

NATIONAL NANOTECHNOLOGY INITIATIVE AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5940, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GORDON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5940, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 407, nays 6, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 383]

YEAS—407

Abercrombie	Clyburn	Goodlatte
Ackerman	Cohen	Gordon
Aderholt	Cole (OK)	Granger
Akin	Conaway	Graves
Alexander	Cooper	Green, Al
Allen	Costa	Green, Gene
Altmire	Costello	Grijalva
Andrews	Courtney	Gutierrez
Arcuri	Cramer	Hall (NY)
Baca	Crenshaw	Hare
Bachmann	Crowley	Harman
Bachus	Cubin	Hastings (FL)
Baird	Cuellar	Hastings (WA)
Baldwin	Culberson	Hayes
Barrett (SC)	Cummings	Heller
Barrow	Davis (AL)	Hensarling
Bartlett (MD)	Davis (CA)	Herger
Barton (TX)	Davis (IL)	Herseth Sandlin
Becerra	Davis (KY)	Higgins
Berkley	Davis, David	Hill
Berman	Davis, Lincoln	Hinchev
Berry	Davis, Tom	Hinojosa
Biggert	Deal (GA)	Hirono
Billbray	DeFazio	Hobson
Bilirakis	DeGette	Hodes
Bishop (GA)	Delahunt	Hoekstra
Bishop (NY)	DeLauro	Holden
Bishop (UT)	Dent	Holt
Blackburn	Diaz-Balart, L.	Honda
Blumenauer	Diaz-Balart, M.	Hooley
Blunt	Dicks	Hoyer
Bonner	Dingell	Hulshof
Bono Mack	Doggett	Hunter
Boozman	Donnelly	Inglis (SC)
Boren	Doolittle	Inslie
Boswell	Doyle	Israel
Boustany	Drake	Issa
Boyd (FL)	Dreier	Jackson (IL)
Boyd (KS)	Duncan	Jefferson
Brady (PA)	Edwards	Johnson (GA)
Brady (TX)	Ehlers	Johnson (IL)
Brown (SC)	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Brown, Corrine	Ellsworth	Johnson, Sam
Brown-Waite,	Emanuel	Jones (NC)
Ginny	Emerson	Jones (OH)
Buchanan	Engel	Jordan
Burgess	English (PA)	Kagen
Burton (IN)	Eshoo	Kanjorski
Butterfield	Etheridge	Kaptur
Buyer	Fallin	Keller
Calvert	Farr	Kennedy
Camp (MI)	Feeney	Kildee
Cannon	Ferguson	Kilpatrick
Cantor	Filner	Kind
Capito	Forbes	King (IA)
Capps	Fortenberry	King (NY)
Capuano	Fossella	Kingston
Cardoza	Foster	Kirk
Carnahan	Fox	Klein (FL)
Carney	Frank (MA)	Kline (MN)
Carson	Franks (AZ)	Knollenberg
Carter	Frelinghuysen	Kucinich
Castle	Gallely	Kuhl (NY)
Castor	Garrett (NJ)	LaHood
Cazayoux	Gerlach	Lamborn
Chabot	Giffords	Lampson
Chandler	Gilchrest	Langevin
Childers	Gillibrand	Larsen (WA)
Clarke	Gingrey	Larson (CT)
Clay	Gonzalez	Latham
Cleaver	Goode	LaTourette

Latta	Olver	Simpson
Lee	Ortiz	Sires
Levin	Pallone	Skelton
Lewis (CA)	Pascarella	Slaughter
Lewis (GA)	Pastor	Smith (NE)
Lewis (KY)	Payne	Smith (NJ)
Linder	Pearce	Smith (TX)
Lipinski	Pence	Smith (WA)
LoBiondo	Perlmutter	Snyder
Loeb	Peterson (MN)	Solis
Loeb	Peterson (PA)	Souder
Lofgren, Zoe	Petri	Space
Lowe	Pickering	Speier
Lucas	Pitts	Spratt
Lungren, Daniel E.	Platts	Stark
Lynch	Pomeroy	Stearns
Mack	Porter	Stupak
Mahoney (FL)	Price (GA)	Sullivan
Maloney (NY)	Price (NC)	Sutton
Marchant	Putnam	Tanner
Markey	Radanovich	Tauscher
Matheson	Rahall	Taylor
Matsui	Ramstad	Terry
McCarthy (CA)	Rangel	Thompson (CA)
McCarthy (NY)	Regula	Thompson (MS)
McCaul (TX)	Rehberg	Thornberry
McCollum (MN)	Reichert	Tiahrt
McCotter	Renzi	Tiberi
McCrery	Reyes	Tierney
McDermott	Richardson	Towns
Cohen	McGovern	Tsongas
Granger	McHenry	Turner
Graves	McHugh	Udall (CO)
Green, Al	McIntyre	Udall (NM)
Green, Gene	McKeon	Upton
Grijalva	McMorris	Roskam
Gutierrez	Rodgers	Ross
Hall (NY)	McNerney	Rothman
Hare	McNulty	Visclosky
Harman	Meek (FL)	Walberg
Hastings (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Walden (OR)
Hastings (WA)	Melancon	Walsh (NY)
Hayes	Mica	Walz (MN)
Heller	Michaud	Wamp
Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Wasserman
Herger	Miller (MI)	Schultz
Herseth Sandlin	Miller (NC)	Waters
Higgins	Miller, Gary	Watson
Hill	Miller, George	Watt
Hinchev	Mitchell	Waxman
Hinojosa	Moore (KS)	Weiner
Hirono	Moore (WI)	Welch (VT)
Hobson	Moran (KS)	Weller
Hodes	Moran (VA)	Westmoreland
Hoekstra	Murphy (CT)	Wexler
Holden	Murphy, Patrick	Whitfield (KY)
Holt	Murphy, Tim	Wilson (NM)
Honda	Murtha	Wilson (OH)
Hooley	Musgrave	Wilson (SC)
Hoyer	Myrick	Wittman (VA)
Hulshof	Nadler	Wolf
Hunter	Napolitano	Woolsey
Inglis (SC)	Neal (MA)	Wu
Inslie	Neugebauer	Yarmuth
Israel	Nunes	Young (AK)
Issa	Oberstar	Young (FL)
Jackson (IL)	Obey	
Jefferson		
Johnson (GA)		
Johnson (IL)		
Johnson, E. B.		
Johnson, Sam		
Jones (NC)		
Jones (OH)		
Jordan		
Kagen		
Kanjorski		
Kaptur		
Keller		
Kennedy		
Kildee		
Kilpatrick		
Kind		
King (IA)		
King (NY)		
Kingston		
Kirk		
Klein (FL)		
Kline (MN)		
Knollenberg		
Kucinich		
Kuhl (NY)		
LaHood		
Lamborn		
Lampson		
Langevin		
Larsen (WA)		
Larson (CT)		
Latham		
LaTourette		

NAYS—6

Broun (GA)
Coble

Flake
Paul

Poe
Tancredo

NOT VOTING—20

Bean
Boehner
Boucher
Braley (IA)
Campbell (CA)
Conyers
Everett

Fattah
Gohmert
Hall (TX)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Manzullo
Marshall

Mollohan
Pryce (OH)
Reynolds
Ruppersberger
Rush
Shuler
Weldon (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are advised there are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1310

Mr. POE changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. BEAN. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to vote on the following rollcall votes: rollcall 380 on ordering the previous question, rollcall 381 on agreeing to resolution H. Res. 1233, rollcall 382 on agreeing to the conference report of S. Con. Res. 70, and rollcall 383 on a motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 5940 on Thursday, June 5, 2008. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes” on rollcall 380, “yes” on rollcall 381, “no” on rollcall 382, and “yes” on rollcall 383.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SARBANES. 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 H.R. 5540.

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

There was no objection.

CHESAPEAKE BAY GATEWAYS AND WATERTRAILS NETWORK CONTINUING AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1233, I call up the bill (H.R. 5540) to amend the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 to provide for the continuing authorization of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1233, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5540

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network Continuing Authorization Act”.

SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Section 502 of the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; Public Law 105-312) is amending by striking subsection (c) and inserting the following:

“(c) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section.”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, it shall be in order to consider the amendment printed in House Report 110-677 if offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order or demand for division of the question, shall be considered read, and shall be debatable for 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5540, legislation that will reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network which will otherwise expire at the end of 2008.

First, Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Chairman RAHALL and Chairman GRIJALVA for their leadership in getting this bill to the floor. They've been stalwart advocates in this effort.

The Chesapeake Bay has a tremendous tale to tell.

□ 1315

The Chesapeake Bay Gateways Program connects those who live in the Chesapeake Bay watershed to the natural, cultural and historic resources of the bay, and thereby encourage individual and citizen stewardship of these resources.

I guess the best way to describe the Gateways program is an insurance policy on our larger investment in the Chesapeake Bay. There are three parts to cleaning up the Chesapeake Bay; there is funding, which of course is extremely critical, there is regulatory guidance, and then there is citizen stewardship. Without individual responsibility, without widespread engagement by the 16 million people that reside in the watershed, it would be impossible to achieve and maintain the goal of cleaning up the bay. For a very modest investment, the Gateways program helps to foster the citizen stewardship that will be necessary to advance bay clean-up and maintain the gains that we hope to make.

As many of my colleagues know, the Chesapeake Bay is our Nation's largest estuary. It is a national environmental treasure and an economic catalyst as it pertains to the region's tourism and seafood industries. Unfortunately, as many also know, the bay's health in recent years has been significantly and negatively impacted by multiple factors, such as increased nutrient runoff, chemical contaminants, and other forms of pollution. As a result, there has been a severe deterioration in the bay's water quality in recent years and a rapid loss of living resources and natural habitat.

To combat these trends, in 1983 the Chesapeake Bay Program was created. It is a partnership between the States of Maryland, Virginia and Pennsylvania, the District of Columbia and the Federal Government, which is dedicated to restoring and protecting the bay. I am also committed to reversing these trends and restoring the bay's water quality and natural habitats, and that is why I have introduced this legislation to continually reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network.

The Gateways program is the National Park Service's component of the greater Chesapeake Bay program. The Park Service has entered into a memorandum of understanding under the Chesapeake Bay program that tasks the Park Service with "conserving the

Chesapeake Bay's national and cultural heritage for the benefit and enjoyment of future generations." It goes on to say that the Park Service will provide assistance to the bay program through resource planning and grants management, rivers and trails conservation assistance, public education, interpretation, and cooperative heritage planning support.

That is precisely the purpose of the Gateways program. It provides grants and technical assistance to parks, volunteer groups, wildlife refuges, historic sites, museums, and water trails throughout the Chesapeake Bay watershed. It also provides assistance to the critical volunteer groups that have stepped forward to support the Gateway sites.

The network ties these sites together to provide meaningful experiences and to encourage individual citizens to invest their own time and energy in the clean up of the Chesapeake Bay. Since 2000, the network has grown to include 156 gateways in six States and the District of Columbia. That is why the Park Service has repeatedly praised the Gateways program.

In September of 2004, the Service released a special resource study recommending that Gateways be a permanent Park Service program. It goes on to say that an enhanced version of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network would be the most effective and efficient way for the National Park Service to help protect and tell the story of the Chesapeake Bay.

In 2005, the White House Conference on Cooperative Conservation recognized Gateways as "a cooperative conservation success story." And therefore, Mr. Speaker, it is critical that we act now to reauthorize this program so that the network and its partners can continue to educate residents of the Chesapeake Bay watershed about the natural, cultural, historic and recreational sites throughout the bay region, and how their communities relate directly to the health of our largest estuary and a national treasure, the Chesapeake Bay.

By maintaining the network and providing access to these sites, we can help develop the next generation of environmental stewards, which is one of the best ways to truly save the bay.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, before I give my opening statement, I would like to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina. I thank my good friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak on H.R. 5540, the Chesapeake Bay Watertrails Network bill.

While I understand the value of the bill we're discussing today and I commend my colleague, Congressman ROB WITTMAN from Virginia, for the hard work he has done on this bill, his efforts will be all for nothing if we do not

address the energy crises we're facing in the United States today.

In my district of coastal South Carolina, my constituents are dealing with the same problems as those who live and work along the Chesapeake Bay. Just as the watermen of the Chesapeake Bay cannot afford to bring their boats out of the dock to catch blue crab due to the all-time-record-high diesel prices, my constituents in our fishing communities cannot bring their shrimp boats on the water to catch shrimp due to the high cost of diesel fuel.

Mr. Speaker, it is irresponsible for our Democrat colleagues to continue obstructing responsible energy legislation that will help our energy crisis from being considered on the floor of the House of Representatives.

Mr. Speaker, we currently depend on foreign—and in many cases unfriendly—nations for over 60 percent of our Nation's energy needs. This is a serious national security concern for my constituents in coastal South Carolina.

On behalf of all the recreational and commercial fishermen, the shrimpers, the tour boat operators, and the recreational boaters in coastal South Carolina, I would like to ask the Democrat majority why we are not voting today on the many pieces of legislation that have been introduced that would open up domestic sources of energy and help them get back on the water immediately?

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, it is my pleasure at this time to yield 3 minutes to Representative SCOTT, who is a leader on the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Task Force.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. I thank the gentleman from Maryland for his hard work on this bill and for his leadership on the Chesapeake Bay issues.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 5540, the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network Continuing Reauthorization Act. I commend my colleague from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) for introducing the bill, which will help further the Chesapeake Bay's restoration.

I serve as cochair of the bipartisan Chesapeake Bay Task Force, and I'm proud to be an original cosponsor of this legislation.

Over 400 years ago, the first permanent English settlers of North America sailed into the Chesapeake Bay and settled on the banks of the James River at Jamestown, Virginia. Although the Chesapeake Bay played a significant role in the founding of this great Nation, the bay is often one of the most overlooked natural and economic estuaries in the United States.

The Chesapeake Bay Watershed touches 41 congressional districts in the States of Virginia, West Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York and the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I have been actively involved in ensuring that the resources are available to protect and restore the

Chesapeake Bay since my days in the Virginia General Assembly. When I served in the Virginia House of Delegates, I was a member of a joint Virginia/Maryland legislative task force that first recommended in 1980 a multi-State commission to address bay issues. And that multi-State commission continues to recognize the Chesapeake Bay as a vitally important regional and national treasure.

H.R. 5540 will reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network, which is the National Park Service component of the greater Chesapeake Bay Program. The goal of this network is to conserve the natural beauty and cultural heritage of the bay for the benefit and enjoyment of future generations through grants, technical assistance to parks, volunteer groups, wildlife refuges, historical sites, museums and water trails throughout the bay watershed. The network ties all of these sites and projects together to actively engage citizens to help clean up the Chesapeake Bay. Since 2000, the network has grown to include 156 gateways in six States and the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I commend the gentleman from Maryland for his leadership. And I want to take the opportunity to thank our new Virginia colleague, Mr. WITTMAN, for his long-time leadership and activity in Chesapeake Bay issues. I commend the Committee on Natural Resources for reporting the bill favorably to the full House and urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SALI).

Mr. SALI. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today on H.R. 5540, permanent authorization for the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network.

As my colleague pointed out, today's bill would permanently reauthorize these Federal funds and remove the \$3 million annual cap.

When we held a hearing on this bill in committee, the administration testified that there have been some successes with this program, and consequently Federal funds are no longer necessary to subsidize this partnership. So I rise with serious concerns over the permanent authorization of this program.

In committee, I offered an amendment that would strike a compromise limiting this authorization to 5 years. Today's legislation, however, proposes to put the taxpayer, including taxpayers in Idaho, on the hook permanently funding this program, and that in spite of the administration's claim that no Federal funds are even needed.

This comes on the heels of the vote of this body we just took approving the largest tax increase in American history, a tax increase of some \$683 billion, as well as action raising the national debt to an all-time record high of \$10.5 trillion. This, together with skyrocketing fuel prices and increases

in fuel cost, has the American taxpayer, the American family, and everyone across this country, including my great home State of Idaho, under a tremendous burden.

Idahoans are considering the reality that they may not have enough money to pay their bills, let alone enjoy the majestic beauty of Idaho's outdoors this summer. Notably, however, this is not a problem limited to weekend excursions or vacations. The price pinch is hitting folks who have a job, but wonder if they can afford the fuel to get to work, those people that have called my office to complain. In addition, schools across this country are cutting programs and moving to four-day school weeks to address rising fuel costs.

People being hit the hardest by these high gas prices don't even drive, they're our parents and our grandparents, those seniors who rely on services like Meals on Wheels to deliver the food they eat each day. In Idaho, it was reported on Tuesday that five volunteers had quit because they couldn't afford the gas they needed to complete their routes and deliver meals to seniors.

This is a moral issue, an issue which for many senior citizens and low-income, hardworking families affects their access to food as well as to education and even doctors. It's time for Congress to act on that moral obligation, to make provision so the needs of the poor and the elderly will be met. It's time for Congress to lift the restrictions on America's energy-rich public lands, to responsibly increase exploration for production of American crude, and to increase American supply and bring down prices of gas and diesel.

Increasing the supply of crude oil and ultimately lowering its price is the single most effective thing Congress can do to lower gas prices. Today, 73 percent of every dollar we pay for gasoline is the price of producing crude oil. Almost two-thirds of it comes from foreign countries, including OPEC nations and dictatorships like Hugo Chavez's Venezuela.

Congress could vote today to unlock huge American onshore oil and natural gas reserves on public lands in the United States. In a study just released by the Bureau of Land Management, while onshore public lands in the United States are estimated to contain 31 billion barrels of oil and 231 trillion cubic feet of natural gas, some 60 percent of these lands are completely closed to leasing because of the actions of Congress.

□ 1330

Once such example is the oil reserves in Alaska, where in 1980 President Jimmy Carter set aside 2,000 acres specifically for energy production. According to the U.S. Energy and Information Administration, the mean estimate of technically recoverable oil on those section 1002 lands is 10.4 billion barrels. That's more than twice the proven oil

reserves in all of Texas and almost half of the total U.S. proven reserves of 21 billion barrels. The recoverable oil within these lands represents a possible 50 percent increase in total U.S. proven reserves.

Congress must act to lift the restrictions on America's energy-rich public lands and increase exploration and production of American crude oil and natural gas. We can do this in an environmentally friendly manner. But we have to act and we have to act now. Of that there can be no dispute.

With those pressing needs before us, why would Congress act on this bill to give a permanent authorization and increase the amount of money to go to the subject of this legislation when the administration has told us that no Federal funds are even needed? Mr. Speaker, we can and we must do better.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I just want to note a couple of things. First, that this is a bipartisan bill, and I want to salute, as Representative SCOTT did, the partnership of Congressman WITTMAN from Virginia in helping to marshal support for this bill.

I also want to point out that the annual appropriation process will determine the funds that go to support this authorization. Otherwise, the claims that it's sort of breaking through the cap or not are not correct.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I would like to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. VAN HOLLEN), who is another leader with respect to the Chesapeake Bay and co-chairs the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Task Force.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Speaker, let me begin by commending my colleague from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) for taking the initiative on this important piece of legislation and for all his leadership in our effort to clean up the Chesapeake Bay and to Mr. WITTMAN for joining him in this bipartisan effort.

Before I say a few words about this bill, I do think it's important to point out that this body has now passed numerous pieces of legislation to try to address the energy crisis and the rise in gas prices around this country, including legislation to reduce our dependence on foreign oil by diversifying our energy portfolio. One of the things we passed out of this body to do that was to say we shouldn't be giving taxpayer subsidies, giveaways, to the oil and gas industry at a time when they're already making record profits and Americans are facing record prices at the pump. We should instead be using those resources to invest in renewable energy and energy efficiency. That's the direction this country needs to go.

The President was in Saudi Arabia recently having tea with the leaders of the Saudi Royal Family asking them to reduce prices. They said no. We need a long-term strategy. We passed that out of this House, and, unfortunately, the President said he's going to veto it

because he wants to keep giving those subsidies to the oil and gas industry rather than taking a new and different approach to our energy crisis. That's what this House did. Unfortunately, the President continues to block those efforts.

Now, we do need, as a country, to protect our beautiful and vital natural resources like the Chesapeake Bay. The Chesapeake Bay, as my colleague Mr. SARBANES has pointed out, is the Nation's largest estuary. It is a national treasure; it's a natural treasure. And that's what this bill is about because the Chesapeake Bay is currently under assault from a whole host of sources of pollution. Point sources of pollution like the kind of pollution that comes out of a sewage pipe when it's not being adequately treated before it gets into the tributaries, like the Potomac River, the Anacostia River, the Susquehanna River; and nonpoint sources of pollution, the kind of pollution that washes off our driveways from oil dripping from cars or the pollution that comes off of fields that are under agricultural production.

Now, not long ago we passed in this legislature, in this Congress, the farm bill, and that farm bill provided vital additional help to our farmers, who are good stewards of our land. It provided them with vital new tools to help prevent that kind of nonpoint source pollution. And that will give them a vital boost in the years ahead in our effort to clean up the Chesapeake Bay and meet the goals that have been set.

But the other key element to sustain that support is to engage the public. And we mean not just the Department of Agriculture but the other departments and agencies of the United States Government like the Department of Interior and the National Park Service, who has played such an important role in raising the understanding of the public that we all need to be part of this effort to clean up the Chesapeake Bay.

In our State of Maryland, when you go down your roads and you see the systems where the water dumps into the pipes to take it out to rivers, it says this drains into the Chesapeake Bay. We have done a good job of trying to raise that public support. But this system, this whole effort, the Gateways effort that we are talking about in this bill, has also been a vital component of that to let people know what the Chesapeake Bay means to our region and to our country.

And it would be very shortsighted to end this program. What we need to do instead is to say, as has been said by others, that this program has worked in raising that public awareness, enlisting the support of students and adults, young children and senior citizens in this big effort to protect this vital estuary. And this Gateways program has been a very important component in that effort. We need to keep it going, and we need to make it permanent.

I salute my colleague from Maryland, JOHN SARBANES, for his tremendous effort in this region and for reaching out and making this a bipartisan effort along with Mr. WITTMAN, and I urge adoption of this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST).

Mr. GILCREST. I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding.

I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland, the other gentleman from Maryland, for working on this project, the Gateways and Watertrails system. It is a system, Mr. Speaker, that provides, as the gentleman from Maryland described, public education about the ecology of the Chesapeake Bay and what an individual can do not only to enjoy the landscape, not only to explore and paddle the landscape, but to understand the landscape.

Now, a lot of discussion here recently has been about energy, fossil fuels, should we drill for more oil? The issue of the Gateways is about education. A quote from Norman Cousins, the editor of the Saturday Evening Post some 30 or 40 years ago, said, "Knowledge is the solvent for danger." So let's focus on a little bit of information, knowledge. The United States can never become energy independent if it continues to be dependent on fossil fuel. There is simply not enough here. We peaked in the 1970s. Energy from fossil fuels has created the situation we now call "climate change" or "global warming." Global warming creates a transition for the Chesapeake Bay. This is not a geologic transition. This is not a natural forces transition from a changing ecology. This is a human-forced transition for the Chesapeake Bay that will continue to degrade the water. What can we do about it? One of the things is a source of education, a source of knowledge.

The Gateways program involves the public in understanding some amazing things. Number one, the geology of the Chesapeake Bay Watershed. Why is the Chesapeake Bay here? Why is the Delmarva Peninsula here? An understanding of how geologic forces created this magnificent estuary over millions of years.

Number two, Gateways helps people understand the ecological evolution of the Chesapeake Bay. Why are there forests here? Why is there a whole range of song birds or water fowl or marine life? It is a magnificent place unknown anywhere else on the continent but the Chesapeake Bay. The ecological evolution of the Chesapeake Bay.

And the other thing the Gateways program does is help us understand human history, when the first Native Americans got here about 10,000 years ago, to John Smith 400 years ago, to the transition that we see today in the Chesapeake Bay. The Gateways and Watertrails program is an educational program.

To understand the transition that the bay is now going through is not a

geological change. It's not an ecological change. It's that human activity is not compatible with nature's design. And this program helps us understand those views so we can be a part of the solution and not part of the problem.

I urge my colleagues to vote for the bill.

Mr. SARBANES. I want to thank the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. GILCREST) for his career's work on behalf of the environment and the Chesapeake Bay and thank him for his support.

Mr. Speaker, it is my extreme pleasure now to yield 1 minute to the majority leader, another champion of the Chesapeake Bay.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker and ladies and gentlemen of the House, I had the great privilege of being elected to the Maryland State Senate in 1966. There were two other individuals—there were a lot of other individuals, but there were two other individuals who were elected with me. The other two were elected to the House of Delegates. One of those was BENJAMIN CARDIN, who is now Maryland's junior United States Senator. The other individual elected that had same year was Paul Sarbanes.

Paul Sarbanes served for 4 years, then was elected to the House in 1970, served in the House for 6 years, and in 1976 was elected to the United States Senate. I was in the State Senate and had the privilege of working hard for his election that year. He served longer than any other individual representing our State, and one of the programs that he fostered was the program that we are reauthorizing today.

He can swell with pride not only on the substance of this legislation but also on the fact that his extraordinary son, who now represents a district that he used to represent, the Third Congressional District of our State, is now sponsoring and shepherding this legislation through the House of Representatives.

My colleagues have spoken about the substance of this legislation. John Smith in 1607 came up a bay that was pristine and essentially unspoiled. In the next 400 years, man, in his somewhat irresponsibility, has not husbanded that asset that God gave us as he should or as she should.

This legislation, sponsored by Senator Sarbanes many years ago, now shepherded by his son, Congressman JOHN SARBANES, was an effort to ensure that we understood what Congressman GILCREST talked about and the importance of this asset we call the Chesapeake Bay, not just to Maryland, not just to Pennsylvania or Delaware or Virginia, but to our country. An extraordinary ecological resource.

So I rise simply not to recite what my colleagues have already recited but to congratulate JOHN SARBANES, to say how proud we are, as I know he is as well, of the extraordinary service given to our State by his father, Senator

Paul Sarbanes, the original author of this legislation, and to thank him for carrying this torch forward on behalf of a resource that is priceless, as the ad says.

So I thank him for yielding this time, congratulate him for his efforts, and urge my colleagues to strongly support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 5540, legislation introduced by Representative JOHN SARBANES which seeks to permanently reauthorize the National Park Service's Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network Program.

Those of us fortunate to live in this region have been blessed with a multitude of magnificent natural resources, not the least of which is our Nation's largest estuary—the Chesapeake Bay, a body of water that has played such an important role in shaping the cultural, economic, political, and social history of our region.

Unfortunately, the Chesapeake Bay of 2008 is not the pristine body that Captain John Smith first charted on his expeditions some 400 years ago. Indeed, earlier this year, the EPA Chesapeake Bay Program released the Chesapeake Bay 2007 Health and Restoration Assessment which found the overall health of the bay remains significantly impaired.

In the 110th Congress, I have joined with my colleagues in successfully advocating legislation to improve the health of the bay.

We've strengthened the ability of the Army Corps of Engineers to undertake bay oyster restoration, water pollution control, and environmental infrastructure projects in the 2007 WRDA bill. And, we've included approximately \$438 million in mandatory funding to help Chesapeake Bay watershed farmers in their ongoing efforts to implement practices to prevent runoff and control shoreline erosion.

H.R. 5540, the legislation we consider today, takes another important step forward in our efforts by permanently authorizing a program that has already done so much to raise awareness of the fragile health of the bay and directly engage our region's citizens and visitors to take an active role in fulfilling our shared goal of restoring the Chesapeake.

The Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network, which includes more than 156 museums, State parks, wildlife refuges and other sites in 6 States and the District of Columbia, was established to link together these wonderful places in the hopes of enabling visitors to better understand and appreciate the role they can play in the bay's survival.

The program enables sites to compete for grant funding—which must be fully matched—for projects that will help conserve, restore and interpret their roles in the bay's natural, cultural, and social history.

The Gateways Program is a critical component to fostering a commitment among our citizens to restore the bay and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

So here we are debating a bill under a rule which we all know should have best been under a suspension. It's not a perfect bill. If they accept an amendment later on, it will be a perfect bill. But for any imperfections that are

here, this bill has far better drafting, far better intent, far more bipartisanship than perhaps some illogical partisan gamesmanship that produced vociferous debate under suspensions yesterday.

But one would wonder why we are taking time on the floor to consider a bill which was passed out of the Resources Committee by a voice vote and a bill in which I intend to vote in favor? What is it about this bill that is actually so important that we are talking about it rather than other more pressing national issues such as an energy crisis? Why does such a relatively innocuous bill take precedence over finding solutions to gas prices that are now around \$4 a gallon and probably going higher?

□ 1345

It must be that this bill accomplishes something so dramatically important that we are foolish to consider other issues, such as national security or our deepening dependence on foreign oil.

This bill deals with an area that includes no Federal waters. There are no Federal assets that are a part of it. It could easily be done with an inter-local cooperating agreement, which many States in the West use. Instead, the Federal Government is involved in that. Despite that fact, I still intend on voting for this particular bill.

This is a recreational bill. This bill provides moneys for trails, maps, signs, and all the nice things in the quest of healthy outdoor recreation in the Chesapeake Bay region. This program was originally authorized in 1998 as a 5-year program, and then reauthorized for another 5 years in 2002. And now the authorization, not for the program but for the appropriations for this program, are set to expire and the proponents are offering this legislation to authorize funding this program for eternity.

There will be no caps on the funds that can be appropriated for this program, no time limit. Maybe this is such a big priority for the Democratic majority because the National Park Service testified this program has received \$7.7 million in earmarks since its creation. Maybe the Democrats wish to preserve a conduit for earmarks masquerading as a recreation bill. This is what takes precedence over national security and the energy crisis here on the floor of the House.

Yet, I don't object to the earmarks that were made for this particular bill, even though some of them are different. Part of the money that goes to this particular bill or has been earmarked in the past has been \$20,000 dollars for a Native American interpretive brochure. I don't oppose that. Funds go into this for a Dino-Mania! Camp-In so that people can delve into the world of dinosaurs as your family spends the night in a Virginia Living Museum, explore how big some dinosaurs were, find out what might have caused their extinction, and it also comes with an evening snack and a breakfast.

My favorite, the Tree Spirits. The ancients believed the trees had spirits, and if you look hard enough, you see them in this woody bark. This workshop will focus on the old beliefs to trees, their meaning, their practical purposes. Fathers and sons will join the rangers on a hike as we scavenge the materials to make our own Tree Spirits for you all.

I actually don't object to that. I still intend to vote for this particular bill.

Nature hikes, picnics in the park, learning about ecology are causes to champion, and I'd be happy to support those things, but this bill doesn't solve the major threat to those activities. How will one be able to afford to get to these outdoor locations, enjoy these earmarks when the gas is too expensive to allow them to travel anywhere. At this point, Americans are not working to live, they are working to pay for the gas to get to work and back home. With gas at \$4 a gallon, weekend family visits to the Chesapeake are becoming less and less of a possibility.

Unfortunately, our unwillingness to address the dramatic spike in energy prices today hurts American families, not only by putting some recreational activities beyond their reach, but by wrecking the household budget for basics, such as food, electricity, and medicine. Some people talk about our goal should be to get revenge on companies that produce energy, but such a program does not add one barrel of energy to meet the demands of the present time.

The Resources Committee, from which this legislation originated, is the same committee that has jurisdiction over domestic resources, resources on public lands, such as the Outer Continental Shelf and ANWR. It's past time for the Resource Committee to stop in its quest to become merely a "Recreation Committee." This country has locked up more resources in America than other nations have in their entire country. America is blessed with a wealth of natural resources and historically we have had the unique ability to develop and continuously improve the technology needed to use these resources.

We have faced and overcome bigger challenges in the past, but we in Congress must act now to meet the critical energy needs of today. We need to stop creating obstacles to domestic energy production so the American people can get to work and solve the problem. That should be the priority of the people, that should be our priority as well.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SARBANES. How many minutes remain?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Both sides have 15 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I am gratified that Representative BISHOP intends to vote for the bill. I did want to point out that this is about as far as from an earmark as you can get. The projects under this particular

Gateways program are determined at the discretion and based on application to the agency by the National Park Service.

At this time, I would like to yield such time as he may consume to another champion of the Chesapeake Bay and someone who understands the importance of reaching out to partners throughout the watershed, and that is the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. CUMMINGS).

Mr. CUMMINGS. I want to thank my colleague from Maryland for yielding. I want to thank him for his tremendous leadership, outstanding leadership with regard to such a critical issue.

As I listened to the last speaker from the other side, I could not help but think about how many people in our country simply want to have an opportunity to have a little life brought to their lives. This is not a major measure, but it is one that will bring spice to life.

We are very blessed to have the Chesapeake Bay. We are very blessed to have this program. When you think about my favorite saying, and that is, That we did not inherit our environment from our parents but we borrowed it from our children, I think this program goes a long ways to making sure that we leave an earth better than the one we received when we came upon the earth.

This Gateways program and its reauthorization are very important because through its partners it can continue to educate people about the natural, cultural, historic, and recreational sites throughout the bay region and about how their communities relate directly to the health of our largest estuary and national treasure, the Chesapeake Bay.

And so what will happen as a result of this is that children will have an opportunity to learn about what part the bay plays in their lives and how important it is and, believe it or not, some of them even being exposed to the bay to really understand that it is indeed a very, very wonderful feature of their State and their backyard.

So, again, I congratulate Mr. SARBANES and all of those who have anything to do with making this happen. I think it's very important, as I said before, that we bring spice to the lives of our citizens, and this bill goes a very, very long way in doing that.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am happy to yield 4 minutes to the newest member of the Virginia delegation, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia. I'd like to thank the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) for yielding time to me on this important issue.

I rise in support of H.R. 5540, legislation to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network. I represent Virginia's First Congressional District, which is largely defined by the Chesapeake Bay. My constituents live, work, and play in the Chesapeake Bay watershed. My district also includes many components of the Gate-

ways Network, including historic Yorktown, Colonial Williamsburg, historic Jamestown, all the way to Washington's birthplace in Westmoreland County.

This is a fantastic effort here that, as you have heard, was spawned by lots of great ideas and leaders in the past, and one of those that was part of this effort was the late Congresswoman Jo Ann Davis. She did a tremendous amount of work to put together the ideas to help in creating this network. She had a passion for the Chesapeake Bay and all the assets that are there in the Chesapeake Bay and passion to make sure people knew about those so they could appreciate the bay, they could appreciate the culture that it brings to our region, that folks could appreciate the natural resources there, and that they could understand how all of those parts are interrelated to understand the importance of the bay to our region.

The Gateways Network links together over 100 parks, museums, wildlife refuges, and other cultural and historic sites into a comprehensive system so that people can understand it and so that they realize the parts of the things that make the Chesapeake Bay important.

This Gateways program connects visitors with the natural beauty, rich history, and the recreational opportunities there within the Chesapeake Bay watershed. That's extraordinarily important so that folks can make the effort to understand the bay and be part of the effort to preserve and protect the bay.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, my constituents, like everybody else, are dealing with the cost of rising prices for gasoline. These increasing cost are impacting their budgets and cutting into their planned summer vacations. I am strongly in support of this bill. But I do join Mr. BISHOP and many of my colleagues to call on Congress to take action on a comprehensive plan to rein in gas prices.

We should take a number of steps to promote American-made energy. We need to encourage next-generation technologies, we need to promote conservation, we need to look at bridging from the present and the use of fossil fuels to the future. But, let's face it folks, fossil fuels is going to be part of that bridge to the future. So we need to make sure that we have them available for us to get to this next generation of energy.

We need to make sure that we, as part of that, look at our dependence on foreign oil, while keeping in mind the environment that we must protect in all parts of that puzzle in creating a comprehensive energy policy.

Unfortunately, unless gas prices come down soon, I am concerned that families that may want to come to the Chesapeake Bay and enjoy the Chesapeake Bay watershed and enjoy the Chesapeake Bay network may not have the opportunity to do so. That means it's incumbent upon us to put together

a responsible, comprehensive energy policy the make sure that folks can indeed enjoy the Chesapeake Bay, enjoy the network that this program provides so they can understand the importance of the different cultural and environmental and economic aspects of the Chesapeake Bay.

So let's not miss this opportunity as we work to extend this particular network system to make sure that we also use this as a conduit to talk about energy policy, energy issues that are important to this Nation and to the Chesapeake Bay. Let's face it, the bay these days is being affected by the impact of man, and energy is part of that. So let's make sure that across the board we address these particular issues and make sure that we provide some relief to our hardworking American families that are dealing with these high energy prices. Again, it needs to be a long-term energy solution to make sure that we are able to address this in a way that is important for our future.

Mr. SARBANES. I want to thank, again, Congressman WITTMAN for his support and his lifelong commitment to the Chesapeake Bay.

Congressman DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER has been a champion of the Chesapeake Bay throughout his career, earlier in his career as county executive for Baltimore County, Maryland, and now as a Congressman from the Second District of Maryland. I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RUPPERSBERGER).

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I thank you for yielding. Congressman SARBANES, thank you for your advocacy. The Chesapeake Bay is so important to our region, to our country.

I do want to respond though to my colleagues on the other side about the issue of oil prices. We are talking about the Chesapeake Bay, which is very important to our country. We all know that the oil prices and energy is a very important issue. Believe me, we have had 8 years trying to deal with that issue. And we will continue to deal with it because we know people are suffering. But we are talking about the Chesapeake Bay today.

The Chesapeake Bay is very important to those of us who live in the Chesapeake Bay. We feel that we are stewards of the Chesapeake Bay. There are 16 million people that live within the watershed of the Chesapeake Bay, and that is very relevant. It's very relevant that we generate millions of dollars in seafood from the Chesapeake Bay. It's very relevant that our citizens who work around and within the Chesapeake Bay are also paid money for their jobs.

But, more importantly, it's also about an issue of the environment too. The watershed. Right now, the Chesapeake Bay is having problems. We have to deal with those problems. This bill is a very important bill because if we don't move forward with this bill, we will not be able to educate our peers, 16

million people who, unfortunately, don't understand that when you pour a toxic substance down the drain, that it could go to the Chesapeake Bay.

We need to educate our farmers to let them know that we need to have no-till farming, make sure that the fertilizer don't go to the Chesapeake Bay and kill the fish and the crabs and the oysters that are generated through the Chesapeake Bay.

So I feel very, very strongly that we need to pass this bill. It's a relevant bill. We will deal with the issue of energy. We need to. We can't keep relying on other countries for our oil. I urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of reauthorizing this critical program to continue and expand the Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network and make sure that the treasures of the Chesapeake Bay are preserved for future generations.

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

□ 1400

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, just a couple of other points I wanted to make. First of all, I am pleased to indicate that we have a letter that came to Chairman RAHALL and to Ranking Member YOUNG from the six Governors of the six States that make up the watershed and from the Mayor of the District of Columbia. So that is the Governors of Maryland, Virginia, Delaware, Pennsylvania, New York and West Virginia, and the Mayor of the District of Columbia, who have written to indicate their very, very strong support for this legislation.

JUNE 5, 2008.

Hon. NICK J. RAHALL,
*Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Longworth House Office Building, Wash-
ington DC.*

Hon. DON YOUNG,
*Ranking Minority Member, Committee on Nat-
ural Resources, Longworth House Office
Building, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN RAHALL AND RANKING MEMBER YOUNG: We are writing to express our strong support for H.R. 5540, the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network Continuing Authorization Act.

The Chesapeake Gateways Program ("program") plays a vitally important role in our efforts to restore the Chesapeake Bay by improving public access, enhancing public education, and fostering citizen stewardship of the many natural, cultural and historical resources of the Bay region. Since its establishment in 1998, more than 150 sites and water trails have been designated as Gateways throughout the watershed in Virginia, Maryland, Pennsylvania, Delaware, West Virginia, New York, and the District of Columbia. These Gateway sites are helping to promote a greater understanding and appreciation of the Chesapeake Bay and a greater commitment to the Bay's restoration. The relatively modest federal investment in the program has leveraged substantial matching contributions—both financial and in-kind—from our States, community organizations and other partners. For these reasons, among others, the program was recognized by the White House Conference on Cooperative Conservation in 2005 as a cooperative conservation success story.

However, there is still a tremendous need for improved on-site interpretation, en-

hanced public access, and additional strategies to engage visitors and residents alike in the Chesapeake Bay restoration and protection effort. In 2004, the National Park Service completed a Chesapeake Bay Special Resources Study which recommended, as its preferred alternative, that the Gateways Program be made permanent and expanded. The Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrail Network Continuing Authorization Act would codify this recommendation as well as enable implementation and fulfillment of the original vision for an expansive Gateways and Watertrails Network. It is critical that the Congress reauthorize this important program and reject efforts to weaken the legislation or sunset the Network. Doing so will pay significant dividends in the years ahead by helping to preserve and enhance our nation's largest estuary.

Thank you for your consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,

MARTIN O'MALLEY,
Governor, Maryland.

TIMOTHY M. KAINE,
Governor, Virginia.

RUTH ANN MINNER,
Governor, Delaware.

EDWARD G. RENDELL,
Governor, Pennsylvania.

DAVID A. PATERSON,
Governor, New York.

JOE MANCHIN III,
Governor, West Virginia.

MAYOR ADRIAN FENTY,
Mayor, District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I did want to just mention one site, because we talked about the 156 sites and I wanted to bring that to life a little bit. The Patuxent Wildlife Refuge, which is not far from here, located in Maryland between Baltimore and Washington, is the oldest and really only National Wildlife Refuge that conducts wildlife research. It is 13,000 acres. It is the largest contiguous block of forest in the Baltimore-Washington corridor and it is the site of a tremendous amount of environmental education.

Not too long ago we had the opportunity in connection with some other environmental education legislation that I have sponsored to do a field hearing at the Patuxent Wildlife Refuge, and in the morning we had six schools represented from Maryland that came there with busloads of children to participate in activities of environmental education. If you could have seen the look on their faces and how excited they were to be outdoors and engaged in this kind of learning you would have I think been very, very impressed with the resource that exists there.

That is just one site of 156 sites across the bay watershed that are providing a tremendous opportunity to our citizens to connect not just to the environment, but to the heritage and cultural history of this area.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, if you recall back to the movie "The Natural," if you remember there is that one wonderful scene where this mythical team, the New York Knights, have

called in a psychologist to talk to the team to try to get them out of their losing slump. And as they are sitting there, talking to these ballplayers he says, "The mind is a strange thing, men. We must begin by asking, what is losing? Losing is a disease that is as contagious as syphilis. Losing is a disease as contagious as the bubonic plague, attacking one, but infecting all. But curable. Now I want you to imagine you are on a vast ocean. You are on a ship at sea gently rocking, gently rocking, gently rocking, gently rocking."

In that scene Roy Hobbs, now in disgust, breaks out of that and leaves this therapy session, because he recognizes that the solution to their losing season is not sitting there talking philosophically about it, but actually going out on the field and doing something.

We today in the issue of energy are in the mode of simply talking about it. All we are doing is coming here and talking about these theoretical approaches, gently rocking, gently rocking. We are talking about building straw men that we can then knock about, whether it is big oil or a so-called bubble, or yesterday someone said the reason we are paying so much at the pump is because of Enron. Ken Lay has somehow reached up from the dead and somehow hiked up the price of gasoline. And our only solution to this entire situation so far is we have passed a piece of legislation that allows lawyers to go out and sue OPEC, in the hopes that maybe they might give us some more energy money.

It is almost as if what we are trying to say is we are going to have everyone sit down and listen to a psychologist that will try and convince us that freezing in the dark can be an enjoyable thing if we just have the right attitude towards it, because losing is simply a mind game and it is contagious.

What Roy Hobbs did is the exact opposite. He left that stuff. He went out on the field, he knocked the cover off the ball, and when they actually started doing something, that is when this mythical New York Knights team started to win.

If we want to solve the problem of energy for American citizens, we have got to stop, quit talking about it and our secret plans and coming up with these mythical enemies which we want to attack, and we simply have to go out and do something. And that means production now. We cannot sit here simply idly by while American people are suffering without actually doing something in reality. And that means yes on conservation, but it also means we have to increase production. If we don't do that, recreational opportunities like this particular bill have no purpose and have no meaning. There is nothing left for them to do.

If I could give a few statements that have been given by people who live in this area and who will be impacted by this particular bill and what they are

saying about the energy issues and how it impacts and affects them.

“Repercussions,” a quote here, “from the escalating price of fuel are felt everywhere. Sportsfishing is no exception. Neither is the business of chartering, headboating or commercial fishing. The same applies to businesses associated with fishing. One big tackle shop proprietor told the other day, ‘I have four people and myself working now and not a single customer in the shop. Haven’t seen one in 10 minutes.’”

“Alex DeMetrick reports gas prices are soaring, having an impact on those who depend on boats and the Bay to make a living. Naming a work boat the ‘Last Penny,’ which may have been a stab at some kind of subtle humor, it is striking a little too close to reality at the fuel docks around the bay as diesel is now at \$4.50 a gallon and climbing. ‘Gas is doubling and the price of seafood is going down,’ said one of the watermen who works there. ‘Working the water takes constant moving, but with crabs spotty and fuel high, watermen are trying to conserve. They are hurting us bad,’ he says. ‘It’s almost double in the past year, so it is taking a right good bite out of us,’ says another one of the watermen who works there.”

Over at Dredge Harbor, New Jersey, another one of those people who work there said high gas prices are also affecting his customers. “Instead of taking four trips down the Chesapeake Bay, they now might take two trips this year, and most of their customers use their boats as homes afloat so they can conserve as much fuel as possible. High prices are somewhat affecting the sales.”

Another one of the reports from this area, “Elevated prices are causing some charter fishing captains to want to jump overboard.” As one said who owns a yacht yard, he is selling gas for \$4.20 per gallon at his fuel dock, and he has noticed fewer and fewer small power boats on the water.

What we are simply doing as we go along with this, there are other people that simply say, “Now I can see no way of getting over the hump of fuel costs. We have got good fishing, but we have fewer and fewer customers. With gas prices going this way, we are simply losing the opportunity of using this resource for the purpose in which it was therefore designed. High costs not only affect the fishing industry on the water, local businesses are also feeling the gas price pinch. A local tackle shop simply said, ‘I still got people working there and no one is coming in there.’ Gas prices are dipping into his resources and his ability to make a living.”

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. One of the things we have to deal with if we are actually going to deal in a proper way with the reauthorization of this entire

program is to understand that if we are going to have these types of opportunities, either for people to recreate, people to learn, people to enjoy, people to enhance their entire environment, we have got to be able to get them there. Kind of like today. We seem to be needing to get people up from the White House, in which case they are walking because we can’t afford the fuel to put them on buses to get them here. Therefore, things change because of those circumstances, and it is one of those concepts in which we are working.

If we really need to be serious about this, we have to realize that our energy crisis today is limiting the ability to experience this type of an environment, this type of attitude and this process. And if we want to make full use of the Chesapeake Bay resources that are there, we have to make sure that real people have the opportunity of going there and experiencing it. Because when we talk about oil prices, we are not simply talking about some concept, some ethereal project that is out there. We are talking about real people, how they live, how their jobs work, how they get to the chance to recreate and make their lives fuller and better. And that has to be an integral part of this discussion, ought to be an integral part. In fact, it is a more significant part of this discussion on a bill that still is a decent bill that should have been done as a suspension, not as a rule here on the floor.

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, a couple of points.

First of all, the gentleman from Utah spoke to the livelihood of people who work on the Chesapeake Bay, but the biggest threat to those who make their living on the Chesapeake Bay is the decline in the health of the Chesapeake Bay and the fisheries in particular that are in the Chesapeake Bay. So if we have the interests of those people at heart, we ought to be committing ourselves wholeheartedly to this continuing authorization of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network, because it is designed to enhance and improve and protect over the long term the health of the Chesapeake Bay.

To address another point, one of the reasons that the Democratic majority has been so steadfast in urging the pursuit of alternatives to fossil fuels in terms of energy sources is to reduce our dependence there, which obviously could go a long way towards the concern over fuel prices and gas prices. But another reason is because it will reduce these greenhouse gas emissions, which, again, impact the environment. If we don’t take steps to do that, then there is not going to be any environment for us to enjoy.

The Chesapeake Bay Gateways Program, it has been alluded to the fact that this is noncontroversial bill, that it should have come up on suspension. I agree. The minority resisted our de-

sire to have it permanently authorized, and that is why we are in the process we are in today. But that permanent authorization I think is very much a part of the strong statement that we are seeking to make to the citizens in the watershed and to the many millions of visitors who come to the watershed every year, that our national government stands steadfast in this partnership with our citizenry.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, one of the things I would still like to try and reemphasize as we are talking about this particular bill is this bill deals with the reauthorization of the appropriations concept. This is not about cleaning up the environment. Several of the speakers who have spoken today talked about the necessity of environmental protection. This is not the EPA’s program. This is a wholly separate issue and a separate concept.

One of the things that we should keep in mind is the purpose and the concept of an authorizing committee, is an authorizing committee should be reviewing what we are trying to do at periodic bases. That is our purpose.

One of the things in this particular bill that is a problem, is problematic to the future, is that it rejects the ability of Congress to take periodic reviews of this particular program. When it was first initiated in 1998, there was a 5-year statute in which we would then review it. In 2002 we reviewed it. We are now looking at a bill that I think we are all going to agree is needed to go forward, but there still should be some kind of review.

It should not be forgotten that when we voted this particular bill in the Resource Committee on a voice vote, there were six other bills at that time similar in scope, similar in fashion, similar in funding, but each of them had a periodic review attached to it. So a bill by Mr. UDALL, a bill by Ms. BALDWIN, a bill by Mr. BILBRAY, by Mrs. BONO MACK and Ms. BORDALLO, all of them had the responsibility of allowing Congress to do what it is supposed to do and try to take some kind of review at regular basic intervals.

That still is the wisest approach to it. It is one of the few flaws that I actually find in this particular bill, and it is one of those flaws that probably should be addressed.

We talked about the kinds of grants that have been awarded in the past. There are \$7.7 million worth of earmarks not asked by the agency that have been added to this. We have added grants in certain years that have been, for example, \$34,000 for the Chesapeake Bay Marine Museum, \$21,000 for the Stratford Hall Plantation; \$12,000 for the Mason Neck State Park; and \$18,000 for the Annapolis Maritime Museum. I am not objecting to these as being inappropriate. In fact, I could probably argue they were appropriate and they were needful. They are useful. But I am

saying that what Congress should do if we actually fulfill our responsibility is make sure that we look at these on a periodic basis, and that should be part of the statute. That is what we commonly do in most pieces of legislation, and it all should be part of this legislation at the same time.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1415

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah has 1 minute. The gentleman from Maryland has 6 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, one more time, if we can try and emphasize the point of this.

This is still a decent bill. There are a few flaws, but it is a decent bill and I support it going forward with this particular bill. There are still some changes I would like to see in that bill.

Also, we must realize, though, that if we are talking about the overall use of this bill, we are taking time on the floor when we should be talking about much more significant and vital issues than this particular bill.

Having a rule on this bill is a strange use of the time of Congress, especially when there are much more significant issues that need to be debated and discussed at this particular time. And even though I plan on voting for this bill, it is one of those things that is still sad that we are as a Congress not addressing the core issues for which the people have sent us here and not looking at what should be the core issues for which the people have sent us here.

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, again, I am gratified the gentleman from Utah plans to vote for this bill. I do note that the reason that we are here, the reason this was under a rule in part was to allow the gentleman to present an amendment, which I guess is going to be coming next.

In terms of safeguards, the appropriations process provides that on an annual basis in terms of looking at the program and deciding what kind of support ought to be given to it. The permanent authorization is about making a statement, making a statement to the citizen partners that we are asking to step up and be part of this effort to preserve the Chesapeake Bay.

The way we are going to save the bay, the way we are going to enhance its health over time is not by turning it over to experts, but by taking ownership at the community level, having every citizen understand what they can do in their own backyard, working with nonprofit groups, working with museums, with wildlife refuges, with historic sites, et cetera, to stake a claim in the future of the bay. And that is what the Chesapeake Bay Gateways program is all about; it is a gateway to this national treasure, 156 sites, 1,500 miles of water trails, and a tremendous investment on the part of or-

dinary citizens in the future of this national treasure. That is why we sought a permanent authorization. That is why we continue to seek it. That is at the heart of H.R. 5540, and I urge my colleagues to support it when it comes to the vote.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, as Chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources, I would like to commend our colleague, Representative JOHN SARBANES, for his tireless efforts on behalf of the pending legislation.

This bill is a simple, straightforward measure that would permanently authorize the highly successful Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network, which would otherwise expire at the end of this fiscal year.

Over 10 million people each year visit one of the 156 gateway sites supported by this program. They come to kayak or canoe, hike or bike, picnic, hunt or fish or to watch wildlife. Others come to visit the Chesapeake's many maritime museums or to renew their acquaintance with turning points in our Nation's history at sites such as Fort McHenry and Yorktown Battlefield.

Each of those visitors comes away with a strengthened awareness of the crucial role of the Chesapeake in our national story and as the ecological and economic heart of the mid-Atlantic. And that is the goal of the Gateway Network, to renew our connection with that great bay.

The program is so successful that the National Park Service has heaped praise upon it, and the White House, in 2005, declared it to be a "cooperative conservation success story."

Congress originally authorized this program for 5 years, and renewed that short-term authorization in 2002. In 2004, a National Park Service special resource study concluded that a permanent commitment to the program would ensure its long-term viability and enhance the Chesapeake's status among America's national treasures.

Anyone who saw the Washington Post article on Monday knows that the bay's oyster population is in trouble. That situation is both a symptom and one of the causes of the precarious health of the bay. Keeping people connected with and concerned about the Bay is vital to each step in restoring that great estuary—from its headwaters to its oysterbeds.

The Gateways Network does just that. The program is a proven success, and should be permanently authorized. I commend the gentleman from Maryland, a valued member of the Natural Resources Committee, for his advocacy of this measure.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5540.

Mrs. DRAKE. Mr. Speaker, my district is home to many beautiful American treasures and one of them is the Chesapeake Bay. "Save the Bay" is one message that reaches beyond all political boundaries.

Working alongside my longtime colleague and friend Jo Anne Davis in the 109th Congress, we passed legislation to create the Captain John Smith Chesapeake National Historic Trail—which is part of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network we are reauthorizing today. As many of you know, this initiative falls under the larger Chesapeake Bay Program, which was created in 1983 to restore and protect the bay.

I am proud to lend my vote in favor of this bill today, however, I would like to call atten-

tion to one of the greater matters that this Congress should also be voting on: legislation to help the American people pay for the astounding cost of energy. One example is a comprehensive bill by Representative PETERSON that creates a partnership between energy development and the environment. This bill opens up the OCS for natural gas exploration and uses an estimated \$86 billion dollars in royalties for environmental restoration efforts. The Chesapeake Bay Commission estimated that the total cost to restore the Chesapeake Bay is \$19 billion. The NEED Act fully funds the Chesapeake Bay restoration effort at \$20 billion. This energy bill is another way we can help Save the Bay, and the budgets of American families.

I am an original cosponsor of the NEED Act and I believe it is an example of bipartisan energy legislation. We must all come together in a bipartisan manner to pass legislation that will increase our domestic energy supply and help alleviate soaring prices. I cannot speak for your districts, but families in Virginia's Second District need an energy solution now and it is our job to give them one.

Mr. SARBANES. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ROSS). All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

Page 2, line 14, insert after "section" the following: "for fiscal years 2009, 2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1233, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, the amendment that I proposed here was actually proposed in the committee as well, and it is an amendment which in all sincerity is an effort to try and make a good bill into a very, very good bill. It has no intentions whatsoever of trying to derail the path of successful completion of this particular bill, but actually solve a problem and present a sense of comfort that might not necessarily be there as the bill proceeds to the other body.

We are dealing, obviously, as some people have—not here on the floor, for all of us here on the floor who are Members, but some people have said that this is simply a sunset provision. It is not that. This program is not going to be sunsetted. But there is an authorization of appropriations which desperately needs that time to be looked at.

My amendment is designed to bring this bill in line with all the other bills that we have passed out of the Resources Committee this year. Typically

in the Resources Committee we review authorizations on specific periods of time. For this reason, I anxiously anticipate the support of Democratic colleagues, because this is good government. It is a fiscally responsible amendment.

My amendment reauthorizes the review of this program after 5 years. This is a compromise between the National Park Service request, which was no authorization at all. They were fine about technical assistance, but they suggested there should be no more grants given to this program, as they said this program has matured enough and don't need any more, and the bill's sponsor who was asking for an eternal unending authorization of appropriations. Five years was good enough the first time this program was authorized, it was sufficient when this program was reauthorized, and it ought to be a sufficient time for Congress not to abrogate our responsibility but do our responsibility to review the programs that we authorize and how they are being funded.

There is a reason we add these positions to bills. As I told you in the committee, the very committee that sent this bill out, there were six other bills in a similar status; and on each of those six bills we put in this process so that the committee could review that authorization and the funding source and what those programs were doing at 5-year intervals. Some bills we have passed out have no time limits, but in every situation they have funding limitations that are put on them. This particular bill in the course it is drafted right now has no funding limitation nor any review process to it. And that is where it can be improved.

There is a reason we add these provisions to bills. Without them, programs have a tendency of languishing, depending upon Federal funds, where we want them to encourage recipients of these funds to use them wisely and to have an incentive to produce results. When programs expire, we have a chance to reevaluate them and conduct this oversight. That is our responsibility as an authorizing committee and as Congress as a whole, and we should not abrogate that responsibility. Without my amendment, we are relinquishing our oversight and leaving it simply to appropriators.

Already this program has received, as I said earlier, \$7.7 million in unrequested earmarks. This bill also eliminates the annual cap on the funds that are eligible to be received. I understand that this has been an excellent conduit for earmarks, but let us not lose the fiscal responsibility that we have to do and get away from simply handing out a blank check.

I mentioned earlier parts of the program that are funded, somewhat sarcastically, I admit. They do sound on the surface humorous. I am not opposed to what they are doing; I am not opposed to those programs. I am simply saying that Congress should have

the responsibility of looking at those at a regular period. That is our job.

It is nearing impossibility for the average family to drive to any of these recreation areas; much of the responsibility for that lies here in Congress as well. Despite that fact, the other side of the aisle is unwilling to increase oil and gas reductions. I hope they will cut the taxpayers at least a small break by accepting this good government amendment, and allow us to review how the money is spent on a periodic basis as we traditionally do in most bills that come out of this committee.

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to the Bishop amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman indicated some anxiety that the program would languish if it was permanently authorized. And I can assure him that this is one program that will not languish, because it has so stimulated the interest and the engagement of so many citizens and volunteer groups across the six States and the District of Columbia that make up the Chesapeake Bay watershed. And that is the point. That is the point of permanently authorizing it, because the citizenry has stepped up and they have shown that they are ready to work in partnership with their national government, and it is time for the national government to make an equally powerful statement to the citizenry that, when it comes to the Chesapeake Bay, we are going to be here as a steadfast ongoing supporter of that partnership.

Gateways has a proven track record. Initially authorized in 1998 and reauthorized in 2002, the Park Service conducted a special resource study on the program in 2004, and it concluded that Gateways should be made permanent and expanded. That is because the program is tested and proven. Park Service has already made the Gateways network a permanent unit of the Park System. Again, another reason it certainly will not languish, and a reason why the kind of oversight that the gentleman from Utah is concerned about will be there in terms of the agency's responsibility.

The appropriations process, which he dismissed as a significant way of overseeing the program and providing scrutiny to it, is there on an annual basis and can certainly serve that purpose.

So it is the essence of this bill in fact that we permanently authorize it, because we want to make the statement to those volunteers and citizens who stepped into this tremendous partnership to preserve the Chesapeake Bay that we understand the commitment they have made, and we are prepared to make an equal commitment from our side.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate one more time the opportunity of talking about this.

It is one of the fundamental elements that we have as the concept of good government that Congress should exercise its right of oversight on programs. Even if we authorize a program, however good it should be, there still should be at a regular basis an oversight. It is not threatening to a program. It is the responsibility of Congress.

We do have a bunch of programs that simply run without that kind of oversight. Some programs whose authorization has lapsed still function on. That is not the concept of good government. We have things especially in our area, Coastal Zone Management, Endangered Species Act whose reauthorization has lapsed, still functions on under their authorization by the appropriators, but it needs to be reviewed by the Appropriations Committee. That is its purpose.

We have some programs that are permanent, that have no oversight whatsoever: Defense, food stamps, child health care, school lunches. But, once again, in each of those areas what Congress should be doing is exercising our responsibility, and simply saying there is nothing that we should pass that shouldn't ask Congress to relook at a bill and relook at a program, and evaluate the essence of that program if it is still the most significant thing we should be doing. Or perhaps our priorities have changed. That should not be seen as an attack on the bill, it should not be seen as something that is negative or unfriendly. It should be seen as something simply as reauthorizing and re-recognizing what we are supposed to be doing. That is our job as representatives of the people, is to constantly be looking at what we have authorized, reevaluate, and reappropriate. And we are doing something in this particular amendment in an effort to do that at a 5-year basis. That is not illogical. In fact, that is the norm. That is rational. That is what usually happens in these particular situations, and it is what should happen in this particular situation. Again, it is nothing again to try to harm the bill in any way; it is simply an effort to try to move us forward to make sure that Congress does its job, and does its job on a regular, appropriate level. That is why we are here. We should not abrogate that responsibility. We should accept that. We should embrace it. And we should try to move forward from that position.

I apologize for trying to elongate this in some particular way. I think I have said repeatedly what the crux of this issue is. This is not a proposition from Liechtenstein; this is simply the concept of, do we periodically review what we authorize. It is a plus thing that we should be doing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I am new to Congress, but I have already sat through a number of hearings in the

Natural Resources Committee where we scrutinize the appropriations requests and presentation of various agencies that are under our jurisdiction. So I have high confidence that the congressional oversight that is needed for this kind of program will be there through the annual appropriation process.

And I say again that this is about making a statement to all of those citizens who stepped forward and have supported the Gateways program, that are there to back these sites, to preserve our environment and the Chesapeake Bay, its heritage, its cultural legacy. And if we vote today as I hope we will, to permanently authorize this program, we will be saying to all of those citizen stewards that we are thankful for the commitment that they are making, and that their national government is ready to step up and make an equal commitment to protecting and preserving the Chesapeake Bay.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1430

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1233, the previous question is ordered on the bill and on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 178, nays 232, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 384]

YEAS—178

Aderholt	Davis, David	Keller
Akin	Deal (GA)	King (IA)
Alexander	Dent	King (NY)
Altmire	Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston
Bachmann	Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk
Bachus	Doolittle	Kline (MN)
Barrett (SC)	Dreier	Knollenberg
Bartlett (MD)	Duncan	Kuhl (NY)
Barton (TX)	Emerson	Lamborn
Bean	English (PA)	Latham
Biggert	Fallin	LaTourette
Billbray	Feeney	Latta
Bishop (UT)	Ferguson	Lewis (CA)
Blackburn	Flake	Lewis (KY)
Bonner	Fortenberry	Linder
Bono Mack	Fossella	LoBiondo
Boozman	Fox	Lucas
Boustany	Franks (AZ)	Lungren, Daniel
Brady (TX)	Frelinghuysen	E.
Brown (GA)	Gallely	Mack
Brown (SC)	Garrett (NJ)	Mahoney (FL)
Brown-Waite,	Giffords	Manzullo
Ginny	Gingrey	Marchant
Buchanan	Gohmert	Marshall
Burgess	Graves	McCarthy (CA)
Burton (IN)	Hall (TX)	McCaul (TX)
Buyer	Hastings (WA)	McCreery
Calvert	Hayes	McHenry
Camp (MI)	Heller	McHugh
Cannon	Hensarling	McMorris
Capito	Herger	Rodgers
Carney	Hobson	Mica
Chabot	Hoekstra	Miller (FL)
Coble	Hulshof	Miller (MI)
Cole (OK)	Hunter	Miller, Gary
Conaway	Inglis (SC)	Moran (KS)
Crenshaw	Issa	Murphy, Tim
Cubin	Johnson, Sam	Musgrave
Culberson	Jones (NC)	Myrick
Davis (KY)	Jordan	Neugebauer

Nunes	Rogers (MI)
Paul	Rohrabacher
Pearce	Ros-Lehtinen
Pence	Roskam
Peterson (PA)	Royce
Petri	Ryan (WI)
Pickering	Sali
Pitts	Scalise
Platts	Schmidt
Poe	Sensenbrenner
Porter	Sessions
Price (GA)	Shadegg
Radanovich	Shays
Ramstad	Shimkus
Regula	Shuster
Rehberg	Simpson
Reichert	Smith (NE)
Renzi	Smith (NJ)
Reynolds	Smith (TX)
Rogers (AL)	Souder
Rogers (KY)	Stearns

NAYS—232

Abercrombie	Gilchrest
Ackerman	Gonzalez
Allen	Goode
Andrews	Goodlatte
Arcuri	Gordon
Baca	Green, Al
Baird	Green, Gene
Baldwin	Grijalva
Barrow	Gutierrez
Becerra	Hall (NY)
Berkley	Hare
Berman	Harman
Berry	Hastings (FL)
Bilirakis	Herseth Sandlin
Bishop (GA)	Higgins
Bishop (NY)	Hill
Blumenauer	Hinchev
Boren	Hinojosa
Boswell	Hirono
Boyd (FL)	Hodes
Boyd (KS)	Holden
Brady (PA)	Holt
Braley (IA)	Honda
Brown, Corrine	Brown, Hooley
Butterfield	Hoyer
Cantor	Inslee
Capps	Israel
Capuano	Jackson (IL)
Cardoza	Jefferson
Carnahan	Johnson (GA)
Carson	Johnson (IL)
Castle	Johnson, E. B.
Castor	Jones (OH)
Cazayoux	Kagen
Chandler	Kanjorski
Childers	Kaptur
Clarke	Kennedy
Deal (GA)	Kildee
Dent	Cleaver
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kingston
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kirk
Doolittle	Clyburn
Dreier	Cohen
Duncan	Conyers
Emerson	Cooper
English (PA)	Costa
Fallin	Costello
Feeney	Courtney
Ferguson	Cramer
Flake	Crowley
Fortenberry	Cuellar
Fossella	Cummings
Fox	Davis (AL)
Franks (AZ)	Davis (CA)
Frelinghuysen	Davis (IL)
Gallely	Davis, Lincoln
Garrett (NJ)	Davis, Tom
Giffords	DeFazio
Gingrey	DeGette
Gohmert	DeLauro
Graves	Dicks
Hall (TX)	Dingell
Hastings (WA)	Doggett
Hayes	Donnelly
Heller	Doyle
Hensarling	Drake
Herger	Edwards
Hobson	Ellsworth
Hoekstra	Emanuel
Hulshof	Engel
Hunter	Engel
Inglis (SC)	Eshoo
Issa	Etheridge
Johnson, Sam	Farr
Jones (NC)	Finer
Jordan	Forbes
	Foster
	Frank (MA)
	Gerlach

Sullivan	Wilson (OH)
Tancredo	Wittman (VA)
Terry	Wolf
Thornberry	Woolsey
Tiberi	
Turner	
Upton	
Walberg	
Walden (OR)	
Walsh (NY)	
Wamp	
Weldon (FL)	
Weller	
Westmoreland	
Whitfield (KY)	
Wilson (NM)	
Wilson (SC)	
Young (AK)	
Young (FL)	

Wilson (OH)	Wolf	Wu
Wittman (VA)	Woolsey	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

□ 1454

Messrs. TANNER, MURPHY of Connecticut, CANTOR, ABERCROMBIE, COSTELLO, LARSON of Connecticut, SPRATT, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, and Messrs. SAXTON and SCOTT of Georgia changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. ISSA changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. SALI

Mr. SALI. I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. SALI. In its current form I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Sali moves to recommit the bill H.R. 5540 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House promptly in the form to which perfected at the time of this motion, with the following amendment:

Section 502(a)(1)(B) of the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; Public Law 105-312) is amended to read as follows:

“(B) to identify and utilize the collective resources as Chesapeake Bay Gateways sites for enhancing public education of and access to the Chesapeake Bay, including educating the public regarding the effect of high fuel prices on access to and use and enjoyment of all present uses of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways sites and Chesapeake Bay Watertrails;”.

□ 1500

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. SALI. Mr. Speaker, this motion is a straightforward one and one that I hope we can all support.

Because the underlying bill is a permanent authorization of appropriations for this regional program, it is suitable that the Secretary of the Interior should use some of these funds to help the residents of the Chesapeake Bay better understand exactly how their recreational opportunities, their livelihoods and even their everyday lives are affected by the shocking gas prices affecting the country, prices which have skyrocketed over 71 percent since the current majority was installed in the House of Representatives.

I have read several news reports that show exactly how high boat fuel prices have affected the watermen of the bay. They cannot afford to run their boats to catch seafood we all enjoy. In the meantime, the price of those delicious crabs is climbing almost as fast as gas prices just so these fishermen can make their costs.

While this program creates popular Chesapeake Bay watertrails, tour operators have shuttered their boats because they cannot afford to fill up their tanks. Families are forced to stay home rather than vacationing on the Chesapeake Bay shore to enjoy its historic sites, education programs and Chesapeake Bay gateway sites supported by the authorization in this bill. This is a shame because the area has much to offer.

I wish I could offer a motion to actually decrease these prices, but the majority won't allow a vote on a measure to open up secure, American supplies of oil and natural gas, or oil shale, on our public lands. In the meantime, we are occupying hours of our legislative day with this minor program.

Our constituents, including the millions who live near, use, and enjoy the Chesapeake Bay, deserve better.

Mr. Speaker, we all know that we're going to hear from the other side of this body that there's a problem with this motion being made "promptly." As we also know, the majority controls the work of this committee and schedules the House. Just as they have scheduled this bill today, they can bring this bill back early next week. This motion is made promptly so that, in addition to the matters that are considered within this motion to recommit, that the committee can take up all of the matters and make sure that we have fully addressed all of these issues as they affect the people who live and work in the Chesapeake Bay area.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Maryland is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, this is an odd motion as you read it and one that I don't think takes full account of how aware people are of the effect of gas prices, which is the issue that the other side has talked about all day. It says that there will be education of the public regarding the effect of high fuel prices. I think the public is fully able to educate itself with respect to that impact.

This is a distraction. It doesn't really connect to the underlying bill. It was not offered in committee. It was not offered as part of the rules process. But more importantly than that, this is styled, as was just indicated, as a "promptly" motion and, therefore, effectively would kill the bill. And I can't imagine why anybody would want to kill this bill.

What this is designed to do is to recognize the incredible commitment that

has been made by ordinary citizens on behalf of the Chesapeake Bay. It would reauthorize on a permanent basis the Chesapeake Bay Gateways Program and Watertrails Network, which was first enacted in 1998. This is a successful, efficient and effective program. The White House Conference called it "a cooperative conservation success story."

It includes 156 sites across six States and the District of Columbia, parks, wildlife refuges, museums, historic sites, watertrails, and most importantly, it reaches out to volunteer groups that have stepped forward to take stewardship of the Chesapeake Bay, millions of visitors from around the country and around the world every year.

It's an efficient and effective program, and this reauthorization makes an important statement. And that's why I object to the motion because the "promptly" nature of it would effectively kill this bill, and we need to make a statement now to those citizens that have stepped forward, that just as they have made an important and steadfast commitment to the health of the Chesapeake Bay, so their national government will make a similar commitment to the Chesapeake Bay and the watershed by stepping forward and permanently authorizing this outstanding program.

I urge my colleagues on both sides to vote "no" on the motion to recommit.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, isn't it true that if this motion did pass, that this bill could be referred back to the committee or committees of authority and be reported back the next business day?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As the Chair reaffirmed on November 15, 2007, at some subsequent time, the committee could meet and report the bill back to the House.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SALI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of the bill, if ordered, and the motion to suspend with regard to H.R. 3058.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 181, nays 223, not voting 29, as follows:

[Roll No. 385]

YEAS—181

Aderholt	Gingrey	Pearce
Akin	Gohmert	Pence
Alexander	Goode	Peterson (PA)
Altmire	Goodlatte	Petri
Bachmann	Graves	Pickering
Bachus	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Barrett (SC)	Hastings (WA)	Poe
Bartlett (MD)	Hayes	Porter
Biggart	Heller	Price (GA)
Bilbray	Hensarling	Radanovich
Bilirakis	Herger	Ramstad
Bishop (UT)	Hobson	Regula
Blackburn	Hoekstra	Rehberg
Bono Mack	Hulshof	Reichert
Boozman	Hunter	Renzi
Boustany	Inglis (SC)	Reynolds
Brady (TX)	Issa	Rogers (AL)
Broun (GA)	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (KY)
Brown (SC)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (MI)
Brown-Waite,	Jones (NC)	Rohrabacher
Ginny	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Keller	Roskam
Burgess	King (IA)	Royce
Burton (IN)	King (NY)	Ryan (WI)
Buyer	Kingston	Sali
Calvert	Kirk	Scalise
Cannon	Kline (MN)	Schmidt
Capito	Knollenberg	Sensenbrenner
Castle	Kuhl (NY)	Sessions
Chabot	Lamborn	Shadegg
Coble	Latham	Sha's
Cole (OK)	LaTourette	Shimkus
Conaway	Latta	Shuster
Crenshaw	Lewis (CA)	Simpson
Cubin	Lewis (KY)	Smith (NE)
Culberson	Linder	Smith (NJ)
Davis (KY)	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Davis, David	Lucas	Souder
Davis, Tom	Lungren, Daniel	Stearns
Deal (GA)	E.	Sullivan
Dent	Mack	Tancredo
Diaz-Balart, L.	Manzullo	Terry
Diaz-Balart, M.	Marchant	Thornberry
Doolittle	McCarthy (CA)	Tiberi
Drake	McCaul (TX)	Turner
Dreier	McHenry	Upton
Duncan	McHugh	Walberg
Emerson	McKeon	Walden (OR)
English (PA)	McMorris	Walsh (NY)
Fallin	Rodgers	Wamp
Feeney	McNerney	Weldon (FL)
Ferguson	Mica	Weller
Flake	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
Forbes	Miller (MI)	Whitfield (KY)
Fortenberry	Miller, Gary	Wilson (NM)
Fossella	Moran (KS)	Wilson (SC)
Foxx	Murphy, Tim	Wittman (VA)
Franks (AZ)	Musgrave	Wolf
Frelinghuysen	Myrick	Young (AK)
Gallegly	Neugebauer	Young (FL)
Garrett (NJ)	Nunes	
Gerlach	Paul	

NAYS—223

Abercrombie	Cazayoux	Engel
Ackerman	Chandler	Eshoo
Allen	Childers	Etheridge
Andrews	Clarke	Farr
Arcuri	Clay	Filner
Baca	Cleaver	Foster
Baird	Clyburn	Frank (MA)
Baldwin	Cohen	Giffords
Barrow	Conyers	Gilchrest
Bean	Cooper	Gonzalez
Becerra	Costa	Gordon
Berkley	Costello	Green, Al
Berman	Courtney	Green, Gene
Berry	Cramer	Grijalva
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Gutierrez
Bishop (NY)	Cuellar	Hall (NY)
Blumenauer	Cummings	Hare
Boren	Davis (AL)	Harman
Boswell	Davis (CA)	Hastings (FL)
Boyd (FL)	Davis (IL)	Herseth Sandlin
Boyd (KS)	Davis, Lincoln	Higgins
Brady (PA)	DeFazio	Hill
Braley (IA)	DeGette	Hinchee
Brown, Corrine	DeLauro	Hinojosa
Butterfield	Dicks	Hirono
Capps	Dingell	Hodes
Capuano	Doggett	Holden
Cardoza	Donnelly	Holt
Carnahan	Doyle	Honda
Carney	Edwards	Hooley
Carson	Ellsworth	Hoyer
Castor	Emanuel	Inslee

Israel	Miller, George	Scott (VA)	Baird	Giffords	Murphy (CT)	Watson	Weller	Wolf
Jackson (IL)	Mitchell	Serrano	Baldwin	Gilchrest	Murphy, Patrick	Watt	Wexler	Woolsey
Jefferson	Mollohan	Sestak	Barrow	Gingrey	Murphy, Tim	Waxman	Whitfield (KY)	Wu
Johnson (GA)	Moore (KS)	Shea-Porter	Bartlett (MD)	Gonzalez	Murtha	Weiner	Wilson (NM)	Yarmuth
Johnson, E. B.	Moore (WI)	Sherman	Bean	Goode	Nadler	Welch (VT)	Wilson (OH)	Young (AK)
Jones (OH)	Moran (VA)	Sires	Becerra	Goodlatte	Napolitano	Weldon (FL)	Wittman (VA)	Young (FL)
Kagen	Murphy (CT)	Skelton	Berkley	Gordon	Neal (MA)			
Kanjorski	Murphy, Patrick	Slaughter	Berman	Green, Al	Oberstar		NAYS—86	
Kaptur	Murtha	Smith (WA)	Berry	Green, Gene	Obey	Aderholt	Hayes	Neugebauer
Kennedy	Nadler	Snyder	Biggert	Grijalva	Oliver	Akin	Heller	Nunes
Kildee	Napolitano	Solis	Bilbray	Gutierrez	Ortiz	Bachmann	Hensarling	Paul
Kilpatrick	Neal (MA)	Space	Bilirakis	Hall (NY)	Pallone	Barrett (SC)	Herger	Pearce
Kind	Oberstar	Speier	Bishop (GA)	Hare	Pastor	Barton (TX)	Hoekstra	Pence
Klein (FL)	Obey	Spratt	Bishop (NY)	Harman	Payne	Boozman	Hulshof	Pitts
Kucinich	Oliver	Stark	Bishop (UT)	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi	Boustany	Inglis (SC)	Poe
Lampson	Ortiz	Stupak	Blumenauer	Hersteth Sandlin	Perlmutter	Brady (TX)	Issa	Price (GA)
Larsen (WA)	Pallone	Sutton	Bono Mack	Higgins	Peterson (MN)	Broun (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Radanovich
Larson (CT)	Pastor	Tanner	Boren	Hill	Peterson (PA)	Burgess	Jordan	Reichert
Lee	Payne	Tauscher	Boswell	Hinchev	Petri	Burton (IN)	King (IA)	Roskam
Levin	Perlmutter	Taylor	Boyd (FL)	Hinojosa	Pickering	Buyer	Kingston	Royce
Lewis (GA)	Peterson (MN)	Thompson (CA)	Boyd (KS)	Hirono	Platts	Cannon	Lamborn	Ryan (WI)
Lipinski	Platts	Thompson (MS)	Brady (PA)	Hobson	Pomeroy	Chabot	Latta	Sali
Loebsack	Pomeroy	Tierney	Brale (IA)	Hodes	Porter	Coble	Lewis (KY)	Scalise
Lofgren, Zoe	Price (NC)	Towns	Brown (SC)	Holden	Price (NC)	Conaway	Lungren, Daniel	Sensenbrenner
Lowey	Rahall	Tsongas	Brown (CA)	Holt	Rahall	Culberson	E.	Sessions
Lynch	Rangel	Udall (CO)	Brown-Waite,	Honda	Ramstad	Davis (KY)	Mack	Shadegg
Mahoney (FL)	Reyes	Udall (NM)	Ginny	Hoolley	Regula	Davis, David	Manzullo	Smith (NE)
Maloney (NY)	Richardson	Van Hollen	Buchanan	Hoyer	Rehberg	Deal (GA)	Marchant	Souder
Markey	Rodriguez	Velázquez	Butterfield	Hunter	Renzi	Duncan	McCarthy (CA)	Stearns
Marshall	Ross	Visclosky	Calvert	Inslee	Reyes	Feeney	McHenry	Sullivan
Matheson	Rothman	Walz (MN)	Camp (MI)	Israel	Reynolds	Flake	McKeon	Tancredo
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Waters	Capito	Jackson (IL)	Richardson	Foxx	McMorris	Terry
McCarthy (NY)	Ryan (OH)	Watson	Capps	Jefferson	Rodriguez	Franks (AZ)	Rodgers	Thornberry
McCollum (MN)	Salazar	Watt	Capuano	Johnson (GA)	Rogers (AL)	Garrett (NJ)	Mica	Walberg
McDermott	Sánchez, Linda	Waxman	Cardoza	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (KY)	Gohmert	Miller (FL)	Westmoreland
McGovern	T.	Weiner	Carnahan	Johnson, E. B.	Rogers (MI)	Hall (TX)	Moran (KS)	Wilson (SC)
McIntyre	Sanchez, Loretta	Welch (VT)	Carney	Jones (NC)	Rohrabacher	Hastings (WA)	Musgrave	
McNulty	Sarbanes	Wexler	Carson	Jones (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen		Myrick	
Meek (FL)	Saxton	Wilson (OH)	Castle	Kagan	Ross			
Meeks (NY)	Schakowsky	Woolsey	Castor	Kanjorski	Rothman			
Melancon	Schiff	Wu	Castro	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard	Blackburn	Ellison	Pascarell
Michaud	Schwartz	Yarmuth	Cazayoux	Keller	Ruppersberger	Blunt	Everett	Pryce (OH)
Miller (NC)	Scott (GA)		Chandler	Kennedy	Ryan (OH)	Boehner	Fattah	Putnam

NOT VOTING—29

Barton (TX)	Ellison	Pascarell
Blunt	Everett	Pryce (OH)
Boehner	Fattah	Putnam
Bonner	Gillibrand	Ruppersberger
Boucher	Granger	Rush
Camp (MI)	Jackson-Lee	Shuler
Campbell (CA)	(TX)	Tiahrt
Cantor	LaHood	Wasserman
Carter	Langevin	Schultz
Delahunt	McCotter	
Ehlers	McCrery	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1522

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 385, I was in an Intelligence committee briefing. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. SALI. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 321, nays 86, not voting 27, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

YEAS—321

Abercrombie	Allen	Arcuri
Ackerman	Altmire	Baca
Alexander	Andrews	Bachus

Baldwin	Bartlett (MD)	Bean	Becerra	Berkley	Berman	Berry	Biggert	Bilbray	Bilirakis	Bishop (GA)	Bishop (NY)	Bishop (UT)	Blumenauer	Bono Mack	Boren	Boswell	Boyd (FL)	Boyd (KS)	Brady (PA)	Brale (IA)	Brown (SC)	Brown, Corrine	Brown-Waite,	Honda	Hoolley	Hoyer	Hunter	Inslee	Israel	Jackson (IL)	Jefferson	Johnson (GA)	Johnson (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Jones (NC)	Jones (OH)	Kagan	Kanjorski	Kaptur	Keller	Kennedy	Kildee	Kilpatrick	Kind	King (NY)	Kirk	Klein (FL)	Klein (MN)	Knollenberg	Kucinich	Kuhl (NY)	Lampson	Langevin	Larsen (WA)	Larson (CT)	Latham	LaTourette	Lee	Levin	Lewis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Lipinski	LoBiondo	Loebsack	Lofgren, Zoe	Lowey	Lucas	Lynch	Mahoney (FL)	Maloney (NY)	Markey	Marshall	Matheson	Matsui	McCarthy (NY)	McCaul (TX)	McCollum (MN)	McCrery	McDermott	McGovern	McHugh	McIntyre	McNerney	McNulty	Meek (FL)	Meeks (NY)	Melancon	Michaud	Miller (MI)	Miller (NC)	Miller, Gary	Miller, George	Mitchell	Mollohan	Moore (KS)	Moore (WI)	Moran (VA)
---------	---------------	------	---------	---------	--------	-------	---------	---------	-----------	-------------	-------------	-------------	------------	-----------	-------	---------	-----------	-----------	------------	------------	------------	----------------	--------------	-------	---------	-------	--------	--------	--------	--------------	-----------	--------------	--------------	----------------	------------	------------	-------	-----------	--------	--------	---------	--------	------------	------	-----------	------	------------	------------	-------------	----------	-----------	---------	----------	-------------	-------------	--------	------------	-----	-------	------------	------------	----------	----------	----------	--------------	-------	-------	-------	--------------	--------------	--------	----------	----------	--------	---------------	-------------	---------------	---------	-----------	----------	--------	----------	----------	---------	-----------	------------	----------	---------	-------------	-------------	--------------	----------------	----------	----------	------------	------------	------------

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining on this vote.

□ 1529

Mr. GARRETT of New Jersey changed his vote from "yea" to "nay." So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PUBLIC LAND COMMUNITIES
TRANSITION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HARE). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3058, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFazio) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 3058, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 218, nays 193, answered "present" 2, not voting 21, as follows: