage of protecting our natural resources for future generations. In fact, in the late 1980s, Minnesota took part in enacting a multi-State ban on oil and gas drilling in the waters of the Great Lakes. Yet, today, discussion persists about drilling in this pristine area, particularly directional or slant drilling, is what is being discussed.

Since 1979, the seven existing directionally drilled wells have produced enough energy to cover less than a half day of our Nation's consumption. Think about this: risking the Nation's largest supply of fresh water for a few hours of consumption.

As a Nation, we must not fall back into the old way of doing things in this country. We will never get balance in our energy policies if we continue to debate drilling in our Nation's most pristine areas.

I urge this Congress to have the vision to develop new approaches to energy policy in this country. I urge Members to consider the ramifications, before risking this resource for a few hours of energy consumption. Let us give our children and their children the splendor of the Great Lakes coastline.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from the State of Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to strongly oppose drilling of any kind in the Great Lakes. Just visit Minnesota's North Shore and you will immediately know why. Lake Superior is a constant source of wonder for many of us in this country. It helped to shape our landscape, our climate, it supports our economy, and it enhances our quality of life.

I oppose drilling not because we do not need to find additional energy resources. We do. But these lakes are just too valuable and too many families' lives would literally be at risk without fresh drinking water. It is simply not worth the risk.

We are making progress in using energy more efficiently, reducing our reliance on coal and natural gas through energy efficiency and technology; but we must work hard to make bigger investments in current programs to do more.

Investments do not always have to cost money either. We can and we must reduce our consumption by supporting wind, solar power and renewable fuels, like ethanol, which we produce in Minnesota.

Future generations depend on us not to jeopardize today's greatest natural resources. An oil spill or any related disaster on the shores of the Great Lakes would impact fresh drinking water for 35 million people, and for what? For less than 1 day's worth of oil and natural gas.

The Great Lakes are important to this Nation. They are important to my State. They are important to the families in this country. They have been crucial in our historical and economic development. Our communities continue to play a critical role in Minnesota, and water is a part of that.

I urge my colleagues to protect today's drinking water for future generations. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Michigan for yielding me time. I especially want to thank the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR), the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT), the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), and other colleagues from the Great Lakes region for consistently championing the preservation and protection of these precious lakes.

I live on Lake Erie and appreciate the lake for its natural beauty. But Lake Erie is far more than a pretty backdrop. Ohioans rely on the lake for our region's economic well-being. We rely on Lake Erie to ship goods, to provide us with drinking water, to play host for recreational activities, and to attract tourists from all over the world.

The Great Lakes contain 20 percent of all the fresh water in the world; and yet attempts are now being made to expand so-called directional drilling under the beds of the Great Lakes, jeopardizing the water, the shorelines, and the surrounding wetlands. These attempts are being made even though the existing oil and gas wells in operation under the Great Lakes have not produced enough oil and gas to fuel our domestic needs for even a single day.

President Bush's solution for the country has been to drill early and

drill often. Drill in the Arctic National Wildlife Preserve, drill in the Gulf of Mexico, drill in the five Great Lakes. Instead of pursuing fossil fuels to the end of the Earth, Congress should author an energy policy that addresses both the immediate and long-term energy needs of our people.

We should explore for additional courses of oil and gas, but we cannot drill our way out of dependence on foreign oil. Any strategy that calls for drilling in the Great Lakes, where there is more drinking water than any other place on Earth, fails even the most basic risk-reward analysis.

Fossil fuels are a finite resource. Instead of risking despoiling of every piece of ground or water under which fossil fuels may reside, we must focus instead on using energy resources more efficiently, increasing our use of renewable fuels and encouraging conservation.

Last week, this body supported an amendment that afforded protection to the coast of Florida from the potential ravages of oil and gas exploration. Today I ask my colleagues to afford the Great Lakes the same protection.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time, and I congratulate him and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) and others on both sides of the aisle for sponsoring this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, this should not be, in my opinion, a hard decision for us to make. The risk is too great, when you consider the damage a spill would cause to one of the world's environmental treasures. Twenty percent of the world's fresh water is contained in the Great Lakes. It is much too precious to risk for additional drilling. And what would that drilling get us? The existing 13 wells have produced enough over their lifetime to provide only approximately a quarter of 1 day's use of natural gas in this country, and only approximately 2 percent of 1 day's use of petroleum. At what cost? I cannot imagine what type of drilling would have to occur to make a serious dent in Michigan's energy needs.

Since receiving criticism for taking the hard road of production versus conservation, the Bush administration has tried to say nice things about conservation. But the facts are clear: the Bush budget proposed to cut the Department of Energy's renewable energy and efficiency programs by almost 30 percent. It cut innovative technologies like wind, solar, and hydroelectric research by 50 percent. The American people clearly do not want to see a policy of drilling at all costs, and the people of Michigan do not want it either.

I urge my colleagues to support this very excellent amendment.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Ohio (Mrs. JONES).

Mrs. JONES of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my colleagues for

having the tenacity and the guts to stand up and talk about no drilling in the Great Lakes.

When I was a little girl studying about geography in the Cleveland public school system, people used to say to us, how do you remember the names of the Great Lakes? And they used to tell us to call it "HOMES," Huron, Ontario, Michigan, Erie, and Superior.

So when I think about the Great Lakes, I think about it as home to 20 percent of all the freshwater resources, home to all the species of fish and wildlife that live around those lakes, home to millions of Ohio residents, Michigan residents, Minnesota residents, Illinois residents, and the residents of all the 50 States.

Now, I know that the Army Corps of Engineers holds the Great Lakes in the public trust, but I also know that this Congress is obligated to give direction and guidance to the Army Corps of Engineers. By this amendment, we can give them direction and guidance and say no direct drilling in the Great Lakes.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA).

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding me time.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the amendment to prohibit the Army Corps from issuing any permits to provide for directional drilling for either natural gas or oil on the Great Lakes.

Mr. Chairman, I live on a great lake, Lake Michigan. My district borders the lake. I want to point out to the Members, especially those opposed, that Lake Michigan alone provides fresh clear drinking water to about 10 million residents of not only Wisconsin, but also Michigan and Illinois.

I hear from the opponents saying we need more drilling and we need more drilling and we need more drilling, but I have yet to hear the word "conservation."

I would like to point out to the Members that in the 22 years that drilling has occurred on the Great Lakes, a grand total of 439,000 barrels of crude oil has been extracted. Well, if you would support us and increase the fuel efficiency for automobiles, light trucks, and SUVs by only a small amount, we could save 1 million barrels of crude per day in this country, obviating the need to go into fresh water areas like the Great Lakes, which, as has been said many times, has 20 percent of the world's fresh water, and provide for drilling and looking for crude on that great body of water.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the distinguished gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. OBEY), the ranking member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Chairman, I simply want to take the time to thank the two gentlemen for offering this amendment. The greatest body of fresh water

in the world is Lake Superior. Lake Michigan is certainly not far between. The only proper level of risk to such a pristine resource is zero risk. I congratulate the gentlemen for offering the amendments.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his comments and support on this.

Mr. Chairman, again I want to thank my friend, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), for his leadership on this and all the colleagues who have spoken on this issue.

The State of Michigan is a very gorgeous State. We are talking about more than just Michigan here, we are talking about all the Great Lakes States and the connecting waterways that touch them.

But I would like to focus in on my State for a second, if I could, because we have had a history, Mr. Chairman, of being ravaged. If you go back 300 years ago, John Jacob Astor and his ilk came into our State and they took the fur and the animals out of our Great Northwest. It took them about 5 years before they depleted some of the most precious resources we had, leaving extinct many of the most important mammals in our Northwest region.

Then, of course, in the next century, after the pine had been exhausted in Maine, the lumbermen came into the State of Michigan, and built the country. At one point, the State of Michigan was 17/18ths trees. We had pine, white pine, as tall as some of the great redwoods out West today, reaching 200 feet in the air; and they were leveled. Thanks to Franklin Roosevelt and the CCC and the second growth policy of replanting during those 9 years during the Great Depression, the CCC and the 90,000 workers planted, Mr. Chairman, 465 million trees in our State.

Then the Boston mineral magnates came in, and they took the iron and the copper that Houghton, Burke, and all the others discovered in our great State.

I give you this history, because now the attack is on our water resources. And if you do not believe my word today, all you need to do is review the record in our State. We have 11,000 inland lakes. Every one of them is filled with mercury.

I went and got my fishing license the other day. They gave me a little booklet that said if you are a pregnant woman or 15 years of age or under, you cannot eat a good amount of the fish in the inland lakes. The Governor of our State has issued permits to dump raw and undertreated sewage in our rivers and streams, to the point now where many of our beaches are closed in our State because of E. coli bacteria.

□ 1800

And now he is pursuing a policy of drilling in the Great Lakes, extending 30 more wells. We do not need that. Oil and water do not mix.

I think it has been made very clear today that this is our most precious re-

source. A fifth of the fresh water on the planet is in our region, and we need to protect it. We need to protect it from diversion, we need to protect it from drilling, we need to protect it from being polluted with E. coli bacteria in our rivers and streams and closing our beaches; we need, as my colleague from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK) has said on numerous occasions, a water policy for our State. We do not have it. Until we do, we need to do all we can to protect this most valuable resource.

So I ask my colleagues, please, do not create this picture. For all of my colleagues who come up into our beautiful State, who travel up into Michigan, from the South, from the east coast, from the other parts of the Midwest who come to vacation, they do not come to see this, they come to swim in our lakes, they come to use our beautiful sand dunes, they come to fish in our waters, they come to rest on our beaches, and they come to drink our wonderful water.

So, Mr. Chairman, I would say to my colleagues, thank you for your support on this amendment. Vote for the amendment that has been offered, and make sure that we can save one of the most precious resources that God has given our planet.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague from Michigan.

This is a solution, though, that is looking for a problem. There is not one State in the Great Lake States that allows offshore drilling, not one. There is a moratorium on new angle drilling wells in Michigan. What are we doing? This is not about protecting the Great Lakes. This is not about talking about protecting the diversion of our water; not at all. What we have here is a direction that many in this Chamber I hope would disagree, including those who may have ambitions to hold office of Governor. I trust my Governor. I trust the Governors of the Great Lake States to be in charge of the water of the Great Lake States.

As a matter of fact, underneath the Great Lakes today, there is about 22,000 barrels of crude oil an hour flowing under the Great Lakes. There are 550 offshore wells in Canada. This bill addresses none of that. There are 5 million tons of oil bobbing around on the Great Lakes every year, 20 spills a year in our Great Lakes. This amendment does nothing to address any of those issues.

This is not about protecting the Great Lakes; this is about the Federal Government going into the State of Michigan and telling the legislators there, you do not know what you are doing. Do we want to talk about our Great Lakes? You ought to live there in February. You ought to have to put

up with the cold weather in the winters and the high degree of snow. Let us not get confused about what we are doing here.

There are some great protections of our Great Lakes, and I trust those Governors, and I trust those legislators to do the right thing.

I want to say it again, because this is very important, I heard it 10 times tonight if I heard it once, that somebody is out there trying to build an oil rig in the Great Lakes, and they are going to do it now, and President Bush is leading the charge. There is not one State in the Great Lakes that allows offshore drilling, not one. There is a moratorium on directional drilling in the State of Michigan today. So what are we doing?

Mr. Chairman, I do not believe that a bureaucrat in Washington whose only experience with the UP is a picture in the National Geographic is going to do anything for the protection of our shoreline, our Great Lakes. I want people who live there. The gentlewoman from Ohio talked about home, and that is how we learn the names of those Great Lakes. Why? Because we live there. We see the water, we see the pollution, we fought back and took back Lake Erie, and now we can eat the fish. We could not about 10 or 15 years ago. Why? Because the people of the Great Lake States stood up. It is nothing that Congress did. It is not us arguing this issue, it is the people around the Great Lakes. Why? Because those in California are taking care of California needs in their districts, and those legislators who are State-elected and Governors who are elected by all of the people of the Great Lake States are protecting our Great Lakes.

Mr. Chairman, I have a passion for this stuff as well. We have a real difference of opinion on what we are doing here. Diversion of water. There is a bill in this House to empower Congress to decide what happens on diversion issues in the Great Lakes. The last I checked, Kansas and Arizona and New Mexico and California could use a bit extra water, and last I checked, there are more of them than there are of us. It has no business in this Chamber. It has all the business in the chambers in our State legislatures back home.

This is a solution that is looking for a problem.

There is this package of bills in, and I have done many of them, one to encourage the States to protect the diversion of that water, the States to do it. I have a bill in that continues the ban on offshore drilling in our Great Lakes and goes after the 550 wells currently in operation in Canada that are out in the water. Even the industry tells us they do not want to put a pipe in that fresh water. They do not want to do it. Anything that touches the water they do not want to be a part of. We ought to applaud them for it, and we ought to stand up with them today.

But what the Federal Government can give us, they can take away. Pret-

ty soon, maybe the faces of this Chamber will change, and maybe pretty soon the folks in this Chamber will decide that we want oil in the Great Lakes, and since many of us do not live there, and the bureaucracies of Washington, D.C., that do not get to visit there much are going to decide, maybe it is worth it.

The thing that will protect us then, my good esteemed colleagues, is our State legislators and our Governors of those great States.

Mr. Chairman, I want to urge this body to reject this amendment, to throw away all the rhetoric about how this is going to pollute the water and people are rushing to put platform drilling in the Great Lakes, and they cannot wait for that oil to gush through Lake Superior and Lake Michigan. That is just absolutely not true.

What I would encourage the gentleman from Michigan to do is to work with us. Let us take a look at studying how good of shape those pipes are that are pumping those 22,000 gallons a minute under the Great Lakes today. Let us get together and tell Canada, get off the water. Shut down those rigs that are on the water pumping today. What are we going to do to make sure that those ships bobbing around out there carrying 5 million tons of oil are safe and do not have 20 spills on average a year?

Does the gentleman want to do something for the Great Lakes? Let us be a partner with them and help them solve those problems. Let us not flex our muscles as the Federal Government and come in and tell those legislators, you really do not know what you are doing out here. We are here to help you.

I used to be an FBI agent, and when I would walk into a local police station and tell them that, I did not get a warm welcome then, and I can tell you, Congress is not going to get a warm welcome in the State halls in Lansing.

Mr. Chairman, this is an important issue. It is an extremely important issue. I grew up on a lake. I want that lake safe for my kids. I want them to go to Lake Michigan and be able to play in the water and not have to worry about turning green when they come home. I want them to be able to eat the fish in Lake Erie. Meaning no disrespect to this Chamber, I just came from the State legislature, and I have seen the good things that Congress can do, and I have seen the bad things that Congress can do, and I served with some very bright people in that State legislature. I served with a great Governor who understood that we had to protect our Great Lakes while we have a moratorium on drilling. I want those people empowered to make a difference for our Great Lakes.

I would urge this body's strong rejection of the Federal Government encroaching into the business of Great Lake States.

I applaud all of the Members for getting up here and talking about their

passion for protecting our greatest natural resource there. Well, let us do it. Let us be a partner with the States. Talk to our State legislators, talk to our Governors. They will be with us. Talk to the people and ask them, who do they want to protect their Great Lakes? Is it the people that get up every morning and eat breakfast there and go off to work and send their kids off to school every day, 7 days a week; or is it a bureaucrat that they have never met in the halls of some bureaucracy over here who is going to make an arbitrary decision on how it ought to look; or is it a Member from California who stands up and passionately argues, maybe 40 or 50 years from now, that it is worth the risk to stick a pipe in fresh water?

Stand up for our Great Lakes today. Stand up for the environment of Michigan, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Indiana, Minnesota, all of those speakers' home States. Stand up for it by rejecting the Federal Government's role of encroaching on our ability back home to protect our greatest national resource. I would urge this body's rejection of the Bonior amendment.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the amendment offered by my colleague Representative BONIOR. I urge its passage by the House.

There should not be any controversy over this issue. The Great Lakes should not be put at risk just so energy companies can extract a few weeks' supply of oil. It was with a certain amount of disbelief that I learned that Governor Engler and the Michigan Department of Natural Resources had proposed to lift a 1997 moratorium restricting new development of oil and gas drilling under the Great Lakes. I believe this proposal is short-sighted.

The Great Lakes are a vital natural resource to Michigan. The Lakes are our State's crown jewels, and the heart of Michigan's multi-billion-dollar tourist industry. In addition, the Great Lakes contain 20 percent of the world's fresh water. Why would we ever choose to place all this at risk? The environmental damage from an oil spill would be catastrophic.

The amendment before the House today is only common sense. It would bar any funds in this bill from being used to expand oil and gas drilling beneath the Great Lakes.

Mr. Chairman, the Great Lakes are an invaluable resource to the people of Michigan and, indeed, the entire country. The Great Lakes are also part of the environmental legacy we will leave to our children and grandchildren. I urge all my colleagues to join me in voting for the Bonior amendment.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR).

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BONIOR) will be postponed.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2311) making appropriations for energy and water development for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PROVIDING FOR CONDITIONAL ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE AND RECESS OR ADJOURNMENT OF THE SENATE

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I offer a concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 176) and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the concurrent resolution, as follows:

H. CON. RES. 176

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the House adjourns on the legislative day of Thursday, June 28, 2001, or Friday, June 29, 2001, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand adjourned until 2 p.m. on Tuesday, July 10, 2001, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first; and that when the Senate recesses or adjourns at the close of business on Thursday, June 28, 2001, Friday, June 29, 2001, Saturday, June 30, 2001, Monday, July 2, 2001, Tuesday, July 3, 2001, Thursday, July 5, 2001, Friday, July 6, 2001, or Saturday, July 7, 2001, on a motion offered pursuant to this concurrent resolution by its Majority Leader or his designee, it stand recessed or adjourned until noon on Monday, July 9, 2001, or until such time on that day as may be specified by its Majority Leader or his designee in the motion to recess or adjourn, or until noon on the second day after Members are notified to reassemble pursuant to section 2 of this concurrent resolution, whichever occurs first.*

SEC. 2. The Speaker of the House and the Majority Leader of the Senate, acting jointly after consultation with the Minority Leader of the House and the Minority Leader of the Senate, shall notify the Members of the House and the Senate, respectively, to reassemble whenever, in their opinion, the public interest shall warrant it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would simply have one question.

I notice that the concurrent resolution indicates that the House would adjourn on either Thursday or Friday. In light of the fact that Members were told that there would be no votes on Friday, my question is why is this language there? It is my understanding that the language is there simply to permit filing of a document, but that there would, in fact, be no session on Friday and no votes. Is that a correct understanding?

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OBEY. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman is correct. Let me state just briefly that the plan will be to convene the house at 9 o'clock in the morning. We will conclude the consideration of the appropriations bill for energy and water. At the conclusion of that bill, we will then begin the rule and the bill for the agriculture appropriations. We will proceed into the evening on the agriculture appropriations bill on tomorrow, Thursday, and at a reasonable time we will make a determination as to how late we will go tomorrow night.

The gentleman is correct that, as I announced with the approval of the leadership yesterday, Members can expect that there will be no votes on Friday.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, further reserving the right to object, I think Members need to know what the reality is in terms of their catching planes. They were told the day before yesterday that we would not be into a long march into the night on Thursday. Could the gentleman give us some idea of how long the majority is intending to proceed so that Members on both sides have some idea of what to do with their plane reservations?

□ 1815

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. If the gentleman would yield further. As we discussed yesterday on this subject, we will very likely plan to go late tomorrow night, but also as we discussed, we would not go beyond midnight, or a reasonable time in the evening, if it appears that we have no opportunity to conclude the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I doubt that we will be able to conclude the bill on tomorrow. I would suspect the House could work its will for an earlier departure.

Mr. OBEY. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS) Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF A CONCURRENT RESOLUTION FOR THE ADJOURNMENT OF THE HOUSE AND SENATE FOR THE INDEPENDENCE DAY DISTRICT WORK PERIOD

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-117) on the resolution (H. Res. 182) providing for consideration of a concurrent resolution providing for adjournment of the House and Senate for the Independence Day district work period, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2330, AGRICULTURE, RURAL DEVELOPMENT, FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 107-118) on the resolution (H. Res. 183) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2230) making appropriations for Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies programs for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2002, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LIMITATION ON AMENDMENTS DURING FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2311, ENERGY AND WATER DEVELOPMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2002

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, during further consideration of H.R. 2311 in the Committee of the Whole pursuant to the House Resolution 180, no further amendment to the bill shall be in order except:

(1) the following amendments, each of which shall be debatable for 20 minutes: Mr. TRAFICANT of Ohio, regarding drilling; Mrs. BERKLEY of Nevada, regarding nuclear waste.

(2) the following amendments, which shall be debatable for 10 minutes: Mr. TRAFICANT of Ohio, regarding Buy American; Mrs. JOHNSON of Texas, regarding bio/environmental research; Mrs. KELLY of New York, regarding the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Inspector General salaries and expenses.

(3) the following additional amendment, which shall be debatable for 60 minutes: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, regarding the Gulf Stream natural gas pipeline.

Each additional amendment may be offered only by the Member designated by this request, or a designee; shall be considered as read; shall be debatable for the time specified, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; shall not be subject to