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amendment is a step in the right direc-
tion and would send a strong signal to
those eager to exploit Great Lakes re-
sources.

People in Wisconsin and other Great
Lakes States are blessed to have the
world’s most pristine lakes and fresh
water resources in our backyard. We
get our drinking water from them, our
kids swim in them, and our tourism in-
dustry depends on them. Because the
Great Lakes are such an important
part of our daily lives, we are not will-
ing to gamble with this precious re-
source for short-term gain.

I urge my colleagues’ support of this
amendment. Please stand with us to
protect the Great Lakes from environ-
mental hazard and degradation.

Mr. CALLAHAN. Mr. Chairman, I
yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from
Michigan (Mr. KNOLLENBERG), a mem-
er 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 amend-
ment is overly broad and would pro-
hibit all agencies in the Energy and
Water bill including the Corps of Engi-
neers, the Department of Energy, and a
portion of the Department of the Inter-
ior 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 at-
tempt by the amendment’s author and
others to shift decision-making author-
ity over the Great Lakes to the Federal
Government, just like the water man-
agement issue. They would rather have bureaucrats in Washington to manage our
resources than those of us who ac-
tually live there. I do not think that is
correct.

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 De-
partment of Environmental Quality,
Department of Natural Resources, and
the State’s Natural Resources Commis-

They have made this decision on
their own, free from Federal inter-
ference, 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 let-
ter went to EPA administrator Christie
Todd brown, he writes, “The mem-
er States of the IOGCC regard drilling
beneath the Great Lakes and protec-
tion 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 any other Federal agency.”

This amendment would be counter
to the belief of the IOGCC and the major-
ity 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. Con-
versely, 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 acci-
dents and no significant impact to the
environment or public health. I think
the evidence 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 re-
source development.

The revenue produced by leasing of
land for drilling is crucial; and without
it, state-owned natural resources could
be taken without compensation by pri-

te wells drilled along the State of
Michigan’s shorelines and the other
States as well; on private lands, I
might add.

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

This amendment is counter-
productive because our Nation, par-
ticularly those in California, are cur-
rently 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 lit-
tle more than an example of mission
creep by which the Federal Govern-
ment slowly, slowly gains more and
more authority. This mission creep
amendment should not pass this House.
I urge Members to oppose this amend-
ment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will
rise informally.

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

SUNDARY 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 Committee resumed its sitting.

ENERGY AND WATER DEVELO-
MENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT,
2002

The Committee resumed its sitting.

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

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

With regard to contamination of
Lake Michigan, we have had the Rock
Goble, the Fish Hook Flea, alewife, nu-
clear waste and PCBs. Lake Michigan
has had enough. We killed Lake Erie in
the 1960s and never Michigan.

The Great Lakes are home to half
of the world’s supply of fresh water.
It is one of our Nation’s greatest environ-
mental 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 con-
sume.

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 every-
thing with respect to any type of activ-
ity on the lake is in the best interest of
the environment and of the American
people and the area.

I would beg to differ that the per-
mitting 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 fur-
ther 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 some-
thing about the energy crisis while not
doing anything to harm the environ-
ment. 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. Up-
ton).

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