

Goodlatte	McCaul (TX)	Ros-Lehtinen	Davis, Lincoln	Klein (FL)	Ross	Miller (MI)	Reichert	Souder
Graves	McCotter	Roskam	DeFazio	Kucinich	Rothman	Miller, Gary	Renzi	Stearns
Hall (TX)	McCrery	Royce	DeGette	Lampson	Roybal-Allard	Moran (KS)	Reynolds	Sullivan
Hastings (WA)	McHenry	Ryan (WI)	Delahunt	Langevin	Ruppersberger	Murphy, Tim	Rogers (AL)	Tancredo
Hayes	McHugh	Sali	DeLauro	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)	Musgrave	Rogers (KY)	Terry
Heller	McKeon	Saxton	Dicks	Larson (CT)	Salazar	Myrick	Rohrabacher	Thornberry
Hensarling	McMorris	Scalise	Doggett	Lee	Sánchez, Linda T.	Neugebauer	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiahrt
Herger	Rodgers	Schmidt	Donnelly	Levin	Sanchez, Loretta	Nunes	Roskam	Tiberi
Hobson	Mica	Sensenbrenner	Doyle	Lewis (GA)	Sarbanes	Paul	Royce	Turner
Hoekstra	Miller (FL)	Sessions	Edwards (MD)	Lipinski	Schakowsky	Pearce	Ryan (WI)	Upton
Hunter	Miller (MI)	Shadegg	Edwards (TX)	Loebsack	Schiff	Pence	Sali	Walberg
Inglis (SC)	Miller, Gary	Shimkus	Ellison	Lofgren, Zoe	Schwartz	Peterson (PA)	Saxton	Walden (OR)
Issa	Moran (KS)	Shuster	Ellsworth	Lowey	Scott (GA)	Petri	Scalise	Walsh (NY)
Johnson (IL)	Murphy, Tim	Simpson	Emanuel	Lynch	Scott (VA)	Pitts	Schmidt	Wamp
Johnson, Sam	Musgrave	Smith (NE)	Engel	Mahoney (FL)	Serrano	Platts	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (FL)
Jones (NC)	Myrick	Smith (NJ)	Eshoo	Maloney (NY)	Shadegg	Poe	Sessions	Weller
Jordan	Neugebauer	Souder	Etheridge	Markey	Sestak	Porter	Shays	Westmoreland
Keller	Nunes	Stearns	Farr	Marshall	Shea-Porter	Price (GA)	Shimkus	Whitfield (KY)
King (IA)	Paul	Sullivan	Fattah	Matheson	Sherman	Putnam	Shuster	Wilson (SC)
King (NY)	Pearce	Tancredo	Filner	Matsui	Shuler	Radanovich	Simpson	Wittman (VA)
Kingston	Pence	Terry	Foster	McCarthy (NY)	Sires	Ramstad	Smith (NE)	Wolf
Kirk	Peterson (PA)	Thornberry	Giffords	McCollum (MN)	Skelton	Regula	Smith (NJ)	Young (AK)
Kline (MN)	Petri	Tiahrt	Gillibrand	McDermott	Slaughter	Rehberg		Young (FL)
Knollenberg	Pitts	Tiberi	Gonzalez	McGovern	Smith (WA)			
Kuhl (NY)	Platts	Turner	Gordon	McIntyre				
LaHood	Poe	Upton	Green, Al	McNerney				
Lamborn	Porter	Walberg	Green, Gene	McNulty				
Latham	Price (GA)	Walden (OR)	Grijalva	Meek (FL)				
LaTourette	Putnam	Walsh (NY)	Gutierrez	Meeks (NY)				
Latta	Radanovich	Wamp	Hall (NY)	Melancon				
Lewis (CA)	Ramstad	Weldon (FL)	Hare	Michaud				
Lewis (KY)	Regula	Weller	Hastings (FL)	Miller (NC)				
Linder	Rehberg	Westmoreland	Herseth Sandlin	Miller, George				
LoBiondo	Renzi	Whitfield (KY)	Higgins	Mitchell				
Lucas	Reynolds	Wilson (SC)	Hinchee	Mollohan				
Mack	Rogers (AL)	Wittman (VA)	Hinojosa	Moore (KS)				
Manzullo	Rogers (KY)	Wolf	Hirono	Moore (WI)				
Marchant	Rogers (MI)	Young (AK)	Hodes	Moran (VA)				
McCarthy (CA)	Rohrabacher	Young (FL)	Holden	Murphy (CT)				

## NOT VOTING—23

Andrews	Frank (MA)	Pickering
Boswell	Frelinghuysen	Pryce (OH)
Brown-Waite,	Gohmert	Reyes
Ginny	Granger	Rush
Carter	Harman	Smith (TX)
Dingell	Hill	Speier
Edwards (TX)	Hulshof	Waxman
Fortenberry	Kennedy	Wilson (NM)

## □ 1304

Messrs. SAXTON, EVERETT, RAMSTAD, EHLERS, and KINGSTON changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Madam 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 224, nays 182, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 481]

## YEAS—224

Abercrombie	Boren	Clarke
Ackerman	Boucher	Clay
Allen	Boyd (FL)	Cleaver
Altmire	Boyda (KS)	Clyburn
Arcuri	Brady (PA)	Cohen
Baca	Braley (IA)	Conyers
Baird	Brown, Corrine	Cooper
Baldwin	Butterfield	Costa
Barrow	Capps	Costello
Bean	Cardoza	Courtney
Becerra	Carnahan	Cramer
Berkley	Carney	Crowley
Berman	Carson	Cuellar
Berry	Castor	Cummings
Bishop (GA)	Cazayoux	Davis (AL)
Bishop (NY)	Chandler	Davis (CA)
Blumenauer	Childers	Davis (IL)

## NAYS—182

Aderholt	Davis (KY)	Hunter
Akin	Davis, David	Inglis (SC)
Alexander	Davis, Tom	Johnson (IL)
Bachmann	Deal (GA)	Johnson, Sam
Bachus	Dent	Jones (NC)
Barrett (SC)	Diaz-Balart, L.	Jordan
Bartlett (MD)	Diaz-Balart, M.	Keller
Barton (TX)	Doolittle	King (IA)
Biggart	Drake	King (NY)
Bilbray	Dreier	Kingston
Bilirakis	Duncan	Kirk
Bishop (UT)	Ehlers	Kline (MN)
Blackburn	Emerson	Knollenberg
Bonner	English (PA)	Kuhl (NY)
Bono Mack	Everett	LaHood
Boozman	Fallin	Lamborn
Boustany	Feeney	Latham
Brady (TX)	Ferguson	LaTourette
Broun (GA)	Flake	Latta
Brown (SC)	Forbes	Lewis (CA)
Buchanan	Fossella	Lewis (KY)
Burgess	Fox	Linder
Burton (IN)	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Buyer	Gallely	Lucas
Calvert	Garrett (NJ)	Mack
Camp (MI)	Gerlach	Manzullo
Campbell (CA)	Gilchrest	Marchant
Cantor	Gingrey	McCarthy (CA)
Capito	Goode	McCaul (TX)
Carter	Goodlatte	McCotter
Castle	Granger	McCrery
Chabot	Graves	McHenry
Coble	Hall (TX)	McHugh
Cole (OK)	Hastings (WA)	McKeon
Conaway	Hayes	McMorris
Crenshaw	Hensarling	Rodgers
Cubin	Herger	Mica
Culberson	Hobson	Miller (FL)

## NOT VOTING—28

Andrews	Frank (MA)	Lungren, Daniel E.
Blunt	Frelinghuysen	
Boehner	Gohmert	Murphy, Patrick
Boswell	Harman	Pickering
Brown-Waite,	Heller	Pryce (OH)
Ginny	Hill	Reyes
Cannon	Hoekstra	Rogers (MI)
Capuano	Hulshof	Rush
Dingell	Issa	Smith (TX)
Fortenberry		Waxman
		Wilson (NM)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

## □ 1311

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1286.

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

There was no objection.

## WASHINGTON-ROCHAMBEAU REVOLUTIONARY ROUTE NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL DESIGNATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1317 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1286.

## □ 1314

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1286) to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail, with Mr. ROSS in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Today, we are considering H.R. 1286, legislation introduced by our colleague, Representative MAURICE HINCHEY of New York. I might also add that it was some 9 years ago that the initial study on this legislation was initiated by our colleague from Connecticut, Mr. JOHN LARSON, and I wish to commend his leadership, as well as Mr. HINCHEY's leadership on the pending bill.

The pending legislation will designate a National Historic Trail, tracing the routes taken in 1781 by the armies of General George Washington and French Count Rochambeau on their march from New England to face the British Army at Yorktown, Virginia.

The story of this trail is a fascinating piece of our history. The French Army, after wintering in Newport, Rhode Island, marched southwest in early July to join General Washington and his troops at Phillipsburg, New York. On August 18, the soldiers, and their provisions and armaments, started to slip away from Philipsburg.

The troops and their supplies traveled 600 miles over a network of strategic roads and waterways through New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, the future District of Columbia, and Virginia. They reached Williamsburg in late September, 1781.

With a French fleet in the Chesapeake, blocking British reinforcements from New York or a sea escape for Cornwallis' troops, Washington and Rochambeau laid siege to Cornwallis' army at Yorktown. Three weeks later, on October 19, 1781, the British troops laid down their arms.

I would note that when we bring forth legislation of this nature, concerns have been raised in some corridors regarding any potential impacts on private property rights. I can assure this Committee that most of this trail follows public roads or crosses public lands. While the historic route does cross some private lands, the National Park Service does not propose or anticipate any acquisition of private lands.

I would also point out that nothing in the National Trails System circumvents the authority of the States over hunting and fishing. However, to make this matter crystal clear, the rule governing debate over the pending measure adopted an amendment which reads as follows. Again, the rule governing debate over the pending measure adopted an amendment which reads as follows:

"Nothing in this act shall be construed as affecting the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of the several States to manage, control, or regulate

fish and resident wildlife under State law or regulations, including the regulation of hunting, fishing, trapping, and recreational shooting. Nothing in this act shall be construed as limiting access for hunting, fishing, trapping, or recreational shooting."

I would say this language covers all the bases. Nothing in the pending measure in any way, shape, or form supercedes the authority of the States over hunting, fishing, trapping, and shooting.

This is essentially the same language this body adopted last April by a vote of 416-5 during consideration of H.R. 2016, the National Landscape Conservation System Act, per an amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ALTMIRE).

I would close by noting that the trail designated by this bill follows the recommendations of a National Park Service study, and the Bush administration supports this legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Over the July 4th holiday, my wife and I rented the movie 1776. It's one of my favorite ones. It has some historical accuracy, a lot of historical inaccuracies, but it's a fun movie.

In the exposition of that, to show John Adams's frustration at Congress at that time, he was called down to vote on a motion by Josiah Bartlett of New Hampshire, which is an effort that says that during the hostilities in which they are in, they shall dissuade any kind of dissipation, any extravagances, any gambling, or any horse racing. That is when John Adams explodes and goes out on the street, with the classic lines in his opening song, which says about Congress in 1776: We piddle, twiddle, and resolve not one—I can't use a swear word here, but it's in there—not one thing do we solve.

Now, the issue at hand in 1776 in Philadelphia was independence. They had already been fighting for a year. They had raised an army and appointed George Washington to do battle. Yet, they still refused to talk about the key sole issue of the day, which was independence. Instead, they talked about everything else, every small, piddly idea they could come up with, rather than coming to the core. And that was John Adams's frustration with that.

As I was watching that movie, I thought, Gee, that is exactly like Congress today. We are doing the same thing.

I have to admit that I have a sense of frustration with congressional leadership. It's a 4-hour flight for me to come back here. Yet, every week I have been coming back on that 4-hour flight to deal with non-issues. We haven't dealt with homeland security, we haven't dealt with the appropriations, we haven't dealt with energy issues.

Instead, the key issue of this week is to federalize a trail that already exists, that is controlled by local govern-

ments, and there is absolutely nothing, nothing the Federal Government can do on this trail that couldn't be accomplished by States and local governments through a well-written interlocal cooperation agreement.

The sponsor does not live in the area of this trail. It encompasses nine States. Not all of the Members of Congress who are impacted either in the trail area or abutting the trail area are cosponsors.

The other side cannot even refute how many people understand or know that this trail is going to be impacting their lives. The estimates we have are less than 10 percent are understanding about this.

Yet, the key issue is not necessarily the trail, because it's already there. The key issue is who will be making decisions in the future about this trail. If it were possible that everyone involved in this particular trail was happy about it, they liked the idea, they wanted it, but at some future date would like to make a decision about that trail, by passing this bill, all of a sudden we change the process and the place of that decision from localities back here to Washington.

It's about power, it's about where do you actually make decisions in America. It's about empowerment of individuals. This bill simply takes the decision-making process away from localities and puts it back here in Washington, where we have too many decision-making powers that we are already avoiding as is.

They did take one amendment of mine and they eviscerated it, an amendment that dealt with second amendment rights, an amendment that dealt with all second amendment rights. Yet, the issue at hand that is now part of the underlying bill through a self-executing rule only deals with hunting, not all second amendment rights, which was the goal and the idea and what should have been in place, which simply means that if I'm hunting, I'm okay on this trail. If I'm trying to protect myself, I'm not. If a mugger tries to attack me, I cannot protect myself unless first I'm trying to hunt the mugger. Or if a moose is shot by me, I better shoot it in the posterior because if a moose is charging me, no longer is that hunting, that is now self-defense, and that is not allowed with the amendment that came in here.

It is simply an absurdity of situations, and it's not an unrealistic absurdity. Even the Washington Post did a recent article about serial killers along the Appalachian Trail. It is not a false fear in there, it's a realistic fear. It's a realistic fear that will be noted that when the Democrats made this self-executing rule, they did not defend all of the second amendment, only the so-called hunting rights, which is not, not the purpose of the second amendment.

But this is now simply the only bill that we will have of significance today.

It's basically the crux of this entire week, which simply means Democratic leaders don't want to address other issues. Specifically, energy issues. There is no issue of comprehensive policy of what we will be doing to address the energy crisis the Americans are facing. The appropriations process has simply shut down over the potential of doing that.

So I fly back for 4 hours to come back here last week to talk about banning pet monkeys from crossing State lines. The week before, about the Chesapeake Bay. This week, I came back here so we could talk about a trail.

Mr. Chairman, in all due sincerity, this is nothing but legislative filler. We are not dealing with the real issues that affect people or should be affecting this Congress, we are dealing with the small stuff, the triviality, the legislative minutia. This is like junk food, like cotton candy. It's there. It's fluffy, it's airy. But it is not filling and has no fiber. It gives the illusion of activity, but in essence we are dealing with a cotton candy agenda.

We have in essence a Democratic de facto filibuster against energy, against ever talking about it in any way, shape, or form. Instead, we have a trail. A trail that already exists, a trail that would be federalized, a trail that encompasses more power back here in Washington, instead of allowing people to help make decisions for themselves.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to illustrate the importance of this issue which we are dealing with here today and an issue in which I rise in strong support. It is a bipartisan effort to implement the National Park Service's study that Congress mandated back in the 106th Congress. It's an issue that has been pending for some time.

The National Park Service study recommended that we designate as a National Historic Trail this 600-mile route used by the allied armies under General George Washington and French Count Rochambeau in their epic march that led to the victory at Yorktown, Virginia, in 1781, and the independence of the United States of America.

The trail travels mostly along existing roads, throughways, and publicly navigable waters from Rhode Island down to Yorktown, Virginia. Designating the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route as a National Historic Trail will help spur a greater understanding of our shared history and will help illuminate the important battle of a young country and its French allies against the rule of King George.

I'd like to thank especially Chairmen RAHALL and GRIJALVA for moving this legislation through the hearing and markup process in the Natural Resources Committee. I greatly appreciate their support and assistance and that of their very capable staff.

This designation is important because we have identified the scope of resources that we need to more effectively commemorate this historic event. In particular, I am thrilled that the expanded involvement of the National Park Service to preserve and interpret the route will highlight to Americans, young and old, our earliest struggles as a country for our independent rule on behalf of all of the people of our country.

The designation also calls for the involvement of State and local historic organizations interested in commemorating the heritage of the American Revolution, with a particular focus on the States of Connecticut, Delaware, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, and Virginia. It was on the 16th of December, 1999, that the Revolutionary War enthusiasts supporting a National Historic Trail designation of the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route organized themselves at the Washington headquarters in Newburgh, New York.

They advocated for the route essentially defined by the march taken by the Continental Army of General George Washington and by the French Army of Count Rochambeau on their way to their ultimate victory over British forces under the command of Major General Charles Cornwallis in Yorktown, Virginia, in 1781. The route also included the march of the French Army in 1782 as it returned back north up to Boston.

□ 1330

In a 1999 interview with the historical magazine "American Heritage," renowned author David McCullough claimed that "as you are working on the Revolutionary War, as I am doing now, you realize what the French did for us. We wouldn't have a country if it weren't for them," David McCullough said. For that America will be forever grateful for the army led by Rochambeau, and this trail will significantly symbolize our appreciation and dedication to our shared history.

I would like to thank all of the Revolutionary War enthusiasts, the National Park Service, and the many Members of Congress whose districts particularly host the route who have cosponsored this legislation. All of these participants helped make this designation possible. It is a designation that will raise to a much greater level the quality of heritage preservation all along the route by providing signage and other commemorative work directed toward linking the Allied encampments along the Revolutionary march with a self-guided auto route, auxiliary hiking trails and appropriate historical signs.

This commemorates one of the most significant events in the history of the United States of America. It is our major victory in the Revolutionary War, which led to the independence of our country, the foundation of our Con-

stitution, the creation of the Bill of Rights, and the leadership that we have provided for the following centuries around the world. I am very much in support of this bill. I hope that every Member of this House of Representatives will vote for it.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) such time as he may consume.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I come in support of the legislation. I served, as many people know, in the United States Army for 5 years actively, 23 in the Reserves, a West Point graduate, great respect for George Washington, who established the fortifications there at West Point, the longest active military installation in the country. Of course, this constitutional Republic owes a great debt of gratitude to the French, and it is unfortunate we have to use discussions on this to come to the floor and exercise our rights of freedom and speech to talk about a new Declaration of Independence. So with respect to the chairman, I hope he will indulge me.

When we talk about the day-to-day and we talk about around the Fourth of July, America knows that we are held captive to imported crude oil as energy and that we have to break away to become energy independent and free. There are a lot of ways that we can do that, and I believe there is a huge consensus in this Congress today. Unfortunately, that consensus is not being allowed to be brought to the floor, and that is why we have to use legislation like this to exercise our ability for free speech to talk about pressing concerns.

We all know the problem, and I have tried to change my debate and discussion away from the basic partisan aspects to just the realities. And the reality is when President Bush became president, the price of a barrel of crude oil was \$23. I highlight it here. I don't shy away from that fact. When the Democrat majority came in, the price of a barrel of crude oil was \$58. Yesterday, I haven't checked the spot price today, but yesterday's price was \$140. And all I have said on this floor now for about 12 weeks is that this trendline is bad, this trendline for our economy, for our middle class, for our lower middle class, for rural America, is not sustainable, and that we have to address this. And we can. We can address it in a bipartisan manner on this floor. There are a lot of things we can do.

We have tried on this floor numerous times to bring alternative fuel standards, the debate of using American coal, the largest recoverable resource we have. We have the largest recoverable resource of coal as any country in the world in coal. People don't understand that, but we do. The Germans developed technology in World War II to

take coal and turn it into liquid fuel. Wouldn't that be helpful today in the high energy prices, to be able to take something that we have a lot of and turn it into liquid fuel to help us become more independent from the importation of crude oil, especially from dangerous places around the world, places that really don't like us and we really would like to not have to be there.

So when we talk about becoming energy independent, we would like to say we are always going to need some, so we have got North American allies, the Canadians, a great source of imported fossil fuels, Mexico, a great supporter of fossil fuels. Using that, using our own coal reserves and our other resources, we could become independent from imported crude oil from other places.

We are independent on energy for electricity. We produce in our country the electricity we need. So we can be independent. We are not independent on the energy we need in liquid fuel.

One way we do this is with our great coal reserves. I am from Illinois, 250 years worth of recoverable coal. You go to a coal mine, you build a coal mine, American jobs. You operate the coal mine, American jobs. You build a coal-to-liquid refinery, American jobs. You operate that refinery, American jobs. You actually have a tax base developed for our local schools.

You build a pipeline from these refineries to maybe the local airport. Four budget airlines are bankrupt. That means baggage handlers, ticket takers, pilots, planes sitting idle because they can no longer compete with the high aviation fuel. Well, you can make aviation fuel from coal-to-liquid technology.

The United States Air Force is the number one aviation fuel user in the world. Every time this barrel of crude oil goes up \$1, it costs us, the taxpayers, \$60 million just to pay the aviation jet fuel bill. They are asking us to do this. If we want to become energy independent, as we are speaking about the independence of our country, being free from foreign oppression, being free from foreign influence, we have to become energy independent.

Another way to do this is the Outer Continental Shelf. Great resources, billions of barrels of crude oil, trillions of cubic feet of natural gas, just waiting to be explored and recovered. These areas here in red are off limits by a dictate imposed by Federal legislators 25, 30 years ago, in a spending bill. We said in a spending bill you can't go off the east coast. You can't go in the eastern Gulf. You can't go on the west coast. It is off limits. So a way that we could become more independent, energy independent, would be to use our vast coal resources and to open up the Outer Continental Shelf. I have another chart here I forgot to bring that talks about wind and solar.

But the great thing about the Outer Continental Shelf is this: When we

allow industry to look for, find and recover this, it is my understanding they have to pay us for that, and how they pay us is in royalties. So if we are going to use money for solar and wind and renewable energy, what a great place to get the pay-for.

I got a lot of Blue Dogs, they have been fighting the battle on pay-fors. What a great pay-for, to become energy independent by using the available oil and gas reserves, bringing more supply to the market, lowering the price.

It is all gain. There is no disadvantage to using our coal resources and creating jobs. There is no disadvantage to opening up the oil and gas reserves off the Outer Continental Shelf. And really there is no disadvantage into going into the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, an area the size of the State of South Carolina, a drilling platform the size of Dulles Airport. To put it in perspective, take a football field and put a postage stamp on there.

When you hear people talk about the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, it is not like Woodland Park in my hometown of Collinsville, Illinois. That might be a little bit disruptive if you are drilling. It is not disruptive in an area the size of the State of South Carolina.

So the frustration for me as a member of the Energy and Air Quality Subcommittee and the Energy and Commerce Committee is we can't even have this debate in the committee. If we could have this debate in the committee, if we could move a bill and get it to the floor, we could use that time to debate energy. But, unfortunately, we have to use this time on a historic trail that helps us remember where we come from, helps us remember our national heritage.

We have obviously the portrait of the Marquis de Lafayette right here in the Chamber. Remember when we have had trouble with our French friends, they were here when we needed them and were instrumental to this Republic, and we need to thank them. Anything we can do as a history teacher to remember history and strengthen it for future generations, I am for.

I just hope what we want to do in the history, I hope we are willing to do the same thing for future generations for energy independence. And I challenge my friends to bring on the environmental restrictions. We can meet them. But we have to have a whole portfolio. I am willing to join you, if you all let me.

With that, I would like to thank the ranking member for the time.

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. MURPHY).

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

I came to the floor today to speak about the underlying legislation, which is incredibly important to those of us who reside in Connecticut, where 340 miles of this proposed route lies, more

than in any other State along this historic trail. But I can't sit here and not respond to some of the comments from our friends from across the aisle.

I appreciate this newfound interest in trying to make this country independent of oil outside of our bounds, independent of energy sources produced outside of the United States. The problem is that our friends on the other aisle who controlled this House of Representatives for 12 years are too late to the game.

It is a shame, a travesty, that we are sitting in this situation that we are today, not only with gasoline in Connecticut, where I come from, at \$4.30 a gallon, but across this Nation families are being held hostage by a product produced and priced outside of this country.

We could have made different choices in this House if we had had leadership on the Republican side of the aisle, who controlled it for 12 years in conjunction with a President who sat in the White House for six of those years. We could have been in a very different place today. But we are not.

So, as Democrats, we are standing up, passing legislation to hold OPEC accountable for price fixing; investing in renewable resources to try to finally get this country off of that oil that we are far too addicted to; and going after those who would try to price-gouge and take advantage of the current economic situation. In all of those situations there are veto threats from the President and far too few of our friends from the other side of the aisle joining us. Now, there is consistency there. For 12 years they neglected the growing energy crisis, and now we don't have enough bipartisan cooperation across the aisle.

So I appreciate the fact that on a bill that is very important to those of us in Connecticut, that we have a little bit of an opportunity to talk about the crisis that is affecting American families. I just wish that our friends on the Republican side of the aisle had been doing a little bit more talking about this subject before we got here, the new members of this class. I wish that we had been talking about this 5 years ago and 10 years ago, and we wouldn't have to be talking about it in such grave terms here today.

Mr. Chairman, I want to talk just for one moment about how important this underlying bill is going to be to us in Connecticut, for it is important for us to celebrate our heritage. What makes us so great as a Nation is that we celebrate it, we respect it and we pass it on to new generations. And so when I look at that 340 miles of this historic trail that is going to lie in Connecticut, I think great things about what it is going to mean to have more resources and more Federal recognition for the students and the children who will walk that trail, who will visit the monuments and markers across it, and will have even more reverence for the history that brings us here today.

□ 1345

Graves of French soldiers still sit in Waterbury, Connecticut; the spot on which the Caleb Baldwin Tavern sat in Newtown.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HINCHEY. I yield 1 additional minute, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut. I thank the gentleman from New York.

A historic tavern in Newtown, Connecticut where General Rochambeau and his troops made several stops continues to be talked about today as an important part of the historic tradition of Western Connecticut.

This is going to add to the historic legacy that of course makes us what we are in New England, makes us so proud of our very unique role in the making of this Nation. And what makes this Nation great is that even in moments of trial like we have today, with families faced with increasing costs of energy and health care and education, that we can come together and propose solutions. I just think that it is too bad that we didn't do something about this before this moment. I think it is too bad that we have to come to this floor in such a crisis mode as we do today. I wish our friends from across the aisle had done a little bit more when they controlled this House. I think that would have done a lot more to fulfill the legacy that we celebrate today than the moment that we are in right now.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HAYES) such time as he may consume.

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

As we stand here today, I think this is a good bill. We all support it. But as a segue into what the real issue for the American people and people here in this Capitol building is today, how can you afford the gas to drive or fly to go see the area that we are talking about today?

Our friend just talked about what happened. Well, Congressman SHIMKUS reminded us that during the 7½ years of the present administration, gas prices went up but not anywhere nearly as dramatically as they have in the 18 months since our friends across the aisle, the Democrat majority, has controlled. But let me make a very strong and separate point.

Many friends on the Democrat side, including the chairman and others, the person sponsoring the bill, these folks want to do what we, the minority, want to do. And that is, all of the above. There have been some neat things done by this House during my almost 10 years here.

CAFE standards. I voted for that. Better mileage. That is important. The American people have heard us, and they are working hard to conserve. Price gouging. That is a piece of the puzzle. I voted for that. Speculation. We have had hearings yesterday, today,

tomorrow. That is an interesting subject. I support that to the extent it affects the issue before us today. But an attorney from a local university made the point today that speculation adds liquidity to the market. Excessive speculation causes problems. He hasn't told us where excessive begins.

But it is important that we look into every single issue that impacts our constituents at home, and that is the price of gas. My friend from West Virginia absolutely knows as well as anybody the importance of utilizing our coal resources. Thank goodness for West Virginia, among others, and their production of domestic energy resources.

As you look at our future and our economy, which includes, among other things, food prices, and you see what the incredibly outrageously high price of gas has done to us, you have to come to the conclusion and let those good people in both parties and on both sides of the aisle have a simple, straightforward vote on whether we are going to become more active in domestic energy resources.

Domestic energy. We have a small group of people, and they apparently have an unusual hold on the Democrat leadership. That group says no to nukes, no to coal, no to tar sands, no to expansion of refineries. We cannot afford and common sense does not allow for us to maintain that position.

I think it is extremely helpful that we are having a lengthy debate. And, again, a lot of good points have been made, but I will refresh everyone's institutional memory to the fact that this House, Republicans and Democrats, in previous terms before we had a switch in majority passed all of the legislation that we are talking about bringing up again today, including exploration drilling in ANWR and off the Outer Continental Shelf. However, our friends in the other body saw fit not to send that to the President's desk.

Well, the distinguished majority leader mentioned today how we should use our reserves. I could support that if it comes to the floor. But I am also on a letter, as many of you others are, telling the President to release the moratorium. We cannot afford, Democrats, Republicans, or anyone else, to leave our constituents hanging out to dry with unbelievably high gas prices.

So I support the minority leader's call for meaningful energy legislation, including votes on nuclear, votes on drilling which the American public has very clearly said, and at the same time I will reemphasize what the majority and minority, regardless of who is in that position, has said over and over again: Environmentally sound? Absolutely. Safely? Without question.

And again thanking you for the time, I wrap up by saying we, this body, regardless of party, has been guilty in the past of using lowered gas prices to conveniently forget how important independence and our future energy needs are.

So that is why I have a piece of legislation, and I would welcome any and every one to join me on, that says every additional dollar of revenue created by new leases will go to a trust fund that can only be used for alternative sources of energy. Wind, waves, solar, everything needs to be on the table, ethanol, methanol, biodiesel.

Gentlemen, I support your bill. But, again, let's get ourselves together and make sure that we get to vote on what the American people and the majority of this Congress want, and that is lower energy prices.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from West Virginia has 17½ minutes remaining; the gentleman from Utah has 8½ minutes remaining.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

For some time now, the Democrats on this side have been watching our colleagues on the other side of the aisle time after time on bill after bill come to the floor and defend multinational oil conglomerates, and now they claim to be the friends of coal as well.

My colleague from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) gave us a great presentation on coal-to-liquids, as has been done a number of times, and there is not much I can disagree with in his presentation about the coal-to-liquids. But it is, and the fact of the matter is, that it is pure and simple that it is the oil industry and their defenders here in the Congress that have time and time again undermined the viability of a true alternative fuels industry in this country. And let me back that up by example.

In the 1940s, the Synthetic Liquids Fuels Act passed the Congress and appropriated over \$80 million for research and production. By the 1950s, America was producing thousands of gallons of synthetic gasoline a day at a test plant in Missouri. But the discovery of cheap oil combined with a lobbying effort by the oil industry caused the government to abandon its synthetic fuel research.

Let's hark back to the 1970s and that oil crisis that we all faced and the long gasoline lines. The Federal Government briefly pursued synthetic fuel production. But once again, when the price of oil receded, interest in coal-derived fuels faded. And here we are again, with oil prices and talk of synthetic fuels both on the rise.

The Congress has a duty, a responsibility to the American people to do much more than simply coddle the oil industry and let history repeat itself. We also need to do more to discourage foreign oil cartels from temporarily manipulating oil prices for the sole purpose of destroying a competitive domestic fuel source.

And if my friends on the other side of the aisle were serious about coal, they would be pressuring this White House to back away, the two oil men in charge, to back away from its cozy relationship with those cartels. Instead, they want to roll over and give Big Oil everything it wants, no strings attached.

Furthermore, the Republican-led Congress had 6 years under the Bush administration to go about making meaningful contributions to clean coal and coal-to-liquids fuels. If Republicans in Congress were truly serious about producing the next generation of these technologies, then we would already be seeing these technologies coming to light today and the capabilities thereof.

I would remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that in 2000, President Bush while running for office pledged to spend \$2 billion over 10 years for a clean coal technology program, a program that the Democrats initiated in the 1980s. He never made good on that promise and allowed in only about half of the promised money while claiming credit for the full pledge.

During its tenure in leadership of the Congress, the Republican Party did nothing to buck the President's low balling for clean coal programs. Again and again, the President's party voted for his budgets to cut funds for clean coal research.

Now, if the other side were truly serious about supporting coal, they would have added funding to clean coal budgets and they would have done more to put coal on a more even footing with oil and gas. They did not, and now we are seeing the consequences of high energy prices that Americans are experiencing.

So the fact of the matter is that the energy challenges that our Nation faces demand more than rhetorical battles on the floor of this body. Certainly our constituents would agree, and they are feeling the energy pinch and deserve much better.

We need to put our energies into finding common ground to achieve real workable solutions to our energy problems. And towards that end, we need to be working on our energy challenge from two ends at the same time: The environmental end and the supply end. If we take that approach, then we can build a viable coal-to-liquids industry.

Unfortunately, too much of the talk in this body in recent weeks has been focused only on supply, and not enough of it has considered the environmental hurdles that we face.

As worldwide pressure mounts to address carbon emissions, the coal-to-liquids industry recognizes that to be economically successful, it must also be environmentally successful. But this administration has done nothing to help the coal industry address the environmental side of this energy challenge. So we need to invest more in environmental research and development, something that Democrats have been arguing for, but that our Republican colleagues during their 12 years in control of Congress have continually relegated to the back burners.

By failing to lay the environmental foundations for coal's future, this administration has opened the opportunity for foreign nations, most notably China, to bolster their coal fuels in-

dustry, putting our own Nation's future fuel production and economy at a disadvantage. This administration has failed to invest in new emissions technologies, technologies that we can use here and we can sell overseas; and, as a result, we risk watching worldwide emissions grow unchecked as we become more and more beholden to yet another set of foreign producers for our fuel, with China at the very lead.

So, Mr. Chairman, I say to my colleagues on the other side who keep coming to the floor on bill after bill and speaking about the energy crunch, which is indeed on the uppermost of every American's mind today and the high price of gas, that we do need to address this in a bipartisan way and in a way that uses all of our domestic sources of energy and in a way that does not coddle one domestic energy fuel over all others, especially when that energy fuel is trying for its own competitive advantages to put other domestic sources of energy at a disadvantage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I apologize for starting out here with my old profession as a teacher coming out. But the gentleman from Connecticut and a couple of others on this floor have said some things that I think bear discussion simply as a review on the fundamentals of how legislative government works around here.

Outside in the hallway we have the distinguished Speakers. Most of them are the most recent ones, but there are the four that I always consider to be the four great speakers of this House, one of whom was Thomas Bracken Reed, who is the one that transformed this House from a minority body into a majority body. He is the one who determined, in fact he said: If the tyranny of the majority is harsh, the tyranny of the minority is unendurable. And he was the one who prohibited the practice of calling a roll call and then not allowing people to say "here"; therefore, not having a quorum to conduct business. He forced the counting of a roll call, which made this from that time on a majoritarian body.

The problem we have over in the Senate is that has never been a majoritarian body; it will always be a minority body. It takes 60 votes to cut off the debate and move onward.

□ 1400

So even though today the Democrats have the leadership positions in both the House and the Senate, I would never jump to the conclusion or the inaccuracy of saying that the Democrats control Congress because the Democrats will not control the Senate until they have at least 60 votes there. It is a minority body.

In like manner, the conversation that Republicans controlled Congress for 12 years and didn't do anything has the same problem because in none of those 12 years did Republicans have 60 votes in the Senate. And, therefore, a minority body was actually in control.

We have had split government. We will probably always have some form of split government in that respect. But to assume that because there was leadership of both parties is not to assume the same basic core that goes along with that factor. And, indeed, over the last 5 to 10 to 12 years, there has been a great deal of energy discussion from this body, and when Republicans were in control of this body, there was a great deal of legislation dealing with energy that was passed in this body only to be prohibited from going through the entire process because this majoritarian body could pass something that the minority-controlled body on the other side could not do.

I appreciate the distinguished chairman from West Virginia of our committee speaking so passionately, especially about coal. I share that passion. We have a great deal of coal in my State. The only difference between the two is, unfortunately, the coal in the State of West Virginia is on private property.

I was so impressed when the chairman had a bill that dealt with wilderness and the coal companies were there to advocate for wilderness because it did not impact them. They were on private property.

In the State of Utah and much of the West, we have the exact opposite problem; the coal is found on public lands. And so I appreciate his commitment to the concept of coal, and even though it may indeed be a form of competition at some time in the future, I take his words as a commitment to try to work forward to try and free up the coal in the West that is on public lands so it can all be part of the energy solution that we are looking for in this Nation.

You know, we are talking about a bill that dealt with Washington. Washington led the troops in an era where he simply was out of ammunition. He had the opportunity of failing, but he did not allow it to be so because the American spirit worked out the details and then worked out the process so he overcame those competitions, those difficulties. The United States today is in the same situation. We are out of energy ammunition, and it is a significant problem for those who are on fixed incomes, the poor and the middle class. If you are rich, this energy problem which we face is merely an annoyance. If you are on a fixed income or a limited income, or if you are poor or middle class, then it becomes a significant life situation so that every dollar that they no longer can spend, that they now have to spend to energy on consumption, is a dollar that they can't spent on such luxuries as Hamburger Helper.

In this particular bill the Democrats accepted an amendment from one of the great young Republican freshmen from Virginia, Mr. WITTMAN. It is an amendment that is still part of this bill that aims to protect energy production and transmission in this particular trail system. It is a microcosm. It is



the appropriate thing to do. The real question then is why not? Why not do this same thing not just in this trail bill, but throughout this entire country so we can honor and protect to do that.

Mr. Chairman, what we are dealing with now is simply the concept of the future of where we are going. We can either find scapegoats or we can find solutions. I think it is time that both sides of the aisle look very carefully at trying to find solutions.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY).

Mr. HINCHEY. Mr. Chairman, I just want to emphasize how the Members on this side of the aisle are completely dedicated to energy independence and doing everything that is possible to achieve that objective. We did much to try to achieve it during the 12 years that our friends on the other side of the aisle held the majority. But they were not interested at all in achieving that objective, or moving forward in any significant way, not even in any real way.

One of first things that we did when we achieved the majority here last year was to pass a very substantial energy independence bill which moves us strongly in that direction. Not as strongly as we would have liked, but we had to be a little less ambitious about it because we were threatened with vetoes as well as opposition from the other side of the aisle.

But what did we manage to achieve? We managed to achieve energy efficiency for automobiles, the first time that had been done in more than three decades. The first time that had been done in more than 30 years. We achieved a great increase in energy efficiency. We wanted to make it more substantial. We wanted to go as high as 40 miles to a gallon, but the President said he would veto anything like that.

What else did we do? We moved towards creating tax incentives for the creation and purchase of other means of energy independence such as direct and indirect solar energy, and we are working very strong on trying to achieve that, in spite of the fact that the White House has said they are not in favor of it, they are opposed to that and would veto that kind of legislation.

They say that we are not in favor of drilling for our own oil off our own coast. Well, the fact of the matter is that we are not opposed to that at all. We recognize that we now have more than 150,000 wells drilled on the land owned by the people of the United States of America on public land, some of it here on dry land in the lower 48 States and up in Alaska, and the rest of it offshore, mostly in the Gulf of Mexico. That's what we understand. In addition to that, we have 68 million acres of land that has been also leased to these major oil companies but because they do not apparently want to

produce any more energy because they realize that if they produce more, then the price is going to go down, they are not drilling on those 68 million acres.

So the fact of the matter is we are moving as aggressively as anyone could, as intelligently as anyone could in the direction of trying to achieve greater energy independence for our country.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. SALAZAR). The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. RAHALL. I yield the gentleman an additional minute.

Mr. HINCHEY. Recognizing that we possess probably less than 2 percent of the known oil reserves in the world, we are doing everything we can to use that small amount of oil reserves intelligently and reasonably and in ways that are going to last our people for a long, long period of time. And we are saying to the oil companies either use it or lose it. If you are not going to use those 68 million acres of public land on which you already have leases, then give them up and let us give them to someone else. Let us lease them elsewhere. Let's have some responsible people go down and drill those wells and produce the oil we need which will drive down the price.

So don't say that anybody over here is against drilling offshore. We are very much in favor of it, and we know that they have the leases to do it, and we are doing everything that we can to press them and pressure them to live up to their obligations and responsibilities in the leasing of the public lands that they now control.

Mr. CASTLE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail Designation Act (H.R. 1286), which would designate the 600-mile route stretching from Rhode Island to Virginia traveled by Revolutionary War General George Washington and French General Count Rochambeau as a National Historic Trail, connecting the States of Rhode Island, Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia. The creation of this Trail will celebrate the Franco-American alliance and the victory of Generals Washington and Rochambeau who faced seemingly insurmountable odds. Importantly, H.R. 1286 will enable the National Park Service to support groups, projects, and activities associated with the trail's preservation and interpretation.

The Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail Designation Act was introduced to ensure that this history, in all its rich detail, is not forgotten. Although we often remember the victory at Yorktown, too often we lose sight of the heroic efforts of two nations, two armies, and two great men that made it possible. During this historic period the armies marched to Wilmington, Delaware, where the bankrupt Continental Army borrowed from Rochambeau to pay American troops. This designation has the strong support of many state, local, private, and public historic preservation groups and I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support its passage.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, as a longtime co-sponsor, I rise in support of H.R. 1286, the

Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail Designation Act. Students of American history are intimately familiar with the Battle of Yorktown, in which French and American soldiers forced the surrender of British General Lord Cornwallis, effectively handing victory of the Revolutionary War to the American Colonies.

However many Americans are less familiar with what preceded it—a harrowing nine state, six hundred mile journey of more than 6,000 allied soldiers from Newport, Rhode Island, through my home state of New Jersey to Yorktown, Virginia. Many historians identify this march led by George Washington, General of the Continental Army and French General Count Rochambeau along a network of roads, trails, and waterways as critical to the American victory at Yorktown and the eventual creation of the United States.

In Philipsburg, New York on August 14, 1781, having learned that a large fleet of French naval vessels was heading from the Caribbean Sea to the Chesapeake Bay, Washington and Rochambeau discarded plans to siege New York City and march to South-eastern Virginia, where another celebrated Frenchman the Marquis de Lafayette and his 5,000 troops were outmaneuvering Cornwallis, forcing his British troops to bunker down in Yorktown. With little time to prepare, Washington and Rochambeau led more than 6,300 American and French troops on a southward march to Virginia.

H.R. 1286 is an important piece of legislation that comes at a critical time. Despite strong grassroots support from organizations like the National Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route Association, and efforts at the state and local level, many historical sites associated with the American Revolution will be lost to development and suburban sprawl. This bill would designate the route as a National Historic Trail, allowing the National Park Service to preserve and link together sites along the trail. Moreover, this designation would preserve this important piece of America's heritage using existing roads and rights of way—without the federal acquisition of private lands.

Preservation of the Washington-Rochambeau route will allow American citizens and visitors alike to gain a greater appreciation of the magnitude and improbability of the American victory as well as the important and often forgotten role our French allies played in securing American independence. Americans need a sense of history and an understanding of history now more than ever. This trail tells an important story in American history, and I strongly urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail Designation Act, a wonderful piece of legislation which will preserve both our country's rich history but also its unique environment.

In the spring of 1781, French General Rochambeau and his army of nearly 5,300 men embarked on an expedition from Newport, Rhode Island, to Yorktown, Virginia, to aid General George Washington and the Continental Army in the American Revolutionary War. After traveling through Massachusetts, Rhode Island, and Connecticut, General Rochambeau joined forces with General Washington in Philipsburg, New York, forming a

Franco-American alliance. The Franco-American forces then traveled through New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, and Virginia, eventually arriving at Yorktown. At Yorktown, General Washington and the Continental Army, with the aid of General Rochambeau and his men, secured a decisive victory against General Cornwallis, effectively igniting a successful end to the American Revolutionary War and laying the groundwork for the creation of our new Nation.

Mr. Chairman, the Newport to Yorktown route that General Washington and General Rochambeau led their forces through reflects an indispensable piece of American history. Today, we have an opportunity to preserve this historically and ecologically significant route by passing the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail Designation Act. The legislation, introduced by my esteemed colleague, Representative MAURICE HINCHEY, will amend the National Trails System Act to designate the route as a national historic trail. Under this legislation, the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail will preserve a corridor approximately 600 miles long, from Newport to Yorktown in nine States and the District of Columbia. The Washington-Rochambeau Trail will include a section in my district in eastern Connecticut.

During General Rochambeau's journey to Yorktown, communities in Connecticut served an invaluable role with ensuring the success of General Rochambeau's mission, supplying necessary supplies to his troops. In June of 1781, General Rochambeau and his men began their march through Connecticut before joining forces with General Washington in Philipsburg, New York. In eastern Connecticut, the army established camps in Plainfield, Windham, and Bolton before arriving in Hartford. On the return trip, in October 1782, the Franco-American force again marched through the State after victory in Yorktown. In total, General Rochambeau's army made 47 stops in the State between the journey to and from Yorktown. The Washington-Rochambeau Trail will preserve these sites and educate residents and visitors on the significance of this piece of American history.

Mr. Chairman, as urban sprawl continues to threaten the integrity of this route, the passage of this legislation is needed now more than ever. Many of Connecticut's avid historians and devout naturalists are anxious to celebrate the bill's passage. As a cosponsor of this legislation, I ask my colleagues to join me in voting in favor of the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail Designation Act, to ensure this historic route is preserved for current and future generations.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 110-744, shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1286

*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 "Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail Designation Act".*

**SEC. 2. ADDITION TO NATIONAL SCENIC AND NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAILS.**

*Section 5(a) of the National Trails System Act (16 U.S.C. 1244(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:*

*"( ) WASHINGTON-ROCHAMBEAU REVOLUTIONARY ROUTE NATIONAL HISTORIC TRAIL.—*

*"(A) IN GENERAL.—The Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail, a corridor of approximately 600 miles following the route taken by the armies of General George Washington and Count Rochambeau between Newport, Rhode Island, and Yorktown, Virginia, in 1781 and 1782, as generally depicted on the map titled 'Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail', numbered T01/80,001, and dated June, 2007.*

*"(B) MAP.—The map referred to in subparagraph (A) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.*

*"(C) ADMINISTRATION.—The trail shall be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with—*

*"(i) other Federal, State, tribal, regional, and local agencies; and*

*"(ii) the private sector.*

*"(D) LAND ACQUISITION.—The United States shall not acquire for the trail any land or interest in land outside the exterior boundary of any federally-managed area without the consent of the owner of the land or interest in land."*

**SEC. 3. ENERGY.**

*Nothing in the amendment made by section 2 of this Act shall prohibit or hinder the development, production, conveyance, or transmission of energy.*

**SEC. 4. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, AND RECREATIONAL SHOOTING.**

*Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of the several States to manage, control, or regulate fish and resident wildlife under State law or regulations, including the regulation of hunting, fishing, trapping, and recreational shooting. Nothing in this Act shall be construed as limiting access for hunting, fishing, trapping, or recreational shooting.*

The Acting CHAIRMAN. No amendment to that amendment in the nature of a substitute is in order except those printed in part B of the report. Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report; by a Member designated in the report; shall be considered read; shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment; shall not be subject to amendment; and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 110-744.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

Strike the new subparagraph (D) added by the amendment in section 2, and insert the following:

*"(D) LAND ACQUISITION.—The United States shall not acquire for the trail any land or interest in land—*

*"(i) outside the exterior boundary of any federally managed area without the consent of the owner of the land or interest in land; and*

*"(ii) acquired from a State or local government if that land was acquired by such government through eminent domain."*

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1317, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, while this legislation prohibits the use of eminent domain by the Federal Government, it does not prohibit State or local governments from doing the same thing, in essence doing the same dirty work. So my amendment is very simple and clear. It prohibits the Secretary of the Interior from accepting lands from State and local governments that were acquired through eminent domain to expand this particular trail.

We are talking about George Washington and the Revolution. I think it is fitting to remember how strongly George Washington felt about ensuring private property and that his soldiers respected the property of civilians, even if they were a Tory sympathizer. He gave orders that forbid looting even though plunder was the norm of the time. And even though his men were hungry and dressed in rags, it is remarkable that in so desperate a situation with such a noble cause for which he was fighting, he imposed on his side such a high standard of conduct and a high respect of individual priority property rights.

In our world, the post-Kelo decision world, we cannot allow our constituents to fall victim to any abuse of power from any level of government that disproportionately attacks them, sometimes even disproportionately attacks those on the lowest level of our economic scales.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for a favorable vote to an amendment that simply says that the Federal Government will not accept land that is taken by eminent domain.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment addresses a concern that is truly far beyond the likely impact of this bill. The bill expressly limits Federal condemnation of land for the trail which is all that should concern us here and the National Park Service. This amendment seems to be based on the assumption that the Federal Government in some smoke-filled back



room conspiracy-type of mind-set is going to conspire with State or local governments to have them condemn land and then turn it over to the Federal government.

First of all, I don't believe this happens often, if ever. We have really reached an extreme level of detail here where we have to legislate out to the far corners of what anybody might imagine might some day happen. But for the sake of argument, let's say that a State does decide to condemn land and pay the owner for his property. Such a decision will be up to the State or local government acting in what that unit of government believes to be the best interest of its citizens. Whether the State or local government subsequently conveys the land to the Federal Government is irrelevant.

And I might add, just for the record, this is not a trail like the Appalachian Trail which cuts across country and private property, it is more a series of signs like those gray historic markers you see along roads all over the country. Most of the route travels along public highways and roads. No private landowner will be forced to let tourists on their land, and the NPS anticipates no Federal acquisition at all.

But nevertheless, in the spirit of bipartisan cooperation and all that I have just said, we are willing to accept this amendment. We think that it is unnecessary, but we are willing to accept it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 110-744.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. PEARCE:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

**SEC. 4. ENERGY AND CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.**

The Secretary of Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and private industry, shall complete and submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives, the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate, and Senators and Representatives from the States affected by the designation, a report using the best available data and regarding the energy resources available on the lands and waters included in the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail. The report shall—

(1) contain the best available description of the energy resources available on the land and report on the specific amount of energy withdrawn from possible development; and

(2) identify barrels of oil, cubic feet of natural gas, megawatts of geothermal, wind and solar energy that could be commercially produced, annual available biomass for energy

production, and any megawatts of hydro-power resources available, including tidal, traditional dams, and in-stream flow turbines, and any impact on electricity transmission.

□ 1415

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1317, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, America is faced with an energy crisis today, and solutions have not been forthcoming under the current Speaker of the House or her leadership. The majority has failed in its effort to take any meaningful action to increase the domestic supply of energy for the American people. In a State like New Mexico, a very moderate income State, probably \$25 to \$30,000 a year is the average income, we find that the price of \$4 gasoline is very difficult.

Last week in a story in the Albuquerque Journal, Associated Press talked about a young woman with cancer who was being treated almost 200 miles from her home. The family had to suspend visits by her young children to visit her because of the price of gasoline. Each day we're finding these sorts of impairments in our daily living while the majority simply says, we're in favor of energy.

I was listening with interest to the previous speaker, the gentleman from New York, and I would invite him to sign on a letter that we will be producing today that would go from the Speaker of the House to mention to President Bush about those 68 million acres of land that are not being used. Let's remove, first of all, the regulatory burdens that are stopping that land from being used and produced. In Utah alone, almost 1 million acres by one office which is 7 years overdue in putting out the land management plan that would allow people to move ahead.

Those are some of the acres that are moved from production that our friends talk about as if the greedy oil companies are sitting out here purposefully withholding production knowing that at all-time record highs, every company is producing every amount of oil and gas that they can get to, and they simply kind of twist the facts around.

So I would invite the gentleman to sign on to that letter indicating his willingness to press the President of the United States to push the BLM into getting these regulations out the door.

I would also be interested to see if the majority would recognize with us their failure in December by removing all shale oil from production. With one simple sentence in a bill in December, the majority removed almost 2 trillion barrels of shale oil from production, and again it tells me that maybe we have words on the House floor that differ from the words that are actually created in the votes.

I would also welcome our friends on the other side of the aisle to change their votes on the wilderness areas that removed over 100,000 acres from production because wilderness stops all development of oil and gas. And so again, I find some difference in the words that we hear on the House floor and the words that are actually put into place by law when we vote.

Additionally, there is a moratorium that limits 85 percent. We're told that the majority doesn't mind offshore production at all. Then go with us, sign a letter, and let's start producing just around the area, just in that spot where Cuba and China are drilling 47 miles off the coast of Florida. We have prohibited it ourselves through a moratorium in producing this oil and gas.

So I would ask the leaders of the majority party to go with me and sign on to this letter to take that one spot and let's allow American oil companies to produce where we're allowing the Chinese to produce within our Outer Continental Shelf area.

My amendment today to this House bill 1286 simply says that as we create this new trail system, we would like an accounting for all of the energy assets that are going to be affected by this bill. It's a very simple amendment.

The majority has, in fact, got a statement in the bill that says nothing will hinder, but too often we find that we do not know what has been hindered and what has not been hindered. So our amendment is very simple. Let's just get a report from the Secretary of Interior to tell us exactly what the stakes are, which resources might be limited, which might be hindered, and it's a very straightforward amendment.

I would appreciate if the majority would understand the reasons for this because we see every day that the American people are paying the price for the majority's opinion on energy. The opinion is that \$4 gasoline is not too high, that in fact \$4 gasoline will cause maybe a change within which we conduct our business; we ought to be converting to other forms of energy. The problem is we don't have wind cars, we don't have solar cars, we have no nuclear cars. America is on an oil and gas economy. We drive oil and gas cars, and as long as we limit the supply, we're going to drive the price higher.

It's not American consumption. American consumption actually has remained quite stable for the last 10 years. It's actually Chinese consumption. It's consumption from those developing countries around the globe that are pushing the price of oil higher.

Now, I did note with interest the comments that the majority party had done something for fuel efficiency. Actually, the majority party did nothing for fuel efficiency.

I ask for support for the amendment. Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise to speak on the amendment.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman from West Virginia is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, in evaluating this amendment, I would ask that Members first read section 3 of the underlying bill which states, "Nothing in this Act shall prohibit or hinder the development, production, conveyance, or transmission of energy." So by its own terms, H.R. 1286 will have no impact whatsoever on energy production.

The Pearce amendment would require the Secretary to assess the impact this trail designation will have on energy production. In other words, the Pearce amendment would require the Secretary to study impacts that would never exist. That's similar to a requirement that the secretary study the Tooth Fairy or the Easter Bunny. The bill says there will be no impacts, so studying them is impossible. Such a report would read in its entirety, "We find no impacts on energy production because the bill prohibits them." Period. The end.

It is my hope that this amendment is simply a platform, and I think the sponsor of it has already used it for that to restate some of their talking points on energy production. It's my hope that no one could ever seriously suggest assessing the energy resources that might lie under George Washington's front lawn.

The first part of this amendment is completely unnecessary because the underlying language in the bill makes impacts on energy production a non-issue. The second part of this amendment contemplates oil rigs and wind farms in places that we would never allow them to be built.

So once again, as with the previous amendment, this amendment is not necessary. Therefore, I will not object to it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chairman announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 424, noes 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 482]

AYES—424

Abercrombie	Bean	Boozman
Ackerman	Becerra	Bordallo
Aderholt	Berkley	Boren
Akin	Berman	Boucher
Alexander	Berry	Boustany
Allen	Biggert	Boyd (FL)
Altmire	Bilbray	Boyda (KS)
Arcuri	Bilirakis	Brady (PA)
Baca	Bishop (GA)	Brady (TX)
Bachmann	Bishop (NY)	Braley (IA)
Bachus	Bishop (UT)	Broun (GA)
Baird	Blackburn	Brown (SC)
Baldwin	Blumenauer	Brown, Corrine
Barrett (SC)	Blunt	Buchanan
Barrow	Boehner	Burgess
Bartlett (MD)	Bonner	Burton (IN)
Barton (TX)	Bono Mack	Butterfield

Buyer	Goodlatte	McCollum (MN)
Calvert	Gordon	McCotter
Camp (MI)	Granger	McCrery
Campbell (CA)	Graves	McDermott
Cannon	Green, Al	McGovern
Cantor	Green, Gene	McHenry
Capito	Grijalva	McHugh
Capps	Gutierrez	McIntyre
Capuano	Hall (NY)	McKeon
Cardoza	Hall (TX)	McMorris
Carnahan	Hare	Rodgers
Carney	Harman	McNerney
Carson	Hastings (FL)	McNulty
Carter	Hastings (WA)	Meek (FL)
Castle	Hayes	Meeks (NY)
Castor	Heller	Melancon
Cazayoux	Hensarling	Mica
Chabot	Herger	Michaud
Chandler	Herseth Sandlin	Miller (FL)
Childers	Higgins	Miller (MI)
Christensen	Hinchee	Miller (NC)
Clarke	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary
Clay	Hirono	Miller, George
Cleaver	Hobson	Mitchell
Clyburn	Hodes	Mollohan
Coble	Hoekstra	Moore (KS)
Cohen	Holden	Moore (WI)
Cole (OK)	Holt	Moran (KS)
Conaway	Honda	Moran (VA)
Cooper	Hooley	Murphy (CT)
Costa	Hoyer	Murphy, Patrick
Costello	Hunter	Murphy, Tim
Courtney	Inglis (SC)	Murtha
Cramer	Inslee	Musgrave
Crenshaw	Israel	Myrick
Crowley	Issa	Nadler
Cubin	Jackson (IL)	Napolitano
Culler	Jackson-Lee	Neal (MA)
Culberson	(TX)	Neugebauer
Cummings	Jefferson	Norton
Davis (AL)	Johnson (GA)	Nunes
Davis (CA)	Johnson (IL)	Oberstar
Davis (IL)	Johnson, E. B.	Obey
Davis (KY)	Johnson, Sam	Oliver
Davis, David	Jones (NC)	Ortiz
Davis, Lincoln	Jones (OH)	Pallone
Davis, Tom	Jordan	Pascarell
Deal (GA)	Kagen	Pastor
DeFazio	Kanjorski	Paul
DeGette	Kaptur	Payne
Delahunt	Keller	Pearce
DeLauro	Kennedy	Pence
Dent	Kildee	Perlmutter
Diaz-Balart, L.	Kilpatrick	Peterson (MN)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Kind	Peterson (PA)
Dicks	King (IA)	Petri
Dingell	King (NY)	Pitts
Doggett	Kingston	Platts
Donnelly	Kirk	Poe
Doolittle	Klein (FL)	Pomeroy
Doyle	Kline (MN)	Porter
Drake	Knollenberg	Price (GA)
Dreier	Kucinich	Price (NC)
Duncan	Kuhl (NY)	Putnam
Edwards (MD)	LaHood	Radanovich
Edwards (TX)	Lamborn	Rahall
Ehlers	Lampson	Ramstad
Ellison	Langevin	Rangel
Ellsworth	Larsen (WA)	Regula
Emanuel	Larson (CT)	Rehberg
Emerson	Latham	Reichert
Engel	LaTourette	Renzi
English (PA)	Latta	Reyes
Eshoo	Lee	Reynolds
Etheridge	Levin	Richardson
Everett	Lewis (CA)	Rodriguez
Fallin	Lewis (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Farr	Lewis (KY)	Rogers (KY)
Fattah	Linder	Rogers (MI)
Feeney	Lipinski	Rohrabacher
Ferguson	LoBiondo	Ros-Lehtinen
Filner	Loeb sack	Roskam
Flake	Lofgren, Zoe	Ross
Forbes	Lowey	Rothman
Fossella	Lucas	Roybal-Allard
Foster	Lungren, Daniel	Royce
Fox	E.	Ruppersberger
Fox (MA)	Lynch	Ryan (OH)
Franks (AZ)	Mack	Ryan (WI)
Gallely	Mahoney (FL)	Salazar
Garrett (NJ)	Maloney (NY)	Sali
Gerlach	Manzullo	Sánchez, Linda
Giffords	Markey	T.
Gilchrest	Marshall	Sanchez, Loretta
Gillibrand	Matheson	Sarbanes
Gingrey	Matsui	Saxton
Gohmert	McCarthy (CA)	Scalise
Gonzalez	McCarthy (NY)	Schakowsky
Goode	McCaul (TX)	Schiff

Schmidt	Speier	Walberg
Schwartz	Spratt	Walden (OR)
Scott (GA)	Stark	Walsh (NY)
Scott (VA)	Stearns	Walt (MN)
Sensenbrenner	Stupak	Wamp
Serrano	Sullivan	Wasserman
Sessions	Sutton	Schultz
Sestak	Tancredo	Waters
Shadegg	Tanner	Watson
Shays	Tauscher	Watt
Shea-Porter	Taylor	Weiner
Sherman	Terry	Welch (VT)
Shimkus	Thompson (CA)	Weldon (FL)
Shuler	Thompson (MS)	Weller
Shuster	Thornberry	Westmoreland
Simpson	Tiahrt	Wexler
Sires	Tiberi	Whitfield (KY)
Skelton	Tierney	Wilson (NM)
Slaughter	Towns	Wilson (OH)
Smith (NE)	Tsongas	Wilson (SC)
Smith (NJ)	Turner	Wittman (VA)
Smith (TX)	Udall (CO)	Wolf
Smith (WA)	Udall (NM)	Woolsey
Snyder	Upton	Wu
Solis	Van Hollen	Yarmuth
Souder	Velázquez	Young (AK)
Space	Visclosky	Young (FL)

#### NOT VOTING—15

Andrews	Fortenberry	Pickering
Boswell	Fortuño	Pryce (OH)
Brown-Waite,	Frelinghuysen	Rush
Ginny	Hill	Waxman
Conyers	Hulshof	
Faleomavaega	Marchant	

□ 1449

Messrs. YARMUTH, WITTMAN of Virginia, HOEKSTRA, HOYER, HODES, MCINTYRE, SOUDER and NADLER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended, was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. TAUSCHER) having assumed the chair, Mr. SALAZAR, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1286) to amend the National Trails System Act to designate the Washington-Rochambeau Revolutionary Route National Historic Trail, pursuant to House Resolution 1317, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

#### PERMISSION TO CONSIDER AS ADOPTED MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. RAHALL. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motions to suspend the rules relating to the following measures be considered as adopted in the form considered by the House on Wednesday, July 9, 2008:

House Resolution 1313, and House Resolution 1315.

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