

they will help me all the way through to codify this into law and statute.

WHY A LEGISLATIVE REMEDY?

At this stage in the process the only way to stop what could be an environmental catastrophe is legislative action.

My bill, H.R. 2818 would bar any person from any drilling activity, including slant or directional drilling, to extract oil or gas from lands beneath Mosquito Creek Lake. The bill gives the U.S. Attorney General the authority to file suit in U.S. District Court to enforce the prohibition.

BACKGROUND ON THE LAKE

Mosquito Creek Lake is located in a heavily populated area, Trumbull County, Ohio. The county seat, Warren, located at the southern end of the lake, has a population of more than 50,000. Trumbull County has a total population of more than 225,000.

The lake was constructed in 1944 primarily for flood control, low-flow augmentation, municipal water supply, and water quality control. The lake also serves to conserve land and preserve fish and wildlife, including several endangered species.

THE LAKE IS MAIN SOURCE OF DRINKING WATER

Mosquito Creek Lake is the sole source of drinking water for the city of Warren. Let me repeat that: the lake is the sole source of drinking water for the city of Warren.

The city of Cortland also relies on the lake to recharge its aquifers. Surrounding communities also rely, in part, on the lake to supply their drinking water.

Any contamination of the lake would severely compromise the drinking water supply of up to a quarter of a million people. That is why I am here today.

ALL LOCAL GOVERNMENTS ARE OPPOSED

The four local governments that are impacted by this proposal, the cities of Cortland and Warren, Bazetta Township, and Trumbull County, all adamantly oppose the drilling.

Keep in mind that these governments will receive royalties from the drilling.

In addition, every civic, scientific and academic organization involved in the process has raised serious and substantive concerns relative to safety and the worth of the drilling proposal. The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has ignored local concerns.

STATE AND LOCAL GOVERNMENTS LACK RESOURCES TO MONITOR AND RESPOND TO EMERGENCIES

The state of Ohio does not have the resources to effectively and consistently conduct inspections and monitor water quality.

BLM glosses over this issue by asserting that the state will somehow come up with the necessary resources or that the drillers themselves will hire outside contractors to do the monitoring and inspecting.

While I have great respect for the oil and gas drilling industry, inspection and water quality monitoring are functions that should not be entrusted to the private sector—especially when the private companies have a glaring conflict of interest.

Contrary to what BLM has stated in their planning analysis and environmental assessment (PA/EA) documents, the local governments do not have the necessary equipment, personnel, expertise and resources to adequately cope with a drilling accident.

BLM HAS NOT ADEQUATELY CONSULTED WITH STATE AND LOCAL OFFICIALS

Throughout the process BLM has not adequately consulted with state and local govern-

ments. For example, BLM did not adequately consult with the Ohio Environmental Protection Agency.

Given that the proposed drilling will affect the sole source of drinking water for more than a quarter of a million people, BLM should have made every effort to ensure that Ohio EPA played a central role at every step of the environmental assessment process.

Unfortunately, this was not done as evidenced by the fact that not a single individual from Ohio EPA was part of the team that prepared the proposed PA/EA.

BENEFITS VERSUS RISKS

Under a best case scenario, the local governments could receive a total of \$150,000 a year.

A single accident could shut down the drinking water supply for the cities of Warren and Cortland, and surrounding communities.

The planning and assessment documents prepared by BLM do not address the key issue of how or where these government entities would get safe drinking water.

A single accident could have devastating and lasting consequences.

NO PLACE TO TURN BUT CONGRESS

I, along with the local governments involved, have tried to work with BLM. Our concerns have been laid out in great detail. We have been involved in the planning and assessment process at every stage. We have done everything by the book.

The Congress is our last resort. I urge the House to approve H.R. 2818. Don't let the federal government impose a program on a community that the entire community does not want.

In closing, I'd like to quote from a 9/28/98 letter submitted to BLM by David D. Daugherty, assistant law director for the city of Warren, as part of the PA/EA process.

There is no gas shortage at present and even if there were, the relative small size of the potential gas resources under the reservoir would do little to solve any national energy crisis. The overall economic benefit to the area is slight while the potential for harm is great. Mitigation measures by their definition imply the possibility of harm; and while they may reduce the probability of harm the possibility still exists, particularly where the mitigation measures rely on questionable enforcement as well as disaster containment capabilities. If no action is taken the mitigation measures are unnecessary and the probability of a spill or other contamination from drilling under Federal lands is zero.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. OSE). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2818.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MINERAL LEASING ACT AMENDMENTS REGARDING TRONA MINING

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill

(H.R. 3063) to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to increase the maximum acreage of Federal leases for sodium that may be held by an entity in any one State, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3063

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. FINDINGS.

The Congress finds and declares that—

(1) The Federal lands contain commercial deposits of trona, with the world's largest body of this mineral located on such lands in southwestern Wyoming.

(2) Trona is mined on Federal lands through Federal sodium leases issued under the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920.

(3) The primary product of trona mining is soda ash (sodium carbonate), a basic industrial chemical that is used for glass making and a variety of consumer products, including baking soda, detergents, and pharmaceuticals.

(4) The Mineral Leasing Act sets for each leaseable mineral limitations on the amount of acreage of Federal leases any one producer may hold in any one state or nationally.

(5) The present acreage limitation for Federal sodium (trona) leases has been in place for over five decades, since 1948, and is the oldest acreage limitation in the Mineral Leasing Act. Over this time frame Congress and/or the BLM has revised acreage limits for other minerals to meet the needs of the respective industries. Currently, the sodium lease acreage limitation of 15,360 acres per state is approximately one-third of the per state Federal lease acreage cap for coal (46,080 acres) and potassium (51,200 acres) and one-sixteenth that of oil and gas (246,080 acres).

(6) Three of the four trona producers in Wyoming are operating mines on Federal leaseholds that contain total acreage close to the sodium lease acreage ceiling.

(7) The same reasons that Congress cited in enacting increases in other minerals' per state lease acreage caps apply to trona: the advent of modern mine technology, changes in industry economics, greater global competition, and need to conserve the Federal resource.

(8) Existing trona mines require additional lease acreage to avoid premature closure, and are unable to relinquish mined-out areas to lease new acreage because those areas continue to be used for mine access, ventilation, and tailings disposal and may provide future opportunities for secondary recovery by solution mining.

(9) Existing trona producers are having to make long term business decisions affecting the type and amount of additional infrastructure investments based on the certainty that sufficient acreage of leaseable trona will be available for mining in the future.

(10) To maintain the vitality of the domestic trona industry and ensure the continued flow of valuable revenues to the Federal and state governments and products to the American public from trona production on Federal lands, the Mineral Leasing Act should be amended to increase the acreage limitation for Federal sodium leases.

SEC. 2. AMENDMENT OF MINERAL LEASING ACT.

Paragraph (2) of subsection (b) of section 27 of the Mineral Leasing Act (41 Stat. 448; 30 U.S.C. 184(b)(2)) is amended by striking "fifteen thousand three hundred and sixty acres" and inserting "30,720 acres".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) and the gentleman

from Puerto Rico (Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ) each will control 20 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN).

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3063, a bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920 with respect to limitations upon the amount of acreage an entity may hold within any one State. This bill would grant discretion to the Secretary of the Interior to raise the statutory limitation upon the amount of acreage a company may hold on a statewide basis for sodium leases and permits.

Mr. Speaker, the current limit was established by a 1948 amendment to the Mineral Leasing Act and was set at 15,360 acres, a reasonable size at that time during mining. But, Mr. Speaker, a modern operation requires a mine-plant complex which may cost well over \$300 million to build.

Like other industries today, consolidation to achieve higher efficiency is taking place in this soda ash business. H.R. 3063 before us today would give the Secretary of the Interior the authority to raise the now too low acreage limit, after he has, in due course, determined it would not be anti-competitive to do so. Otherwise, Federal lessees may need to surrender mined-out leases before backfilling underground voids with tailings currently stored on the surface, a method which the Bureau of Land Management would like to see remain available.

Also, solution mining of the underground pillars left in place cannot occur if the leases are returned to the Government prematurely. From a royalty flow viewpoint, it is desirable for our domestic industry to have these options available.

The administration testified last month before the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources in support of H.R. 3063.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3063 would amend the Mineral Leasing Act to grant the Secretary of the Interior the discretion to increase a number of Federal leases which may be held by any one producer in a single State.

The present acreage limitation for sodium leases of 15,360 acres has been in place for 5 decades. The bill would increase the limitation to 30,720 acres per producer.

The U.S. soda ash producers, four of which are in Wyoming, are competitive with one another for a share of their relatively flat domestic market. They are also faced with strong inter-

national competition. Wyoming generates approximately 2 million tons of soda ash per year. Other countries, including China and India, with vast supplies of Trona have erected tariff and nontariff barriers to support their own less efficient producers, making it difficult to export U.S. soda ash.

The gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. CUBIN) believes that giving the Secretary of the Interior the discretion to raise acreage limitations will have a beneficial effect on the industry's ability to remain competitive.

Congress set forth acreage limits in the Mineral Leasing Act to ensure that no single entity held too much of any single mineral reserve. The lease limitation ensures that there is sufficient competition while providing an incentive for development of these reserves and ensuring a reasonable rate of return to the Federal and State treasuries.

We expect any future Secretary of the Interior who uses this discretionary authority to raise acreage limitations for sodium leases to include a finding that raising an acreage for a producer would not have a negative effect on either Federal royalty revenues or competition.

The Clinton administration testified in favor of this bill. We have no objections on passing this under the suspension of the House rules.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers on this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TRAFICANT).

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, I support the current bill.

Mr. ROMERO-BARCELÓ. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. HANSEN) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3063.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HANSEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2862, H.R. 2863, H.R. 2541, H.R. 2818, and H.R. 3063.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

There was no objection.

CONDEMNING ARMENIAN ASSASSINATIONS

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 222) condemning the assassination of Armenian Prime Minister Vazgen Sargsian and other officials of the Armenian Government and expressing the sense of the Congress in mourning this tragic loss of the duly elected leadership of Armenia.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 222

Whereas on October 27, 1999, several armed individuals broke into Armenia's Parliament and assassinated the Prime Minister of Armenia, Vazgen Sargsian, the Chairman of the Armenian Parliament, Karen Demirchian, the Deputy Chairman of the Armenian Parliament, Yuri Bakhshian, the Minister of Operative Issues, Leonard Petrossian, and other members of the Armenian Government;

Whereas Armenia is working toward democracy, the rule of law, and a viable free market economy since obtaining its freedom from Soviet rule in 1991; and

Whereas all nations of the world mourn the loss suffered by Armenia on October 27, 1999: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the Congress—

(1) deplors the slaying of the Prime Minister of Armenia, Vazgen Sargsian, the Chairman of the Armenian Parliament, Karen Demirchian, the Deputy Chairman of the Armenian Parliament, Yuri Bakhshian, the Minister of Operative Issues, Leonard Petrossian, and other members of the Armenian Government struck down in this violent attack;

(2) strongly shares the determination of the Armenian people that the perpetrators of these vile acts will be swiftly brought to justice so that Armenia may demonstrate its resolute opposition to acts of terror;

(3) commends the efforts of the late Prime Minister and the Armenian Government for their commitment to democracy, the rule of law, and for supporting free market movements internationally; and

(4) continues to cherish the strong friendship between Armenia and the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Con. Res. 222.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I support the motion to suspend the rules and pass this concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 222, introduced by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROGAN), which is identical to the language of a