

they are pro-Michigan does not mean it is not true. This fresh water coast has the best dunes and the best beaches in the United States. I serve on the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands. I have traveled around this country for multiple years. The dunes are more spectacular, more wild and more scenic than what you see in Oregon, than what you see in Kitty Hawk. The beaches are more private and rural in ability to enjoy than you see on any of our other coasts, as someone who visits those coasts as well.

This is incredibly scenic country in a very populace State. This is not like the Indiana Dunes Lakeshore, where we preserved an ecosystem right at the edge of Chicago where other cities are. This is one, however, that still has a number of inholdings, small towns, and, as we work this through, what used to be largely a series of State parks, like DH Day and Platte River and other State parks, has now been joined together, not only where the spectacular dunes are, but the ecosystem that is dependent on the dunes' survival, one of which is the Crystal River.

This beautiful, scenic area comes in through the town of Glen Arbor and out by Glen Haven, as well as the Platte River coming in another part, and the ability for canoeists to enjoy this, the ability to keep the watershed and the trees preserved, so that not only do we have those moving dunes, the largest moving dunes in the world preserved, but the ecosystem that people, like I did when I was in college every spring, we went up and camped at Sleeping Bear, and my parents took me up there when I was young, so that other families can enjoy a wilderness in a fairly populous area of America.

□ 1445

We do not have enough, unlike the speaker from Idaho and others, we do not have a lot of public lands in the Midwest. We do not have a lot of public lands, like many of my colleagues on the Subcommittee on National Parks, Recreation and Public Lands, like the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON), who are looking often at districts that range anywhere from 30 to 90 percent Federal public lands. In the Midwest we have a shortage. This is helping fill an important gap in an important ecosystem with animal and bird diversity, with sand dunes, with rivers; and it is a rare opportunity to purchase this. So I hope we not only authorize this, but move the appropriations soon.

I commend the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. CAMP), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. STUPAK), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE), and the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER), and all of the others who have been involved. It has been a pleasure in preserving this important part of our natural and cultural heritage in the Midwest.

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, we are just glad that the sponsors

of this have not allowed Sleeping Bear Dunes to lie. We appreciate their work.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 408, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING THE MINERAL LEASING ACT TO AUTHORIZE THE SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR TO ISSUE COMBINED HYDROCARBON LEASING

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 3062) to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to issue separately, for the same area, a lease for tar sand and a lease for oil and gas, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 3062

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

SECTION 1. COMBINED HYDROCARBON LEASING.

(a) SPECIAL PROVISIONS REGARDING LEASING.—Section 17(b)(2) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(b)(2)) is amended—

- (1) by inserting "(A)" after "(2)"; and
- (2) by adding at the end the following:

"(B) The Secretary may issue under this Act for the same area, separately—

- "(i) a lease for exploration for and extraction of tar sand; and
- "(ii) a lease for exploration for and development of oil and gas.

"(C) A lease issued under subparagraph (B)(ii) shall not be further subject to the Combined Hydrocarbon Leasing Act of 1981 (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.).

"(D) A lease issued for tar sand shall be issued using the same bidding process, annual rental, and posting period as a lease issued for oil and gas, except that the minimum acceptable bid required for a lease issued for tar sand shall be \$2 per acre.

"(E) The Secretary may waive, suspend, or alter any requirement under section 26 that a permittee under a permit authorizing prospecting for tar sand must exercise due diligence, to promote any resource covered by a combined hydrocarbon lease."

(b) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—Section 17(b)(1)(B) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(b)(1)(B)) is amended in the second sentence by inserting ", subject to paragraph (2)(B)," after "the Secretary".

(c) REGULATIONS.—Within 45 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall issue final regulations to implement this section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON).

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

Mr. Speaker, on November 16, 1981, Congress passed the Combined Hydrocarbon Leasing Act. This act was in direct response to the energy crisis of the late 1970s and a policy of the Carter administration to promote alternative energy sources. This law has not only failed to accomplish its primary objective, which was to stimulate the development of tar sands as an alternative fuel to imported oil, it has restricted conventional oil and gas development in over a million acres of land that is highly productive. The vast majority of this land is located in the Uinta Basin in my State of Utah.

The reality is that extraction and processing of tar sands is an uneconomic venture in the United States. Even if these designated tar sands were designated for lease, the industry would be reluctant to acquire the leases since recovery and processing of the tar sands is so costly. Only one lease sale has occurred on the tar sands since 1981, totaling 1.34 percent of the lands. This fact clearly illustrates the shortcomings of the act.

The potential reserves of conventional natural gas and oil under the tar sands areas is huge. This is a tremendous resource that is not currently available to the citizens of Utah or to the citizens of the United States who, in the recent past have and in the near future, will suffer from extremely high natural gas prices to heat their homes during the coming winter months.

In addition to the valuable oil and gas resources that are being lost, the Federal Government and the citizens of Utah are losing hundreds of millions of dollars in potential royalty and tax revenues from producers who are willing to process the oil and gas deposits in the tar sands areas. The Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management would still administer these lands.

Producers attempting to lease these lands will be subject to every existing environmental stipulation as well as any new regulation that may be placed on these lands. Protections are already in place to prevent any degradation of existing wilderness areas and wilderness study areas.

The goal of my bill is to not circumvent or change any environmental regulations, but simply to make available for lease over 1 million acres of land that contain tremendous potential for natural gas and oil development by allowing the Secretary of the Interior to issue separately for the same area, a lease for tar sand and a lease for oil and gas development.

Action is in the public interest and would help increase the Nation's energy independence.

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

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

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

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that, in effect, this bill would apply to public lands which are administered by the Bureau of Land Management and have been identified as suitable for tar sand and oil and gas leasing within the State of Utah. The committee report states that no land designation would be changed or environmental regulation modified or circumvented in any way by this legislation. I think that is an important fact to note.

Mr. Speaker, I would have preferred that this bill be considered under regular order with a hearing in the Committee on Resources prior to markup and floor consideration, but out of our continuing efforts in the direction of comity and fair play, and in the consideration that we do not have the votes to change the outcome in any event, we are unaware of any substantive problems and will not object to its consideration today.

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

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, let me just point out that in the spirit of comity and fair play, we appreciate the gentleman's statement. This initiative, I think, is well understood and well known, and I can assure the gentleman that all environmental concerns will be dealt with in the appropriate manner.

Mr. Speaker, 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. CANNON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3062, as amended.

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

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CONVEYANCE OF CERTAIN NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LANDS IN MENDOCINO NATIONAL FOREST, CALIFORNIA

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 708) to require the conveyance of certain National Forest System lands in Mendocino National Forest, California, to provide for the use of the proceeds from such conveyance for National Forest purposes, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 708

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

SECTION 1. LAND CONVEYANCE, FARAWAY RANCH, MENDOCINO NATIONAL FOREST, CALIFORNIA.

(a) CONVEYANCE REQUIRED.—Subject to subsection (b), the Secretary of Agriculture shall convey to the owner of the property known as the Faraway Ranch in Lake County, California (in this section referred to as

the "recipient"), by quitclaim deed, all right, title, and interest of the United States in and to the following National Forest System lands in Mendocino National Forest in Lake County, California:

(1) "Faraway Ranch, Tract 39" (approximately 15.8 acres), consisting of a portion of lot 6 of section 4, township 18 north, range 10 west, Mount Diablo base and meridian, as generally depicted on the map entitled "Faraway Ranch, Tracts 39 and 40" and dated June 30, 2002.

(2) "Faraway Ranch, Tract 40" (approximately 105.1 acres) consisting of a portion of the N½SW¼ and lot 7 of section 4, and a portion of lots 15 and 16 of section 5, township 18 north, range 10 west, Mount Diablo base and meridian, as generally depicted on the map referred to in paragraph (1).

(b) TIME FOR CONVEYANCE.—The Secretary shall make the conveyance under subsection (a) not later than 120 days after the date on which the recipient deposits sufficient funds with the Bureau of Land Management, California State Office, Branch of Geographic Services, to cover survey work costs and with the Forest Service, Mendocino National Forest, to cover Forest Service direct transaction costs described in subsection (e).

(c) CORRECTIONS.—With the agreement of the recipient, the Secretary may make minor corrections to the legal descriptions and map of the lands to be conveyed pursuant to this section.

(d) CONSIDERATION.—As consideration for the conveyance under subsection (a), the recipient shall pay to the Secretary an amount equal to the fair market value of the National Forest System lands conveyed under such subsection. The fair market value of such lands shall be determined by an appraisal that is acceptable to the Secretary and conforms with the Federal appraisal standards, as defined in the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions developed by the Interagency Land Acquisition Conference.

(e) PAYMENT OF COSTS.—All direct transaction costs associated with the conveyance under section (a), including the costs of appraisal, title, and survey work, shall be paid by the recipient.

(f) USE OF PROCEEDS.—

(1) DEPOSIT.—The Secretary shall deposit the amounts received by the Secretary as consideration under subsection (d) in the fund established by Public Law 90-171 (commonly known as the Sisk Act; 16 U.S.C. 484a).

(2) USE.—Funds deposited under paragraph (1) shall be available to the Secretary until expended, without further appropriation—

(A) for the acquisition of land and interests in land for National Forest System purposes in the State of California; and

(B) for reimbursement of costs incurred by the Forest Service in making the conveyance under subsection (a).

(3) STATUS OF ACQUIRED LAND.—Notwithstanding Public Law 85-862 (16 U.S.C. 521a), any lands acquired under paragraph (2)(A) shall be managed as lands acquired under the Act of March 1, 1911 (commonly known as the Weeks Act; 16 U.S.C. 480, 500, 515 et seq.), regardless of whether any of the lands conveyed under subsection (a) were reserved from the public domain.

(g) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, the lands to be conveyed under subsection (a) are hereby withdrawn from all forms of location, entry, and patent under the public land laws and the mining and mineral leasing laws of the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON).

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 708, sponsored by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), would require the conveyance of certain National Forest System lands in the Mendocino National Forest, California, to provide for the use of the proceeds from such conveyance for National Forest purposes, and for other purposes.

This legislation would resolve a long-standing problem regarding the property boundary between the Mendocino National Forest and the Faraway Ranch in rural northern California. I urge support of the legislation.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 708 would correct a survey error by directing the Secretary of Agriculture to convey 120 acres of Forest Service land to the owner of the Faraway Ranch in California. In exchange, the rancher would pay fair market value for the lands.

We support this legislation sponsored by the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), who has been a tremendous advocate to get this long-standing issue resolved and has done a great job in his district. We urge the bill's adoption.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington for yielding me this time, and I also thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CANNON) and the gentleman from Washington for the opportunity to speak on this bill. I would also like to thank the chairman of the committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. POMBO), and the ranking member, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL), for their help in finally resolving this long-standing problem.

I want to mention to all of the Members that this bill was passed by this House unanimously last year. Unfortunately, it was part of the omnibus bill that never made it out of the other body.

But as everyone has mentioned, this takes care of a problem that has been festering for quite some time over a disputed boundary line. This bill would convey 120 acres of National Forest Service property to a landowner, the owner of the Faraway Ranch, for fair market value. He would not only pay the fair market value for the land, but he would also pay all of the costs associated with the transfer and any surveying that needs to be done. Then the Forest Service will be able to take that money and purchase from willing sellers other property within the confines of this forest to allow them to better