

Sandra Cantu will be missed, and I join those who grieve as we celebrate her short life.

THE REAL COST OF CAP-AND-TRADE LEGISLATION

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

Mr. PENCE. Mr. Speaker, this week, House Democrats begin hearings on so-called "cap-and-trade" legislation. It is their legislative response to concerns over global climate change. Even former Vice President Al Gore will testify tomorrow here on Capitol Hill. But as many around the country and in this body are realizing, there are a lot of inconvenient truths about the cap-and-trade bill.

The Democrat plan actually caps growth and trades jobs, and the truth is this cap-and-trade legislation is essentially an economic declaration of war on the Midwest by liberals in Washington, D.C., and it must be opposed.

Under the Democratic plan, estimates suggest the average American household could face more than \$3,000 a year in higher energy costs, and people in the Midwest, like us in Indiana, will bear the largest burden. Even the President, as candidate, said, "Under my plan of cap-and-trade, electricity rates would necessarily skyrocket." We can only estimate these numbers, Mr. Speaker, because the Democratic plan includes no numbers.

The truth is the American people deserve to know what all this is going to cost. The Democrats and the Congress need to come clean about the cost of their cap-and-trade bill, and when they do, this Congress and the American people will reject it.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1145, NATIONAL WATER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE ACT OF 2009

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 352 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 352

Resolved, That at any time after the adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1145) to implement a National Water Research and Development Initiative, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Science and Technology. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under

the five-minute rule. It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the five-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Science and Technology now printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read. All points of order against the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute are waived except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI. Notwithstanding clause 11 of rule XVIII, no amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole. All points of order against such amendments are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. Any Member may demand a separate vote in the House on any amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole to the bill or to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, for purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARCURI. I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous materials into the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARCURI. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H. Res. 352 provides for a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 1145, the National Water Research and Development Initiative Act of 2009.

Among the many challenges we face, none is more elemental than protecting our water. Increases in population, growing energy demands and shifting weather patterns jeopardize water supplies across the country. Water is essential and irreplaceable, but many Americans are unaware that many supplies across the country are at risk.

It is critical that we coordinate the efficient use of water resources and maintain water quality. Competent water management is essential if we are to meet the competing needs of

transportation, industry, agriculture, recreation, and power production, but currently more than 20 Federal agencies carry out research and development on some aspect of water supply, water quality or water management.

H.R. 1145 would address this issue by creating a National Water Research and Development Initiative to improve Federal, State and local government activities related to water research and development. The bill would improve coordination on Federal research by establishing an interagency committee to ensure Federal agencies work together on critical water issues.

A lack of coordination and competing interests frequently strain agencies and local communities tasked with managing a limited water supply. A perfect example of this problem can be found in my district in Upstate New York, where the Hinckley Reservoir supplies water for 130,000 residents in my hometown of Utica and for the outlying areas; but as with most bodies of water, the reservoir serves multiple uses, not just as a source of drinking water but as a source of hydropower and a water supply for the canal and a recreational site.

After years of battle between the local water authority and the State canal corporation over rights to the water, a couple of summers ago, the Hinckley Reservoir drained to within 3 feet of disrupting the water supply. That was not because of a lack of water. That has never been the issue. Rather, it was the lack of a cogent water policy and agreement by the conflicting interests. The low reservoir level impacted hydropower generation at a local power facility, and it jeopardized drinking water safety. A situation like this is unacceptable, especially when there is a large amount of water available. It is critical that we put measures in place resolving the conflicting objectives and poor communication between agencies.

This underlying bill and the water census it creates is the first step in that process for similar situations that exist, not only in New York State but around the country. That is why I'm offering an amendment that will require the interagency committee created by this bill to study competing water supply uses and how different uses interact and impact each other. Our water supply is invaluable in so many ways, not only for consumption but for the generation of electricity, for the production of food, for transportation, and for recreation, just to name a few. We must be sure to balance these competing interests in an efficient and equitable way.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support the National Water Research and Development Initiative Act. I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will continue to support it as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my friend, the gentleman from

New York (Mr. ARCURI), for the time, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Water is the most essential and basic natural resource to sustain life. The single greatest factor that has contributed most to the spread of public health in the United States is access to clean water. Across the country, approximately 40 billion gallons of water are used each day for industrial purposes, for home landscaping, for personal hygiene, for thirst, and for many other uses. The average American uses about 100 gallons of water per day.

As our cities and communities continue to expand, one of the greatest challenges faced by local governments is finding ways to sustain adequate clean water supplies to meet the growing demand. However, our knowledge about water resources and conservation is based on research conducted in the middle of the last century. The underlying legislation being brought to the floor now, the National Water Research and Development Initiative Act, will help bring our knowledge of water resources into this century by coordinating national research and development efforts to ensure adequate water supplies through greater efficiency and conservation programs.

Specifically, the bill establishes an interagency committee to develop a national water research and assessment plan in coordination with State, local and tribal governments, and it will also coordinate all research development data and other activities related to water, and it will ensure the optimal use of resources and expertise by avoiding duplicity through better intergovernmental cooperation.

I had the privilege during the last district work period of meeting with constituents throughout my district about issues that matter to them. No one mentioned anything related to this bill. It's an important bill; it's an important issue, but there are other issues that are much more pressing, issues that, I think, we should be debating, instead of spending an entire week on a water bill that enjoys absolute consensus, bipartisan support in this Congress. We should be working on issues that really matter the most to our constituents—the pressing and critical issues Americans deal with on a daily basis. For example, we could be working to help the people of our great Nation to rebuild their retirement, college and personal savings accounts.

Earlier this week, the Inspector General of the Treasury Department released a report confirming the lack of oversight and accounting of taxpayer money in the TARP program. By the way, in my almost 17 years here, Mr. Speaker, there is no vote that I'm happier to have cast a “no” on than for that of the TARP program. I knew the future would be lined with scandal. Less than one-half of 1 percent of that TARP program has gone to the State that I'm honored to represent, really Ground Zero in the housing crisis,

Florida. Less than one-half of 1 percent. Wall Street was more than taken care of. Yet, troubled assets, that was what we were told was the purpose of that legislation, troubled assets recovery. I don't think one troubled asset has been purchased.

□ 1030

Those are the kinds of issues we should be dealing with.

So the question I would ask you, why doesn't the majority address those critical issues? For example, bring forth legislation to increase transparency in that TARP program.

Water is an important issue, but we could bring it here summarily on suspension. It doesn't need to take a week of the precious time of this Congress.

By the time we finish debating this rule, Mr. Speaker—there is a clock there over your head and we see the minutes passing—the Federal Government will have spent over \$400 million just during the minutes that have ticked during this debate. That's four times what President Obama has asked his Cabinet to cut earlier this week. We could have spent this time helping cut Federal waste and reducing the debt being piled on our children and their children. It's another example of the issues that we should be debating in this Congress.

Yet, instead of addressing the challenges that confront the American people, the majority has chosen to devote precious floor time and, in effect, to take an entire congressional week to consider a noncontroversial water bill. That's the way this majority has chosen to run Congress.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from the Rules Committee for his passionate statement, but I have to disagree with respect to talking about water as an issue that isn't as important as other issues.

Clearly, we have many important issues facing this country, but in the past 2 weeks that I was home, I did 11 town hall meetings, and I can tell you that water came up in every single town hall meeting, whether it was ensuring that the water purity, the ground water purity was safe in the southern part of my district where they are doing hydraulic fracking for natural gas in the shale or whether it is using excessive amounts in hydro plants with the Hinckley Dam that I just spoke of, or whether it is lowering the level of Seneca Lake to feed hydro plants in the Finger Lakes.

People are concerned. And I would submit that other needs and other uses of water are very important. Other things that we do here in Congress are critically important, but nothing is more important than keeping the water that we drink clean and fresh. That is the number one resource of our country, that is the most important thing that we, as a Nation, have, and that is keeping our water supply clean. People talk about how important oil is,

and clearly it is. But water is, without a doubt, the most important commodity, resource that we have. We can't live without water, and, therefore, it is the most important thing.

I have already discussed the competing uses of hydro recreation and economic development and water use in my district in one end of it. But as I said, there are other parts of my district, as well, and the Finger Lakes region that are very concerning.

Seneca Lake is the second deepest lake in North America, yet they still encounter safety concerns because the lake levels are going down. Now, not only is that important again for recreation, for hydropower, for water use, for drinking water use, but the level of the lake is going down. It's the water source for the Seneca Falls Power Company. It's located on the Seneca-Cayuga Canal. And at this point, 1 inch of the lake level of Seneca Lake is roughly about 1.2 billion gallons of water, and yet the lake level is down several inches. A number of different State and Federal agencies are involved in the management of the water at Seneca Lake, and yet no one can come together on what the cause is and how to regulate the amount of outflow from the lake.

What is amazing is we have all of these competing uses for a finite amount of water, and yet the agencies that oversee these uses act more like competitors rather than competitive stewards of a very scarce resource.

We need this bill to study how using water for one of these purposes impacts or limits the use of other purposes. That is what is critical. There is nothing more important than our good stewardship of our resource of water.

Seneca Lake, Hinckley Reservoir, two issues in my district alone, and that's just one small congressional district. There are 435 in the country, all with similar issues. To maximize the benefits, we need to make sure we are using the water in the best way. And therefore, Mr. Speaker, I think that it is necessary that we pass this rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I reiterate, water is important, but to have taken an entire week of congressional time on this bill when the American people are facing so many challenges is not appropriate.

At this time, I yield 4 minutes to my distinguished colleague, the great leader in this Congress from Michigan (Mrs. MILLER).

Mrs. MILLER of Michigan. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule and this legislation as well, the National Water Resource and Development Initiative Act.

As a Representative of Michigan, the Great Lakes State, water issues of all varieties are very important to all of my constituents. The Great Lakes are fully one-fifth, or 20 percent, of the

world's freshwater drinking supply, and certainly that makes them a natural resource unparalleled on the planet.

This legislation, which would establish a national committee to study our Nation's water needs and to make recommendations for a comprehensive national water strategy, sounds very good and very noncontroversial at first blush. But whenever a national water policy is first discussed, we in Michigan and the Great Lakes Basin get very nervous. And whether it is due to population expansion and to dryer areas of the Nation in the South or the West or global warming or whatever, water is going to be a very important need for many in the 21st century.

In fact, just last year, Mr. Speaker, *Business Week* magazine did a cover story about why the great oilman T. Boone Pickens thinks water is actually the new oil. As a result of these challenges, some have begun to promote the idea of a natural water policy to deal with these challenges, and attention will undoubtedly turn to the places that have freshwater like the Great Lakes. There have been numerous examples of this over the decades on both sides of the aisle here. But let me illustrate a recent one.

During the 2008 Presidential campaign, New Mexico Governor Bill Richardson, who was then running for President, told the *Las Vegas Sun*, "I want a national water policy. We need a dialogue between the States to deal with issues like water conservation, water reuse technology, water delivery, and water production." And he went on to say, "States like Wisconsin are awash with water."

Fortunately, in order to prevent efforts by others to divert Great Lakes water outside the Basin, last fall we enacted the Great Lakes Compact, which reserves for the Governors of the Great Lakes States the opportunity to regulate diversions of water from the Great Lakes Basin. The compact bans new and increased diversions of water outside the Great Lakes Basin with only limited, highly regulated exceptions, and it establishes a framework for each State and the two provinces in Canada to enact laws protecting the Basin. And after being ratified by the Great Lakes State, the compact passed this House last September by a vote of 390-25, and the Senate actually passed it under unanimous consent, was then signed into law by then-President Bush.

In order to ensure that this new water initiative does not infringe on the principles associated with the Great Lakes Compact, I offered an amendment to the Rules Committee yesterday. Regrettably, it was not made in order. Quite simply, my amendment would have prevented the interagency committee, the National Water Initiative Coordination Office, the National Water Research and Assessment Plan from considering or promoting policies that would undermine

or interfere with the principles of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resources Compact.

The Great Lakes, as I said, are the very identity of my State of Michigan and all of us in the Great Lakes Basin, and we all take their care very seriously. My constituents will not abide even the prospect of a diversion of the Great Lakes water to other areas of the country where growth is beginning to outstrip their resources. And some might argue that the Great Lakes Compact provides all of the protections that we need.

I do agree that there are very strong protections in the compact, but I also fear that everything is subject to change. And while I am not suggesting that this legislation aims to divert Great Lakes water, it also does nothing to protect them or to protect and prohibit diversion either. Such protections would make, certainly, my constituents and all the people that live in the Great Lakes Basin much more comfortable with the establishment of a national water policy. And since those protections are not included in this legislation, Mr. Speaker, I will be opposing both this rule and the bill.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlelady from Michigan for her insightful comments and certainly her strong leadership on protecting what I believe to be the greatest natural resource not only in America but also in North America and our water supply.

I would inquire if the other side has any other speakers.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. No, we do not.

I thank my friend for the handling of the rule on this important matter.

Mr. Speaker, I would simply reiterate that while this issue is of great importance, there are many other issues facing this Nation, and for this entire week for this Congress to have done nothing else during this entire week is really unfortunate and it shows the manner in which the majority of this Congress, the leadership of the majority of this Congress is running this Congress, and the American people are finding out. They are discovering it.

We have no further speakers. At this time, I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART) for his management of this rule.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would like to thank Chairman GORDON for working to bring this important piece of legislation to the floor. As I said earlier, there really is nothing more important or elemental than our water and our water supply. We must manage it wisely. There is just too much at stake if we do not. I believe this bill is going to go a long way towards improving the way we manage our most precious natural resource and ensure that it is clean, safe, and abundant for future generations.

I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 1145.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 18. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of World Malaria Day, and reaffirming United States leadership and support for efforts to combat malaria.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-398, as amended by Public Law 108-7, in accordance with the qualifications specified under section 1238(b)(3)(E) of Public Law 106-398, and upon the recommendation of the Republican Leader, in consultation with the ranking members of the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the Senate Committee on Finance, the Chair, on behalf of the President pro tempore, appoints the following individuals to the United States-China Economic Security Review Commission:

Dennis Shea of Virginia, for a term expiring December 31, 2010.

Robin Cleveland of Virginia, for a term expiring December 31, 2010, vice Mark Esper of Virginia.

The message also announced that pursuant to Public Law 106-286, the Chair, on behalf of the President of the Senate, and after consultation with the Majority Leader, appoints the following members to serve on the Congressional-Executive Commission on the People's Republic of China:

The Senator from Montana (Mr. BAUCUS).

The Senator from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

The Senator from California (Mrs. FEINSTEIN).

The Senator from North Dakota (Mr. DORGAN), Chairman.

The Senator from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

NATIONAL WATER RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT INITIATIVE ACT OF 2009

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 352 and rule