

honor the life and contributions of Gilbert Rivera—a true American success story.

INTRODUCTION OF “MORE WATER  
AND MORE ENERGY ACT”

**HON. MARK UDALL**

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 7, 2007*

Mr. UDALL of Colorado. Madam Speaker, I am today again introducing legislation to facilitate the use of water produced in connection with development of energy resources for irrigation and other uses in ways that will not adversely affect water quality or the environment.

The bill is similar to one I introduced in the 109th Congress (as H.R. 5011) that passed the House last year but on which the Senate did not complete legislative action. It is cosponsored by Representative PEARCE of New Mexico, who is the ranking Republican member on the Natural Resources Committee's Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources and also by Representative EDWARDS of Texas. I greatly appreciate their support.

The bill's purpose is to help change an energy-industry problem into an opportunity, not just for oil and gas producers but for everyone else who would benefit from increased supplies of usable water.

Especially in the arid west, that covers everyone—not least our hard-pressed ranchers and farmers.

The focus of the bill is what's called “produced water”—the underground water extracted in connection with development of energy sources like oil, natural gas or coalbed methane. It would do two things:

First, it would direct Reclamation and the USGS to identify the obstacles to greater use of produced water and how those obstacles could be reduced or eliminated without adversely affecting water quality or the environment.

Second, it would provide for federal help in building 3 pilot plants to demonstrate ways to treat produced water to make it suitable for irrigation or other uses, again without adversely affecting water quality or the environment.

At least one of these pilot plants would be in Colorado, Utah, or Wyoming. At least one would be in one of the three States of New Mexico, Arizona or Nevada. And there would be at least one each in California and Texas. This is to assure that, together, the plants would demonstrate techniques applicable to a variety of geologic and other conditions.

Under the bill, the federal government could pay up to half the cost of building each plant, but no more than \$1 million for any one plant. No federal funds could be used for operating the plants.

The bill's goal is reflected in its title—the “More Water and More Energy Act of 2006.”

The extent of its potential benefits was shown by the testimony of Mr. David Templet at a hearing on the similar bill of mine the House considered last year.

Mr. Templet testified in support of that bill on behalf of the Domestic Petroleum Council and several other groups, including the Colorado Oil & Gas Association. He noted that produced water is the most abundant byproduct associated with the production of oil and gas, with about 18 billion barrels being generated by onshore wells in 1995.

And he pointed out that if only an additional 1% of that total could be put to beneficial use, the result would be to make over 75 billion gallons annually available for use for irrigation or other agriculture, municipal purposes, or to benefit fish and wildlife.

Now, remember that in the West we usually measure water by the acre-foot—the amount that would cover an acre to the depth of one foot—and an acre-foot is about 32,856 gallons, so an additional 75 billion gallons is more than 230,000 acre-feet—more water, indeed.

And at the same time making produced water available for surface uses, instead of just reinjecting it into the subsurface, can help increase the production of oil and gas.

At least year's hearing, this was illustrated by the testimony of Dr. David Stewart, a registered professional engineer from Colorado. He cited the example of an oil field in California from which an estimated additional 150 million barrels of oil could be recovered if water were removed from the subsurface reservoir. And he pointed out that where oil recovery is thermally enhanced, a reduced amount of underground water means less steam—and so less cost—is needed to recover the oil.

The potential for having both more water and more energy is also illustrated by the example of a project near Wellington, Colorado, that treats produced water as a new water resource. An oil company is embarking on the project to increase oil production while a separate company will purchase the produced water to supplement existing supplies, eventually allowing the town of Wellington and other water users in the area to have increased water for drinking and other purposes.

In view of its potential for leading to both “more water” and “more energy” I was pleased but not surprised that last year the Administration, through the Interior Department, testified that it “agrees that the goals of the bill are commendable and the needs that could be addressed are real” and that the roles the bill would assign to the Bureau of Reclamation and the USGS are consistent with the missions and expertise of those agencies.

In view of all this, Madam Speaker, I submit that this bill—and its promise of helping provide our country with both more water and more energy—deserves the support of the House.

For the benefit of our colleagues, here is a summary of the bill's provisions:

SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS OF THE “MORE  
WATER AND MORE ENERGY ACT”

Section One—provides a short title (the “More Water and More Energy Act of 2007”), sets forth several findings regarding the basis for the bill, and states the bill's purpose: “to facilitate the use of produced water for irrigation and other purposes without adversely affecting water quality or the environment, and to demonstrate ways to accomplish that result.”

Section Two—defines terms used in the bill.

Section Three—requires the Interior Department (through the Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Geological Survey) to conduct a study to identify the technical, economic, environmental, legal, and other obstacles to increasing the extent to which water produced in connection with energy development can be used for irrigation and other purposes without adversely affecting

water quality or the environment, and legislative, administrative, and other actions that could reduce or eliminate those obstacles. Results of the study are to be reported to Congress within a year after enactment.

Section Four—provides that within existing authorities and subject to appropriation of funds, the Interior Department is to provide financial assistance for development of facilities to demonstrate the feasibility, effectiveness, and safety of processes to increase use of produced water for irrigation, municipal or industrial uses, or other purposes without adversely affecting water quality or the environment. The section specifies that assistance is to be provided for at least one project in (1) Colorado, Utah, or Wyoming; (2) New Mexico, Arizona, or Utah; (3) California; and (4) Texas. Assistance to any facility cannot exceed \$1 million and cannot be used for operation or maintenance. The section specifies that assistance under this bill can be in addition to other federal assistance under other provisions of law.

Section Five—requires the Interior Department to—(1) consult with the Department of Energy, EPA, and appropriate Governors and local officials; (2) review relevant information developed in connection with other research; (2) include as much of that information as Interior finds advisable in the report required by section 1; (3) seek the advice of people with relevant professional expertise and of companies with relevant industrial experience; and (4) solicit comments and suggestions from the public.

Section Six—specifies that nothing in the bill is to be construed as affecting—(1) the effect of any State law, or any interstate authority or compact, regarding the use of water or the regulation of water quantity or quality; or (2) the applicability of any Federal law or regulation.

Section Seven—authorizes appropriation of—(1) \$1 million for the study required by section 1; and (2) \$5 million to implement section 4.

IN RECOGNITION OF RIGHTING  
HISTORICAL UNTRUTHS, RUTH J.  
SIMMONS FORCES BROWN TO  
ATONE FOR INVOLVEMENT IN  
SLAVERY

**HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

*Wednesday, February 7, 2007*

Mr. RANGEL. Madam Speaker, I rise today to enter into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD an article in the Washington Post discussing a Brown University committee's call for the institution to make amends by building a memorial, creating a center for the study of slavery and injustice and increasing efforts to recruit minority students, particularly from Africa and the West Indies. It is good to see the subject of slavery and the question of reparations being addressed with integrity and grace.

The article announces the findings of the university's Committee on Slavery and Justice. Appointed three years ago by Brown's president, Ruth J. Simmons, the committee recently investigated Brown's historical legacy, focusing specifically on its involvement in the transatlantic slave trade. The descendant of slaves and the first African American president of an Ivy League institution, Ruth Simmons has been steadfast in her commitment to uncovering the truths of Brown's past in ways that are academically and historically rigorous and just.

Arguably one of the most traumatic events in western history, the issue of slavery continues to instigate debate. Most recently questions of reparations, repairing the lives of those forced into the barbarous institution of slavery, often discussed in the form of repaying debts owed to descendants of slaves, have proven divisive at best and controversial at least. Although not called reparations, as reported in the article, the committee's recommendations are substantive and represent a form of repair. The committee's findings offer an example of the many ways that conversations and inquiries around reparations may be had in intelligent and sensible ways.

As stated in the article, the argument around reparations is not about a simple monetary gain, rather at the core of the debate is the need to acknowledge a part of our history that not anyone has fully come to terms with. It is important that we recognize and champion Brown's lead. This issue is central to who we are as a people and to who we are as a country.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 19, 2006]

PANEL SUGGESTS BROWN U. ATONE FOR TIES TO SLAVERY

(By Pam Belluck)

BOSTON, OCT. 18.—EXTENSIVELY DOCUMENTING *Brown University's* 18th-century ties to slavery, a university committee called Wednesday for the institution to make amends by building a memorial, creating a center for the study of slavery and injustice and increasing efforts to recruit minority students, particularly from Africa and the West Indies.

The Committee on Slavery and Justice, appointed three years ago by Brown's president, Ruth J. Simmons, a great-granddaughter of slaves who is the first black president of an Ivy League institution, said in a report: "We cannot change the past. But an institution can hold itself accountable for the past, accepting its burdens and responsibilities along with its benefits and privileges."

The report added, "In the present instance this means acknowledging and taking responsibility for Brown's part in grievous crimes."

The committee did not call for outright reparations, an idea that has support among some African-Americans and was a controversial issue at Brown several years ago. But the committee's chairman, James T. Campbell, a history professor at Brown, said he believed the recommendations "are substantive and do indeed represent a form of repair."

The committee also recommended that the university publicly and persistently acknowledge its slave ties, including during freshmen orientation. Dr. Campbell said he believed that the recommendations, if carried out, would represent a more concrete effort than that of any other American university to make amends for ties to slavery.

"I think it is unprecedented," Dr. Campbell said, adding that a few other universities and colleges have established memorials, study programs or issued apologies, but not on the scale of the Brown recommendations. It was not clear how much the committee's recommendations would cost to carry out.

"We're not making a claim that somehow Brown is uniquely guilty," Dr. Campbell said. "I think we're making a claim that this is an aspect of our history that not anyone has fully come to terms with. This is a critical step in allowing an institution to move forward."

Even in the North, a number of universities have ties to slavery. Harvard Law

School was endowed by money its founder earned selling slaves for the sugar cane fields of Antigua. And at Yale, three scholars reported in 2001 that the university relied on slave-trading money for its first scholarships, endowed professorship and library endowment.

Dr. Simmons issued a letter in response to the report, soliciting comments from the Brown community and saying she had asked for the findings to be discussed at an open forum. She declined to give her own reaction, saying, "When it is appropriate to do so, I will issue a university response to the recommendations and suggest what we might do."

She said "the committee deserves praise for demonstrating so steadfastly that there is no subject so controversial that it should not be submitted to serious study and debate."

Initial reaction to the recommendations seemed to be appreciative.

"It sounds to me like this makes sense," said Rhett S. Jones, a longtime professor of history and Africana studies at Brown. "I did not expect the committee would emerge saying, Well, you know, Brown should write a check."

"I never thought that was in the cards. I'm not sure I think it's even appropriate that a university write a check, even though it's pretty widely agreed on that Brown would not be where it is if it were not for slave money. These recommendations seem to me to be appropriate undertakings for the university."

Brown's ties to slavery are clear but also complex. The university's founder, the Rev. James Manning, freed his only slave, but accepted donations from slave owners and traders, including the Brown family of Providence, R.I. At least one of the Brown brothers, John, a treasurer of the college, was an active slave trader, but another brother, Moses, became a Quaker abolitionist, although he ran a textile factory that used cotton grown with slave labor.

University Hall, which houses Dr. Simmons's office, was built by a crew with at least two slaves.

"Any institution in the United States that existed prior to 1865 was entangled in slavery, but the entanglements are particularly dense in Rhode Island," Dr. Campbell said, noting that the state was the hub through which many slave ships traveled.

The issue caused friction at Brown in 2001, when the student newspaper, the *Brown Daily Herald*, printed a full-page advertisement produced by a conservative writer, listing "Ten Reasons Why Reparations for Slavery Is a Bad Idea And Racist Too."

The advertisement, also run by other college newspapers, prompted protests by students who demanded that the paper pay "reparations" by donating its advertising fee or giving free advertising space to advocates of reparations.

The Brown committee was made up of 16 faculty members, students and administrators, and its research was extensive.

"The official history of Brown will have to be rewritten, entirely scrapped," said Omer Bartov, a professor on the committee who specializes in studying the Holocaust and genocide.

The report cites examples of steps taken by other universities: a memorial unveiled last year by the University of North Carolina, a five-year program of workshops and activities at Emory University, and a 2004 vote by the faculty senate of the University of Alabama to apologize for previous faculty members having whipped slaves on campus.

Katie Zezima contributed reporting.

TRIBUTE TO PHILLIP BRADLEY BELCHER FOR THE AWARD OF EAGLE SCOUT

HON. SAM GRAVES

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 2007

Mr. GRAVES. Madam Speaker, I proudly pause to recognize Phillip Belcher, a very special young man who has exemplified the finest qualities of citizenship and leadership by taking an active part in the Boy Scouts of America, Troop 1433, and by earning the most prestigious award of Eagle Scout.

Phillip has been very active with his troop, participating in many scout activities. Over the years Phillip has been involved in scouting, he has earned 31 merit badges and held numerous leadership positions, serving as Senior Patrol Leader and Den Chief for Cub Scouts. Phillip is a member of the Tribe of Mic-O-Say and is in the Order of the Arrow.

For his Eagle Scout project, Phillip built concrete stairs at the Rolling Hills Community Church.

Madam Speaker, I proudly ask you to join me in commending Phillip Belcher for his accomplishments with the Boy Scouts of America and for his efforts put forth in achieving the highest distinction of Eagle Scout.

INTRODUCTION OF THE HIGH SCHOOL ATHLETICS ACCOUNTABILITY ACT

HON. LOUISE MCINTOSH SLAUGHTER

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 7, 2007

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Madam Speaker, I am proud to rise today to introduce the High School Athletics Accountability Act. As opportunities for girls and women to participate in sports and athletics have been made increasingly available, women's participation has grown exponentially. Nearly 2.6 million high school girls now participate in organized sports, as opposed to 294,015 in 1971 before Title IX was enacted. Athletic participation has brought with it confidence and camaraderie among young women, giving them memories and friends that will last a lifetime.

Despite our progress, persistent attacks against equality for women's sports require that we continue to protect the rights our nation's young women deserve. Currently high schools are not required to disclose any data on equity in sports, making it difficult for high schools and parents to ensure fairness in their athletics programs. The High School Athletics Accountability Act requires that high schools report basic data on the number of female and male students in their athletic programs and the expenditures made for their sports teams. The data will help high schools improve opportunities for girls in sports, and thereby help high schools and parents of schoolchildren foster fairness in athletic opportunities for girls and boys. Ultimately better information will encourage greater participation of all students in athletics.

Without information about how athletic opportunities and benefits are being allocated at the high school level, female students may be