

Conaway
Crenshaw
Cubin
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Dreier
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foss
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hulshof
Hunter
Issa
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan

Keller
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
Lamborn
Lampson
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
LoBiondo
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Mack
Manzullo
Marchant
Marshall
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris
Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Mitchell
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pitts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)

Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascarell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Platts
Pomeroy

Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rohrabacher
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Sestak
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis

Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz (MN)
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. 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 regarding H.R. 415.

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

There was no objection.

TAUNTON RIVER WILD AND SCENIC DESIGNATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1339 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. 415.

□ 1703

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. 415) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Taunton River in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, with Mr. McNULTY 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 Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

H.R. 415 would add a 40-mile segment of the Taunton River in Massachusetts to the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

Back in 1999, local residents approached their congressman, our late colleague Representative Joe Moakley, about securing a wild and scenic designation for the Taunton. Representative Moakley supported the idea and introduced legislation in the 106th Congress to formally study the river. The study was released last year and found the following:

All 40 miles of the main stem of the Taunton River have been found eligible for Wild and Scenic River designation based upon free-flowing condition and the presence of one or more outstanding remarkable natural or cultural resource values . . . Outstandingly remarkable values including fisheries, history and archeology, ecology and biodiversity, and scenery and recreation.

Specifically, the study recommended 26 miles of the river for scenic designation and 14 miles, including the lower Taunton, for recreational designation.

NOT VOTING—9

Boswell
Delahunt
Gilchrist

Green, Al
Inglis (SC)
Johnson, E. B.

Lucas
Pickering
Rush

□ 1656

Messrs. LAHOOD and STUPAK and Ms. RICHARDSON changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NOES—225

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney

Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Holt
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseht Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey

Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee (TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
LaHood
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowe
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN ENGROSSMENT OF H.R. 5959, INTELLIGENCE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009

Mr. REYES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk be authorized to make technical corrections in the engrossment of H.R. 5959, including corrections in spelling, punctuation, section and title numbering, cross-referencing, conforming amendments to the table of contents and short titles, and the insertion of appropriate headings.

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

There was no objection.

□ 1700

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Ms. SUTTON, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 110-761) on the resolution (H. Res. 1350) providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, which

Between November of 2004 and July of 2005, all 10 communities abutting the river adopted resolutions supporting the Federal designation. The Taunton Wild and Scenic River Study Advisory Committee, representing the local communities and State and nongovernmental partners, also voted unanimously to support the designation.

So based on years of study and nearly unanimous local support and collaboration, Representative FRANK introduced H.R. 415 in January of last year. The legislation is cosponsored by the entire Commonwealth delegation in the House, and the companion bill, which passed out of committee in the other body by voice vote, is sponsored by both Commonwealth Senators. H.R. 415 was favorably reported by the Natural Resources Committee by voice vote.

In short, Mr. Chairman, this proposal has cleared every single procedural hurdle placed in its path, and I believe it's high time we approve the legislation.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, a word about the proposed Weaver's Cove LNG plant. If the need arises, we can provide more detail, but for now let me simply enter the following facts into the RECORD: The Coast Guard captain of the Port for Southeastern New England denied approval for the proposed plant based on safety concerns in December of last year. In May of this year, the First District Coast Guard commander, Rear Admiral Timothy Sullivan, upheld that decision on appeal with a thorough review that included more than 50 pages.

In addition, the Commerce Department issued a decision last month finding that "the national interest furthered by the project does not outweigh the project's adverse coastal effects. Of greatest concern are the effects on navigational safety resulting from LNG tanker traffic called for by the vessel transit plan for the project."

These decisions by the Coast Guard and Commerce Department prohibit the Weaver's Cove proposal from moving forward for one simple reason: The proposal is unsafe.

The bottom line is this, Mr. Chairman: The Taunton is deserving of this designation and this has nothing to do with the safety concerns that killed the proposed LNG facility in the area.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 415.

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

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

If this body were a debating society or we were involved in a high school forensics tournament and this bill were the topic of the tournament, I would be giddy with happiness every time one of my teams was given the negative side of the debate because there are so many reasons why this bill is a bad bill for policy reasons that it would almost be a rhetorical feast for even the most inexperienced and naive of my high school debaters.

Let me at least start by addressing three of the main problems with this particular bill.

First, this bill is very clearly an abuse of the Wild and Scenic River language. In 1968 when this bill was passed, its purpose was to inhibit dams and locks along rivers so that there could be a free flow of water on rustic rivers. The verb used in that act was "preservation." The goal and purpose was preservation. Not rehabilitation, not restoration, certainly not economic advantage or economic development, but simply preservation. There are some elements of this particular river which have the qualities of a wild and scenic river, specifically the upper parts of the Taunton River. But the lower parts of the Taunton River, what is sometimes called segment 4, are the elements of this river which provide major problems. They are not and do not have the qualities of a wild and scenic river.

You've seen the pictures before. All you need to do is look at the pictures and you recognize this is not the design of a wild and scenic river as envisioned in the 1968 legislation. In fact, the only part of this river that's scenic is the graffiti that's found on the bridges and the human embankments that are part of this river system. The only thing that's wild about this river are the gangs that wrote this graffiti in the first place. These are not the qualities of which we are looking for. In fact, it doesn't take a rocket scientist to realize that if you are floating down this river, it is not a wild and scenic if you can look over and see the local McDonald's right there on the bank.

What we also have is the understanding that this lower portion is supposed to be for recreation. We could believe it would be for recreation if you believe that tugboat races or barge surfing would be considered recreational activities. This is not the kind of material that one would want to find floating in a river for Boy Scout troops to try to paddle their canoes around or by.

This bill simply violates the concept of the wild and scenic river. The wild and scenic river was never intended to go through an industrial park. It was always intended to be water that was surrounded by public lands so that you could control and preserve both the water and the embankment of those public lands, not something that goes through a privatized residential/industrial park.

Also, if you look at section 1 of the act that it specifically talks not only about preservation of the water but the embankment as well, that actually in a real wild and scenic river, the National Park Service is required to take the embankment as well up to a quarter of a mile away and put that aside. Obviously, you can't do this because there is no public land on this lower Taunton River, although the National Park Service does have eminent domain power; so if you really wanted to create

a true wild and scenic river, we could probably accomplish that deal if that was really what you are after.

This bill provides economic advantages to some elements but not to others. In 2002 the sponsor and other members of the Massachusetts delegation received an earmark to try to dredge this river, a fact which should disqualify it within the National Park Service criteria in the first place. Yet what it does now when we want to make this a wild and scenic river is simply take the law and turn it on its head. This bill gives current businesses disadvantages and some current businesses advantages, as is clearly illustrated in the newspaper articles that are coming from this area already where people are wanting to know what we do to see how it impacts, positively or negatively, their business operation. And that was never, never, never the intent of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Secondly, this is simply an abuse of the system, an abuse of power. In the year 2000, this Congress authorized a study of the Taunton River, the upper Taunton River. The authorization was for the upper Taunton River. The appropriation was to study the upper Taunton River. And yet mysteriously the National Park Service, a system that has millions of dollars of backlog, a system that has 37 studies still in backlog for Wild and Scenic River projects, a system that is always talking about how pressed they are for cash, volunteered in actual disregard to the legislative direction and legislative intent to study something never intended to be studied, never directed to be studied, and spent roughly \$400,000 to do it, in total violation to the aspect of Congress and the requirements of Congress.

One low-level employee within the National Park Service felt in some way compelled to violate Federal law to study the wrong part of the river and to spend money illegally to study the wrong part of the river and then in his report had the audacity to say, well, this would be the most developed river we would ever have in this kind of status. When asked why he did that, his response was very simple to us in committee: He did what the river would choose to do if it could speak.

□ 1715

He said that twice. Not only do we have a mid-level bureaucrat who is talking to water, but he is now interpreting the will of water. And if in 2002 it wished to be dredged and in 2008 it wishes to be wild and scenic, this must be schizophrenic water at the same time.

Here is the problem: When the National Park Service came up with their report, they did not come up with one alternative. The sponsor has chosen one of the alternatives to make part of this bill. They call that the "environmentally preferred" alternative. But there were two other alternatives

which I compare to the rational and the intelligent alternatives that did not include the lower Taunton River. And, in fact, in this so-called second version that has now become part of this bill, the report said it was problematic that there is no precedent for this kind of action, no precedent for this kind of action, but it does meet political expectations.

Let me give a third reason, and yes indeed, this is an energy reason. The potential LNG port which would be put in Weaver's Cove would have been the largest taxpaying entity. And it was not agreed to to move on so far, but it has not been stopped. This project is still viable until the year 2015. This bill, if passed, is the only way to permanently make this a moot issue.

This language is the language of the report, which simply meant that the current proposal was to be rejected but that they encouraged an additional proposal to try and work out the situational problems to be encouraged. And they gave them the time to do that. The actual report encourages them to review this issue one more time. So it is true that this issue of an LNG port is still on the table. And the only way it can be permanently taken off the table is by passage of this type of bill.

Now why would that impact me because I live in Utah and I really don't care about this river all that much? It is simply because one of the members of the delegation came down on the floor this morning and said that last year 350,000, according to his numbers, individuals in the State of Massachusetts had to be given subsidies under LIHEAP, paid by all the taxpayers of the Nation, because they did not have the ability to handle the energy crisis within their State and that, indeed, heat was not something that was negotiable. However, the problem is, why don't we simply solve the problem by providing the energy there so that you don't have to tell the citizens of Massachusetts to freeze in the dark but solve the problem yourselves?

There was an interesting discussion on the floor during the rule which the gentleman, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, was criticized for not having LNG ports in his home State. I wish to simply respond that it was a factual accuracy that has total irrelevance to the issue, because Washington State does not need LNG ports. It has gas pipelines. The entire West is provided by gas pipelines that do not reach to the eastern coast. The only way Massachusetts can step up and solve their own problem is by having not fewer but more LNG ports. That is the only option that is left to them. And this bill does inhibit that particular option.

Now with that are only three of the many reasons why this bill should not be passed, why this bill is poor public policy, why this bill does abuse the statute and change the meaning of the words that were intended for a wild and scenic river, why this bill does disrespect to this body and how we de-

cidated to try and do this study in the first place by ignoring the will of Congress and ignoring the authorization and appropriation of Congress and going off on some other particular way. And it does stop any potential improvements of an LNG port on this river which is desperately needed in that part of the country.

Those are only three of the possible reasons. There are others. I'm sure we will hear from those others as this discussion continues on.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Just one point of clarification before I recognize the sponsor of the legislation is the issue with the LIHEAP reference. LIHEAP doesn't address the ability to get energy. It creates a situation where people can afford to buy energy.

With that, let me introduce the distinguished Congressman from the Commonwealth, Mr. FRANK, the sponsor of the legislation, for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I want to begin by regretting the animus toward the people we represent that we've just heard. The gentleman from Utah said, "Wild and scenic. The only thing wild about this are the gangs there." The city of Fall River, the gentleman has an amendment that would exempt from this bill the city of Fall River, Massachusetts, a city full of working people, many of them immigrants who became American citizens, and their descendants, from Portugal and elsewhere, people who worked in the garment industry and the textile industry, a city which has suffered economically the fate of de-industrialization.

Characterizing them and saying "The only thing scenic about them is their graffiti, the only thing wild about them is their gangs," they don't deserve that denigration, no matter what political points people want to score. If you want to come after me, if you want to come after Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island or Mr. MCGOVERN of Massachusetts, we'll deal with it. But please don't denigrate these hardworking people. Don't impute to them gang activity that doesn't exist. The gentleman who accused them of gang activity has no idea of what goes on there and he makes an inaccurate statement.

The only thing scenic is the graffiti? Is that not scenic? This is the Battleship *Massachusetts*. It's part of a national park. It's one of the few battleships that comes with a Patriot missile, because I got Raytheon to put it up there. It's a park, a park for patriotic people. Do you see any graffiti on the Battleship *Massachusetts*?

In fact, that is part of the problem here. Apparently we're told it's okay to have a wild and scenic river. And of course we're not saying it should be wild and scenic. We are talking about a part of the statute that says you can have recreation. And these are people who have decided that in part because they have lost their industrial base

that they had for a variety of reasons, they will develop new economic activity that is based on their river.

By the way, one of the bridges that is talked about, one of these structures, we have gotten money to take down. Like a number of cities that walled themselves off from the river, Fall River has appreciated the great beauty and attractiveness of that waterfront. And they would like to tear it down.

But here is the issue. Is environmentalism only for suburbanites? Do working people who have found themselves in economic distress have no right to try and enhance the quality of their environment?

Let me have some more of those pictures down here. Let me have some more to show people what we are talking about. We are not talking about only what was pictured.

This is part of the area that would be banned from the bill under the gentleman from Utah's amendment. So is this. Part of it is Mr. MCGOVERN's district. Part of it is my district. It impacts the other districts. Yes, it is not everywhere beautiful. These are people who haven't had the good fortune to live always in land that was so attractive. But they would like to try and improve their situation. They would like to be able to enhance the quality of their environment without being denigrated as gang members or graffitiists. Yes, there are a few people who do graffiti. The overwhelming majority in every single community along this river on both sides has asked for this designation. It was begun by our late and beloved colleague Joe Moakley before anybody heard of LNG. By the way, on LNG, there is an LNG plant in the district of our colleague, Mr. MARKEY. We in the Massachusetts delegation overwhelmingly supported a second LNG plant just a little bit offshore, just north of Boston that has been approved. Many of us support a third one. It is not a case of rejecting LNG. And I notice that people on the other side, those who think Fall River is just full of graffiti artists and gang members and don't know that wonderful city and the decent, patriotic people who live there, they circulated an editorial from the Boston Herald saying this isn't needed. And the Herald editorial, the op-ed piece that they circulated, concluded by saying, of course, it's not necessary because the LNG plant is dead. It's not simply the current LNG plant that has been rejected. It was the Coast Guard saying that in that narrow waterway, with the bridges that have to be traversed, you can't do it.

Carlos Gutierrez said "no," the Secretary of Commerce. I've got to say, I didn't know that I would be defending the Bush administration so much here. I know I will be defending them against the Republicans on the questions of the housing bill. But we were also told there was this terrible conspiracy with the Park Service under George Bush. I don't think the Interior Department

under President Bush was engaged in this kind of chicanery that has been imputed to them.

We are talking about the desire of people who live in an area that has some industrial activity, but some residential and recreational areas, who want to protect what they have and make it better. They have asked us, and we have worked with them, to tear down an elevated highway. We are working with them to enhance the quality of their environment in a way that will also improve things economically. Every Member of Congress whose district is remotely near here strongly supports this bill. Every city and town along the way supports this. Every elected legislator and local official supports it. For them to be told essentially that "it's too gritty, it's too grubby, you aren't people who we had in mind when we talked about the beauties of the environment, you don't deserve this because you've had graffiti and some of you belong to gangs"—an inaccurate characterization of the whole city—to deny them that is I think a degree of cruelty, frankly, that I hope this House does not encompass.

I and others have tried very hard to take into account what other Members think about their districts. To repudiate what all of the Members of Congress, five of us very directly involved here, think would be important for this particular area because an LNG plant that has been rejected by the Department of Commerce and by the Coast Guard and cannot be resuscitated, might some day in 10 years be resuscitated, and by then we will have had enough other LNG plants that it wouldn't even have any demand probably, that these people should be told, just the 9 miles, conveniently, the city of Fall River, the urban area, the area of hardworking immigrants who became American citizens, that they should be told that they don't qualify for environmental protection is a decision that I hope this House would not make.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona and the gentleman from West Virginia for the consideration they have given. It may in part be relevant that these are Members who themselves understand the desire of working people, of people who have lived in these kinds of areas, to get the same kind of consideration for their environmental needs as wealthy suburbanites.

I hope that the bill is passed without amendments that would cripple it.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate very much the gentleman from Massachusetts standing up to defend his constituency. It is the right thing to do. It is the proper thing for him to do. It is his job and purpose. But once again, I want him to focus in on the reality of the situation, which is not the quality of the individuals in Massachusetts. It is simply the issue at hand. This, by the way, is that same battleship—assuming there should be a battleship in a wild and scenic river zone—this is the

same battleship from the other angle which is decidedly less pristine and much more urbanized.

But the issue at hand that the gentlemen on the other side need to deal with is that the purpose of the act is for preservation, not rehabilitation, not for economic development, which are the very words that were just used. That is not what the Wild and Scenic River Act was ever intended to do. And that is what is going to be done in this particular bill. That is why we are abusing the vocabulary of the Wild and Scenic River Act. And we must focus back in on what we are doing. Indeed, the proposed LNG port is in an existing brownfield, zoned for maritime industrial use. But the issue is for what purpose are the verbs and the nouns in the Wild and Scenic River Act supposed to be implied? And does it apply to the lower Taunton? And the answer is simply "no." It doesn't meet the definition.

With that, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia, unless, Mr. Chairman, you would like us to reserve and then come back.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 4 minutes.

Mr. GINGREY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I do rise in strong opposition to this bill, H.R. 415, a bill to designate parts of the lower Taunton River in Massachusetts as part of the National Wild and Scenic River system, especially, Mr. Chairman, in a time when American families are paying \$4.11 for a gallon of gasoline.

The gentleman, the author of the bill that just spoke and his colleagues from the Bay State, I will give them the fact that they want to do things for the lower Taunton and the citizens of their district that live on either side of that river. But this really, in my opinion, doesn't quite pass the smell test.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GINGREY. I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

□ 1730

Mr. MCGOVERN. Two questions. One is how does LNG reduce the price of gasoline at the pump for the average citizen? And two, how many LNG facilities do you have in Georgia? I think it is one. We have two up and running in Massachusetts and a third one permitted, so don't lecture us about not doing our part in addressing the energy crisis.

Mr. GINGREY. Reclaiming my time, basically in response to my friend from Massachusetts, it is the same response that my colleague from Utah made in reference to the gentleman from Washington State when this same argument came up during the discussion of the rule.

But as the gentleman from Utah points out, the whole purpose of this act, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, was not for redevelopment. And I heard

the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK) just talk about tearing down a highway, an elevated highway to make this area more scenic. I would like my colleagues to focus in on this poster of the lower Taunton River and see how unscenic it is. It may be wild, but it is certainly not scenic.

This act was never designed for redevelopment and for tearing down bridges and highways. This is not the time to do that. Clearly, this is not a wild and scenic river and doesn't meet that designation.

I would like to continue, Mr. Chairman, and say that when the Natural Resources Committee held hearings on this bill, representatives from the National Park Service testified that this area would be the most industrialized river ever to be given this designation.

Along the shoreline of the Taunton River, you can find a hair salon, a shipyard, a port area, and yes, even a McDonald's. Now, Mr. Chairman, I don't know about you, but I don't see anything that is scenic about this industrialized area.

Furthermore, as a result of this designation, this Congress would prevent future development along the river and would therefore prohibit the proposed use of the Taunton River as a terminal for liquefied natural gas storage and distribution facility.

Again I reference this poster, right here, this is 73 acres of that proposed LNG facility that I am talking about. When brought online, this facility would have the capacity to provide the needed heating oil for up to 35 percent of all New England households. Let me repeat that, the needed heating for up to 35 percent of all New England households.

It seems to me that this majority seems perfectly content to continue with flawed energy policy that prevents a major liquefied natural gas plant from being brought online, inevitably forcing them to later expand the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program, LIHEAP, to make up for New England's lost home heating ability. At a time when the domestic supply of energy sources is the most important issue in this country, the Democratic majority would rather stymie the growth of supply.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. GINGREY. The Democratic majority would rather stymie the growth of supply through this bill than to allow us to debate meaningful legislation that would help hardworking American families out of this energy crisis.

I urge all of my colleagues to oppose H.R. 415.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I think it is important to reaffirm that the United States Coast Guard has found that the Weaver's Cove LNG proposal was unsafe. The Department of Commerce came to that same conclusion. On appeal, it came to that same

conclusion. As a result, the Weaver's Cove LNG proposal is already dead. Decisions have already been made on that subject, and have absolutely nothing to do with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act or designation.

Mr. Chairman, with that, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and also cosponsor of this legislation, Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman. I have spoken at length about this issue this morning, but this debate is absurd. I mean, we have people holding up pictures that aren't even the right picture. The picture that the gentleman from Georgia held up, I should tell him everything south of that bridge is not covered by this designation. This is fiction that is being brought to the floor today.

The gentleman talks about LIHEAP. Yes, we do need emergency fuel assistance in New England. We have cold winters. But LNG doesn't translate into LIHEAP. And in terms of what we are doing to promote liquefied natural gas measures, we are doing much more than you are in Georgia. We have two facilities already up and running, and we have another one licensed. You know, Mr. GINGREY, help us out, do a little more in your State. Join in this cause to help us become more energy independent. Take your responsibility. We are doing it in Massachusetts. So please do not lecture us on the fact that we are not living up to our responsibility. We are.

The bottom line is, as Mr. FRANK pointed out, this is a debate about whether the hardworking people of Fall River and Somerset and other communities deserve to get this designation on the lower Taunton River. And they do.

And it really is offensive to hear the way these people have been characterized, the way these hardworking citizens have been characterized. I am proud to represent Fall River along with Congressman FRANK. These are good people and they don't deserve this and this bill, quite frankly, should not be subject to petty politics, and that is what is happening here.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I just want to point out, this is a park that would be excluded. Behind it you do see a superstructure. It walls off the city. That is what Mr. MCGOVERN and I have gotten money to take down, without regard to the wild and scenic, but we want to take this down and open up this waterfront even more. That is what you will deny us by killing this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield an additional 1 minute to Mr. MCGOVERN.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Chairman, I think we need to have a course in basic

energy policy here so my colleagues know the difference between liquefied natural gas and the gasoline you put in your automobile and the oil people use to heat their homes. I mean, listening to this debate here, it seems like you have no clue about the energy that our country relies on. So let's get our facts straight here. Let's stop the fiction and let's do the right thing. Let's pass this bill. The people of Fall River deserve it.

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

I appreciate once again the comments that have been made here. I appreciate the defense of constituencies. I appreciate that there is a difference between gasoline that goes in a car and gasoline that heats a home, and LIHEAP does deal with gas that does heat homes.

But once again, the issue is not the same. I want to focus on the issue. The beautiful picture you had here of the park does not qualify for the purpose of a wild and scenic river designation. That is why under the law, you are supposed to take a quarter mile on either side of the river and stop everything from that area. It is already developed. Development does not qualify even under the concept of recreation under the letter of the law.

This bill is bad because the study itself violated the law. Congress told the National Park Service to study the upper river and paid for a study of the upper river which has legitimate merits to it, and instead they studied the lower river in violation of the congressional directive.

Once they wrote their report, they still said it was problematic. There is no precedent for the lower river. It is still the problem of the details of what the river is supposed to be.

The department still recommends not doing this. The National Park Service recommends not doing this until the entire study has been totally completed. So once again we are back to this issue of what does it mean to have a wild and scenic designation?

The upper Taunton River has those qualities. The lower Taunton River does not because the purpose is for preservation, not for economic development, not for creating more urban parks, not for changing the landscape on the sides. It is for the purpose of preserving a river in its native state. That was the purpose of, and that is the intent, and there has never been a proposal to this date that is this far afield from the purpose of the 1968 act. Never. That is why there is no precedent ever for this type of action. That's why this bill should not go forward.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, how much time remains at this point?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona has 15 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Utah has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to

the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman GRIJALVA for offering me the time, and Chairman FRANK for sponsoring this legislation, H.R. 415, the Taunton River Wild and Scenic Act, and let me just say as a Member of Congress from an adjoining district in Rhode Island, I want to repudiate the comments to the effect that these urban rivers are not wild and scenic just because they are in an urban area.

We have the Blackstone River Valley Heritage Corridor which is the Woonasquatucket River which runs right into Providence, Rhode Island, and you have a very urban river. Well, I will tell you, it is right in downtown Providence. And every weekend you have roughly 250,000 people from my State descend on downtown Providence during the weekend in order to watch the water fire because it is one of the great activities along the riverfront that takes place that draws people down to the riverfront every weekend during the summer months, and the spring months and fall months.

We also have children from Central Falls and Providence who wouldn't otherwise know that they live near a river because most of it is overgrown and yet they live merely 20 yards from the river. And now a lot of that is being opened up and they are gaining access to it, and because of the Clean Water Act that was passed in the late 1970s, we are seeing some of the indigenous fish come back and we are able to see these children go out and go fishing on the river and be able to catch fish and go canoeing and see that they can enjoy the environment as well.

The fact of the matter is I for one cannot understand why just because a river is running through a city-like environment, why children and the people who live in that urban environment cannot enjoy that river any differently than someone who lives in a real suburban and rural area, and that is something I want to disabuse everyone from.

I certainly think that the people who live in our inner cities of America deserve just as much of an opportunity to go out and enjoy the water. Frankly, it is the only open space that many of them ever gain access to. When you look at Heritage Harbor that you have seen these pictures of where the battleship *Massachusetts* is, we have Boys & Girls Clubs and we have the Boy Scouts and so forth use that battleship *Massachusetts* every single weekend over the course of the summertime. They are down there in that battleship cove, and they come from Rhode Island and Massachusetts.

This is a very active park. I think this designation fits very handsomely into what the activities of that area are. We need to preserve that area, and I think it would be disastrous to have further development that would spoil what is going on there.

The urban centers of New England are coming back alive. We lost the

manufacturing. We've lost so many of the areas that were keeping the industrial revolution alive. What is bringing these areas back is the tourism and the creative arts. People want to come back to these areas for those reasons, and that's why we want to preserve them.

The last thing we want to do is destroy what we have here which is unique to New England and that is the aesthetic value of these communities by bringing in more new construction, and that's why we want to set back the clock and keep these communities the way they were when they were originally built.

So you're right, we want to keep them historically accurate, and that's why we want them preserved time immemorial and for our children and down the line.

So that's why I think the Coast Guard was right, the National Park Service was right, and I hope my colleagues join me and all of my colleagues in the surrounding area and every single community who has voted in favor of this designation from the surrounding area in supporting H.R. 415 and making this historic Taunton Wild and Scenic Rivers Act a reality.

□ 1745

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Once again I appreciate the comments from the gentleman, and I would like once again to try and focus on what is indeed the issue. The State of Rhode Island, the State of Massachusetts do, indeed, have coastal zone management acts in which they get Federal money to help maintain the quality of their coastal zones and rivers. The fact that they are cool rivers running in urban areas is wonderful. You can do it, it's great, but not under the definition of this act.

When the gentleman from Rhode Island says you want to put it back to the way it were, it disqualifies it from the concept of preservation of existing facilities and preservation of existing embankments. That's why you have struck too far when you go into the lower Taunton River.

Mr. Chairman, I have letters in opposition to this bill from the Shipbuilders Council of America, as well as from three companies who actually do business on the lower Taunton River who are worried about the kind of economic disadvantage they may be facing that I would like to be placed in the RECORD.

SHIPBUILDERS COUNCIL OF AMERICA,
Washington, DC, October 29, 2007.

Hon. BOB BISHOP,
Ranking Member, Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands, Natural Resources Committee, 1329 Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRIJALVA: I am writing to express the opposition of the Shipbuilders Council of America (SCA) to H.R. 415, legislation to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA) to designate segments of the Taunton River as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Specifically, SCA is strongly opposed to the inclusion under the WSRA of the Lower Taunton River (Segment 4).

The Lower Taunton River does not meet designation criteria for inclusion in the WSRA. The WSRA requires that a river be "free flowing" defined as "existing or flowing in a natural condition without impoundment, diversion, straightening, rip-rapping, or other modifications of the waterway". There is today significant industrialization along Segment 4 of the Taunton River including bridges, a power plant, sewage plants, marinas and shipyards, and granite bulkheads. In addition, this portion of the Taunton has been federally dredged for more than 125 years.

The SCA does not oppose designation under the WSRA of the upper portions of the Taunton River. However, inclusion of the Lower Taunton will harm existing businesses and jeopardize crucial industrial jobs.

SCA is the national association representing U.S. commercial shipyards. SCA represents approximately 40 shipyard companies that own and operate more than 100 shipyards on all three U.S. coasts, the Great Lakes and Hawaii. SCA member yards employ more than 30,000 shipyard workers. Our companies build, repair and maintain America's commercial fleet as well as small and mid-sized vessels for the U.S. military and other government agencies. SCA member yards also repair and maintain Navy combatant ships.

Sincerely,

ALLEN WALKER,
President.

GLADDING-HEARN SHIPBUILDING,
October 25, 2007.

Hon. JEFF BINGAMAN,
Chairman, Energy and Natural Resources Committee, U.S. Senate, 304 Dirksen Senate Building, Washington, DC.

Hon. PETE DOMENICI,
Ranking Member, Energy and Natural Resources Committee, U.S. Senate, 304 Dirksen Senate Building, Washington, DC.

Subject: Opposition to Bill S868.

Reference: Bill S868, To amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to include segments of the Taunton River in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BINGAMAN AND SENATOR DOMENICI: Please accept this letter expressing our concern about and objection to the above reference Bill S868, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA) to include segments of the Taunton River. If passed, this designation will prevent our company from maintaining and expanding our commercial waterfront facility and will cost the Commonwealth of Massachusetts much needed jobs in manufacturing.

Since 1955 Gladding-Hearn Shipbuilding, Duclos Corporation (www.gladding-hearn.com) has been located on the western shore of the Taunton River in Somerset, on a site where ships have been built for more than 150 years. In our 52 years, we have built more than 360 commercial vessels for service throughout the world. We also provide regular service and maintenance for vessels operating on the east coast.

With annual revenues of about \$18 million, we provide employment to more than 100 skilled shipbuilders of all trades and maintain active accounts with more than 800 vendors. We currently have 22 vessels under contract with a backlog extending into early 2010. These contracts include passenger vessels, pilot boats, ship docking tugs and patrol boats for the US Navy. In September of 2006 we were awarded a GSA Multiple Award Schedule on which we now have 8 standard vessels listed.

In order to meet our current contractual commitments and anticipated growing de-

mands we are investing about \$1,800,000 in new fabrication and storage facilities that will create the capacity for about 50 new skilled manufacturing jobs.

We are most concerned that the designation of the Taunton River under the WSRA will prevent us from maintaining and expanding our marine railway launching facility and our deep draft dock. In the last six months alone we have turned away several large new build vessel contracts because we do not currently have the railway capacity or draft to launch these vessels. As a result, we have submitted the first phase of our plan to the Army Corps of Engineers to increase the capacity of our marine railway. In the absence of the WSRA, we would not be required to apply for a permit for this project as it would be considered a maintenance project. But even though the Taunton River is only under consideration for the WSRA designation, we are subject the additional expense, time and scrutiny of the Army Corp and the National Park Service (NPS) under what appears to be very loose and subjective WSRA review process.

We applaud the NPS and the Taunton River Study Committee for their efforts toward designating the Upper Segments 1, 2 and 3 but strenuously oppose the inclusion of the Lower Taunton River (Segment 4) because it does not meet any of the "outstandingly remarkable resource value" criteria required by the WSRA. The WSRA requires that a river is "free flowing" which is defined as "existing or flowing in a natural condition without impoundment, diversion, straightening, rip-rapping, or other modifications of the waterway". By contrast Segment 4 can be mostly characterize by two bridges, a power plant, two sewage plants, several marinas and boat builders, a former oil tank farm, granite bulkheads, and a federally dredged channel since 1870. The Port of Fall River is the second largest port in the Commonwealth and is classified under the Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management Program as a "Designated Port Area". This policy "protects and promotes appropriate marine industrial development in port areas with key industrial attributes".

The NPS Taunton Wild and Scenic River Study fails to consider potential impacts on businesses and property owners along the river as it is required to do. We have no record of any attempt by the NPS or the Taunton Wild and Scenic River Study Committee to solicit our participation in the process of developing the Stewardship Plan and Draft Study.

If the "standards" to designate a river under the WSRA can be so distorted then what hope do we have to maintain and expand our waterfront facilities to accommodate the future growth of our business. Including Segment 4 of the Taunton River in the WSRA program is not what Congress intended for this noble legislation.

Very truly yours,

PETER J. DUCLOS,
President, Director of Business Development.

From: Donald V. Church, Owner, Seaboats, Inc.

Date: October 30, 2007

Subject: Act to Designate the Taunton Wild and Scenic River.

To: Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests and Public Lands of the House Natural Resources Committee

I have reviewed the most recent studies of the "Taunton Wild and Scenic River Study" as compiled by the Park Service. In my opinion, their report is totally out of context with the lower part of the river as I know it.

The upper reaches of this river are as described "wild and scenic", however, the lower segment 4 could not under any stretch

of the imagination be classified this way. The lower segment has power plants, old oil refineries, vessel repair docks, shipyards, bridges that should be removed, Battleship Cove Museum, yacht clubs, night spots and a designated port area.

Fall River is the second deepest harbor in Massachusetts, as such it should have been on a regular dredge maintenance schedule. Dredging has not even been discussed since the 1950s.

A few years ago, a rumor from the Newport, RI pilot office indicated that the Brightman Street Bridge would be removed. If this were to happen, I believe that the river from there north, would be open to economic development. The rumor, however, was unfounded. As a result of not dredging and the hardship of the restrictions of the bridge, Shell Oil was closed and the only gasoline terminal left in South Eastern Massachusetts is in Braintree, a loss for the area east of Fall River and South of Boston. Instead of economic development, it created an economic hardship.

Our company began in 1977 in Rhode Island as a very small organization. However, in Rhode Island we did not own our facility but were on leased land. Our company became concerned about the future as the mayor of Providence was repeatedly suggesting a complete revitalization of the harbor with the usual hotels, restaurants, aquariums, etc. with no room for commercial marine ventures.

With an uncertain future, we started looking for a more business-friendly city and were able to purchase our land and dock in Fall River, MA. The company relocated in 1991 and from a small start-up company, we have grown steadily and now have contributed over 24 million dollars to the economy each year, with a payroll over 5 million.

Seaboats is continuing to grow. We are obligated to an expenditure of another \$25,000,000 this year with a payroll of over \$5,000,000 and the possibility of an additional \$30,000,000 in equipment investment.

As with any business, if you do not continue to grow, eventually you fade away. If the lower Taunton River is designated as a "wild and scenic river", it will give the NPS the authority to review certain construction activities that require a federal permit or other federal assistance. Specifically, Section 7(a) of the WSR act stipulates that "No department or agency of the U.S. shall assist by loan, grant, license, or otherwise in the construction of any water resource project that would have a direct and adverse effect on the values of which such river was established or determined by the Secretary charged with its administration".

What this would mean in the case of the entire Taunton River is that any "water resources project" that requires a federal permit (such as a U.S. Army Corps dredging permit), and that involves construction activity that would affect the flow of the river, could be subject to review by, and require approval from, the NPS. The NPS has very broad discretion to consider whether a project will have an impact on the values for which the river has been designated as a Wild and Scenic River—for example, impacts on water quality or fisheries resources. If it is determined by the NPS that the project will have a "direct and adverse effect," the federal permit or other assistance to the project cannot be issued.

In conclusion, I cannot see any benefit to the economy by designating the lower portion of the Taunton River "Wild and Scenic" nor can I see any benefit to the environment. The only possible effect would be to stop economic development.

FORTIER BOATS, INC.,

Somerset, MA, October 25, 2007.

HON. JEFF BINGAMAN,

Chairman, Energy and Natural Resources Committee, U.S. Senate, 304 Dirksen Senate Building, Washington, DC.

HON. PETE DOMENICI,

Ranking Member, Energy and Natural Resources Committee, U.S. Senate, 304 Dirksen Senate Building, Washington, DC.

Subject: Opposition to Bill S868.

Reference: Bill S868, To amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to include segments of the Taunton River in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers Systems.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BINGAMAN AND SENATOR DOMENICI: Please accept this letter expressing our concern about and objection to the above reference Bill S868, to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA) to include segments of the Taunton River. If passed, this legislation will prevent our company from maintaining and expanding our commercial waterfront facility and cost the Commonwealth of Massachusetts much needed jobs in manufacturing.

Since the 1940s, the site now occupied by Fortier Boats, Inc. (www.fortierboats.com) has been located on the western shore of the Taunton River in Somerset. It has always been a marina facility. In our 30 years, we have built more than 500 boats for commercial and recreational use for service throughout the world. We also provide regular service and maintenance for vessels operating on the east coast.

With annual revenues of about \$1.8 million, we provide employment to 10 skilled boat builders of all trades and maintain active accounts with more than 300 vendors. We currently have a backlog of one year. We have just completed a new building adjacent to our existing building at the cost of \$1,000,000 in order to keep up with the growing needs of our present and future customers.

We are most concerned that the designation of the Taunton River under the WSRA will prevent us from maintaining and expanding our marine travel lift facility and our deep draft dock. We are now in the present stages of changing our facility to meet the needs of the Storm Water Prevention Act. In the absence of the WSRA, we would not be required to apply for a permit for this project, as it would be considered a maintenance project. But even though the Taunton River is only under consideration for the WSRA designation, we are subject to the additional expense, time and scrutiny of the Army Corp and the National Park Service (NPS) under what appears to be a very loose and subjective WSRA review process.

We applaud the NPS and the Taunton River Study Committee for their efforts toward designating the Upper Segments 1, 2 and 3 but strenuously oppose the inclusion of the Lower Taunton River (Segment 4) because it does not meet any of the "outstandingly remarkable resource value" criteria required by the WSRA. The WSRA requires that a river is "free flowing" which is defined as "existing or flowing in a natural condition without impoundment, diversion, straightening, rip-rapping, or other modifications of the waterway". By contrast Segment 4 can be mostly characterized by two bridges, a power plant, two sewage plants, several marinas and boat builders, a former oil tank farm, granite bulkheads, and a federally dredged channel since 1870. The Port of Fall River is the second largest port in the Commonwealth and is classified under the Massachusetts Coastal Zone Management Program as a "Designated Port Area". This policy "protects and promotes appropriate marine industrial development in port areas with key industrial attributes".

The NPS Taunton Wild and Scenic River Study fails to consider potential impacts on businesses and property owners along the river as it is required to do. We have no record of any attempt by the NPS or the Taunton Wild and Scenic River Study Committee to solicit our participation in the process of developing the Stewardship Plan and Draft Study.

If the "standards" to designate a river under the WSRA can be so distorted then what hope do we have to maintain and expand our waterfront facilities to accommodate the future growth of our business? Including Segment 4 of the Taunton River in the WSRA program is not what Congress intended for this noble legislation.

Very truly yours,

ROGER W. FORTIER,
President, Fortier Boats, Inc.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, let me yield to the sponsor of the legislation, Mr. FRANK, for such time as he may consume.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I concede three business people out of this whole area opposed it. So we did not pass this by unanimous consent. Three people were there. Fortunately, my area that I represent is not the Senate. You don't need unanimous consent. If you get 98.9 percent, that's good enough.

What particularly puzzles me, though, is the gentleman from Utah apparently thinks that Congress in 1968 reached the ultimate in wisdom and that because something was passed in 1968 it can never be changed. We're not talking about interpreting the statute, we're talking about passing one. And, in fact, our views of the environment have evolved.

As my colleague from Rhode Island eloquently put it, the nature of the economy of New England has evolved. Back then it was a very industrial economy. We have lost that industrial base for reasons not, I think, largely the fault of the people there, and they are trying now to go in a new direction.

So here is where it is. If you were ever industrialized, according to the gentleman from Utah, that's it. The environment is not for you. He says, well, why doesn't the State do it? Probably because we are talking about navigable waterways, and as there are limits to what the State can impose on navigable waterways. This is a navigable waterway. There is Federal responsibility. So we are coming here to the Federal Government to empower the State. Every single community there. Governors. The previous Governor of Massachusetts, Mitt Romney, was for this. The current Governor is for it. But again the gentleman says, well, because it didn't meet this definition of 1968 you can never do it again.

We are talking about recreation, recreation for the people there, and, yes, we are saying that there is an act of Congress. We look at the 1968 act, we look at our current views of the environment, we look at the needs of the people, and this is the question. This isn't a test on what was in the minds of

people 40 years ago who passed the bill. We are the Congress. We are now passing the bill.

The gentleman's amendment excludes 9 miles, the City of Fall River, whom, again, he characterizes, as, well, the only thing that's wild there are the gangs, the only thing scenic is the graffiti. That is a very unfortunate thing to say about a city of hardworking people in which there are a number of very attractive and useful institutions and places.

But the question is, do the people who live in that 9 miles—by the way, that's on both sides of the river, and there is a less-developed town across that my colleague Mr. MCGOVERN represents—are they to be denied the chance to maximize the quality of their environment? Are they to be denied this planning tool, overwhelmingly supported by the city, so that as we tear down this elevated highway, as they expand the open space, as they take advantage of the river, they can do it in a rational way.

The gentleman keeps saying, well, but what about 1968? What about 1968? Maybe it was a good year for wine.

But the notion that because a bill was passed in 1968, this Congress has lost the ability to make subsequent decisions, makes no sense.

We are asking you, all of us who represent the affected area, all of the elected officials in the area, the overwhelming majority of people in the area, give us this tool so that we can enhance the recreational character, improve our environment, and don't say that because we once had this industrialization, we don't qualify for environmental concerns.

EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENT,
CITY OF FALL RIVER,
Fall River, MA, July 15, 2008.

Hon. BARNEY FRANK,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRANK: I am writing to express my full support of the bill you recently sponsored, which is currently awaiting a vote by the House, to designate the Taunton River as a Wild and Scenic River under the federal Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. As the Mayor of the City of Fall River, which is situated on Mount Hope Bay at the mouth of the Taunton River, I recognize the river's value and am pleased to join you and other legislators (Representative James McGovern and Senators John Kerry and Edward Kennedy) in support of legislation that will protect this integral resource from further development.

As a sign of Fall River's commitment the City Council of Fall River passed a resolution on May 20, 2005, in support of the recommendation for designation of the Taunton River as a Wild and Scenic River. In addition, at that same time the City Council endorsed the Taunton River Stewardship Plan developed by the Taunton Wild and Scenic River Study Committee.

Thank you for recognizing the Taunton River's remarkable value and for introducing legislation that will protect it from development and industrial use. The City of Fall River appreciates and fully supports your advocacy efforts in this matter.

Sincerely,

ROBERT CORREIA,
Mayor.

CONSERVATION COMMISSION,
TOWN OF SOMERSET,
July 11, 2005.

TAUNTON RIVER WILD & SCENIC DESIGNATION
COMMITTEE,
Taunton, MA.

DEAR COMMITTEE MEMBERS: I am pleased to inform you that on May 16, 2005 the annual town meeting for the Town of Somerset was held, at which time article 28, to see if the Town would endorse the Taunton River Stewardship Plan and seek a Wild and Scenic River Designation of the Taunton River by the United States Congress, was unanimously passed.

Sincerely,

CHRISTINA A. WORDELL,
Secretary.

OFFICE OF THE TOWN CLERK,
TOWN OF FREETOWN,
Assonet, MA, July 6, 2005.

BILL NAPOLITANO,
Taunton, MA.

DEAR MR. NAPOLITANO: This is to certify that the following vote was taken at the Freetown Annual Town Meeting held on June 6, 2005:

ARTICLE 28: To see if the Town will vote to endorse the Taunton River Stewardship Plan developed by the Taunton River Wild and Scenic River Study Committee, together with its recommendation to seek Wild and Scenic River designation through act of the United States Congress. Submitted by the Board of Selectmen. Requires Majority Vote. Finance Committee recommends. Motion made and seconded to accept the article. So voted unanimously.

Sincerely,

JACQUELINE A. BROWN,
Town Clerk.

OFFICE OF THE TOWN CLERK,
TOWN OF MIDDLEBOROUGH,
Middleborough, MA, August 8, 2005.

TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN: I do hereby certify that the following vote was taken at the July 11, 2005, adjourned session of the June 6, 2005, Annual Town Meeting, at which a quorum was declared by the Moderator:

ARTICLE 30: Voted by a majority vote to endorse the Taunton River Stewardship Plan developed by the Taunton River Wild and Scenic River Committee, together with the recommendation to seek Wild & Scenic River designation through an act of the United States Congress.

Very truly yours,

EILEEN GATES,
Town Clerk.

OFFICE OF THE TOWN CLERK,
TOWN OF BRIDGEWATER,
Taunton, MA, June 22, 2005.

WILLIAM NAPOLITANO,
Principal Environment Planner, Southeastern
Regional Planning & Economic Dev., Taunton, MA.

DEAR MR. NAPOLITANO: This is to certify that the following article was unanimously voted at the Annual Town Meeting held on Monday, May 2, 2005:

ARTICLE 8. It was unanimously voted that the Town endorse the Taunton River Stewardship Plan developed by the Taunton River Wild and Scenic Study Committee, together with its recommendation to seek Wild and Scenic River designation through act of the United States Congress.

RONALD ADAMS,
Town Clerk.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN,
Somerset, MA, March 30, 2005.

Taunton River Wild & Scenic River Study
Committee,
c/o Bill Napolitano, SRPEDD
Taunton, MA.

DEAR MEMBERS: The Somerset Board of Selectmen would like to commend and congratulate you on your efforts to designate the Taunton River as a Wild and Scenic River under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Because the Taunton River is one of the most intact ecosystems in all of New England, the unfragmented habitat and natural estuary are regionally significant. It is imperative to protect this outstanding resource.

The Taunton River has the second largest watershed in Massachusetts. Funding generated from this designation would benefit the entire region. Fragmentation of riparian corridors, floodplains, and continuous upland habitat blocks must be prevented, as well as the spread of invasive species which could displace our native communities of plants and animals. Funds could be used to ensure water quality, protect cold water habitats and restore species and anadromous fish populations.

As a result of this study, we are addressing tidal restrictions in Somerset along the Taunton River at Labor in Vain Brook to improve the biodiversity of our unique marsh system.

The Somerset Board of Selectmen is pleased to endorse the Taunton River Stewardship Plan.

Sincerely,

PATRICK B. O'NEIL,
Chairman.
ELEANOR L. GAGNON.
STEVEN MONIZ.

CITY CLERK'S OFFICE,
Taunton, MA, May 27, 2005.
Congressman BARNEY FRANK,
Jones Building,
29 Broadway, Taunton, MA.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN FRANK: At a regular meeting of the Municipal Council held on May 24, 2005, the Municipal Council went on record endorsing the Taunton River Stewardship Plan by the Taunton Wild & Scenic River Study Committee together with its recommendation seeking wild & scenic river designation through the enactment of the United State Congress.

Your attention to this matter is appreciated.

Respectfully,

ROSE MARIE BLACKWELL.

SELECTMEN AND BOARD OF HEALTH,
Raynham, MA, June 13, 2005.
Re Taunton River Stewardship Plan

JIM ROSS,
Chairman, Taunton River Wild & Scenic
Committee, c/o SRPEDD, Taunton, MA.

DEAR MR. ROSS: At the November 16, 2004 Town Meeting, residents of Raynham voted unanimously to adopt the Taunton River Stewardship Plan and recommend to Congress that the Taunton River be included in Federal Wild & Scenic Riverway Program.

The Taunton River is and has always been vital to the Town of Raynham in so many ways. From an historical, agricultural and biological perspective, the Taunton River is of unequalled value to Raynham. It has important biodiversity and ecological value. It is a source of recreation of boaters, birders, fishermen and others. And it has great scenic value.

We are hopeful that Congress will designate the Taunton River as Wild and Scenic.

Very truly yours,

RANDALL A. BUCKNER,
Town Administrator.

City of Fall River, In City Council.

Be it resolved, that the City Council of Fall River hereby supports the recommendation for designation of the Taunton River as a Wild and Scenic River through act of the United States Congress, with the southern boundary of this designation defined as the south side of the Braga Bridge, and

Be it further resolved, that the City Council endorses the Taunton River Stewardship Plan developed by the Taunton Wild and Scenic River Study Committee.

In City Council May 10, 2005

Adopted, 9 yeas.

Approved May 20, 2005, Edward M. Lambert, Jr., Mayor.

TOWN CLERK, TREASURER
AND COLLECTOR,
Dighton, MA.

I, Susana Medeiros, duly appointed Clerk of the Town of Dighton, Massachusetts, hereby certify that the following is a true copy of an extract from the minutes of the Annual Town Meeting duly called and held on June 6, 2005:

Article 18. Voted: On motion of James Dights that the Town will endorse the Taunton River Stewardship Plan developed by the Taunton River Wild and Scenic Study Committee, together with its recommendation to seek Wild and Scenic River designation through act of the United States Congress.

Witness my hand and the seal of the Town of Dighton this 6th day of July 2005.

SUSANA MEDEIROS.

TOWN OF BERKLEY,
OFFICE OF TOWN CLERK, TREASURER,
Berkley, MA, July 6, 2005.

BILL NAPOLITANO,
SRPEDD,
Taunton, MA.

DEAR MR. NAPOLITANO: As duly qualified Town Clerk of the Town of Berkley, I hereby certify the following action taken June 6, 2005 at the annual Town Meeting.

Article 32: Voted: That the Town endorse the Taunton River Stewardship Plan developed by the Taunton River Wild and Scenic Study Committee together with its recommendation to seek Wild and Scenic River designation through act of the United States Congress.

A true copy of record.

ATTEST:
CAROLYN AWALT,
Town Clerk.

TOWN OF HALIFAX,
OFFICE OF THE TOWN CLERK,
Halifax, MA.

As Town Clerk for the Town of Halifax, I certify that the following Article was voted upon at the duly notified Annual Town Meeting held on May 9, 2005.

Article 28: Voted to endorse the Taunton River Stewardship Plan developed by the Taunton River Wild & Scenic Study Committee together with its recommendations to seek Wild & Scenic River designations through an act of the United States Congress.

Proposed by the Board of Selectmen (T. Garron).

Passed Unanimously.

ATTEST:
MARCIE K. COLE,
Town Clerk.

TOWN OF LAKEVILLE,
TOWN OFFICE BUILDING
Lakeville, MA, December 2, 2004.

TAUNTON WILD & SCENIC RIVER STUDY COMMITTEE,
c/o BILL NAPOLITANO,
SRPEDD, Taunton, MA.

DEAR MEMBERS: The Lakeville Board of Selectmen would like to commend and congratulate you on your efforts to designate the Taunton River as a Wild & Scenic River under the Wild & Scenic River Act. Because the Taunton River is one of the most intact ecosystems in all of New England, the unfragmented habitat and natural estuary are regionally significant. It is imperative to protect this outstanding resource.

The Taunton River has the second largest watershed in Massachusetts. Funding generated from this designation would benefit the entire region. Fragmentation of riparian corridors, floodplains, and contiguous upland habitat blocks must be prevented, as well as, the spread of invasive species which could displace our native communities of plants and animals. Funds could be used to ensure water quality, protect cold water habitats and restore rare species and anadromous fish populations.

We were especially impressed with the Action Strategy. Recognizing that public awareness is vital as we struggle to protect our water resources, Lakeville held its first Biodiversity Day event this year at Ted Williams Camp. We hope to expand the event and continue to celebrate biodiversity every year.

The Lakeville Board of Selectmen is pleased to endorse the Taunton River Stewardship Plan.

Sincerely,

GERALD R. WHITE,
Chairman.
CHAWNER HURD.
RICHARD F. LACAMERA.

TOWN OF SOMERSET,
HISTORICAL COMMISSION,
Somerset, MA, April 23, 2005.

SHEILA WEINBERG,
VIRGINIA JACKSON,
CO-CHAIRWOMEN, SOMERSET, MA.

BOARD OF SELECTMEN: This letter is to inform the board of selectmen of the Historical Commission's support of the Taunton River Wild and Scenic River project.

We would ask that the board of selectmen and Congress endorse the Taunton River Stewardship Plan developed by the Taunton River Wild and Scenic Study Committee, in their efforts to secure a designation for the Taunton River as a National Wild and Scenic River.

We believe this designation would insure the preservation of the Taunton River corridor as an intact river ecosystem and regional resource.

Thank you for your attention to this matter and your support of this project.

Respectfully submitted,

SHERRY L. GALLIPEAU,
Recording Secretary, Somerset Historical
Commission.

TOWN OF SOMERSET,
CONSERVATION COMMISSION,
Somerset, MA, March 25, 2005.

Re Congressional Designation of the Taunton River of Massachusetts as a "Wild and Scenic River"

Hon. SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: The town of Somerset Massachusetts Conservation Commission hereby respectfully requests that the Congress of the United States designate the

Taunton River as a "Wild and Scenic River" of the United States.

Sincerely yours,

TIMOTHY TURNER,
Chairman, Somerset
Conservation Commission.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, once again, I appreciate the fact that the gentleman from Massachusetts, his views may have evolved. The law has not. We are a nation of laws, not what we wish it to be, but what the law is.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Let me yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. That is a most extraordinary misunderstanding of the law. Yes, there was a law in 1968. Guess what this will be if we pass it—a new law. The notion that a law passed in 1968 somehow defies this Congress of the ability to pass a subsequent law incorporating current judgment doesn't make any sense to me.

You're not in court here arguing. The question is, does this Congress have the right to take into account evolved views to amend the law? Yes, there is a law on the books. If the law on the books, I would say to the gentleman, covered this, we wouldn't need this law, but this is a law that we would pass. So the notion that there was a prior law really makes less sense than a lot of other things I have heard today, which says a lot.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to close. Let me inquire of my colleague how many speakers he has.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I will be happy to close when you are ready.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate once again the discussion that we have had here today.

The gentleman from Massachusetts, who is the chairman of a very important committee, does a great job, charming, witty, one of the funniest Members we have in Congress, actually said what my close was going to be. Someone once asked me, why do I care about this? I'm from Utah. I don't care about this river in Massachusetts.

And you're right. I really don't. I didn't get involved in this issue by choice. The gentleman introduced a bill that had to come to my committee.

But the reason that I do care is because exactly what the gentleman from Massachusetts said. We are attempting, in a vote, by a majority vote, to change the definition of law.

When I was in college, I had a professor that told me that all those men that went to the Constitutional Convention had baggage that they took, which meant they had a common educational, classic educational system. They understood what they were talking about. They went back to the concepts of Aristotle, who loved to make

definitions of everything. He said government was of the one, the few, and the many, and it could be either good or bad depending upon the attitude of those who were empowered to govern.

Government that was good is a government where the people, the leaders of that government, cared about the individuals and were self-sacrificing. Government that was bad is where the people didn't care and they tried to make things for themselves.

Then he gave definitions to that. So a government of one that was good was a monarchy, called a monarch back then, that's positive. Government of one that was bad was a tyranny. It is no coincidence that Thomas Jefferson, when he wrote the Declaration of Independence, of all the terms he could use to describe King George called him a tyrant, because it harkened back to their common understanding of classical literature and everything that Aristotle wrote.

The government of the many that was good, he called a polity. The government of the many that was bad, bad intentions, bad mindset, he called a democracy.

That's one of the reasons why we very seldom used the term "democracy" for the first 150-plus years of this country. The idea was that the worst form of government is one in which by a majority vote you can either take property from someone else and redistribute it or you can change the definition of the law—by a majority vote.

And that's why I object to this bill, because that is exactly what we are trying to do. The language of the original act is still clear and has not been changed. The language is clear, and that's why the Park Service did say that this proposal for the lower Taunton is without precedent, that it is problematic, that it does have its problems, because the law and the words of the law need to have a meaning. The law gives us guidelines. It gives us parameters. It protects the minority at the same time it directs the majority.

It's just like if we ever come to a point of time where by a majority vote we can come in here and change the meaning of the law, we have moved to the time where we are back with Petrucchio and Bianca, where the sun is the moon and night is day and by a majority vote we can accomplish it, and that is why I am so opposed to this bill because it is exactly what the gentleman said and exactly what we are doing.

By a majority vote, we are going to change the definition of wild and scenic rivers. By a majority vote. So I really don't care if you want to do this, if it's nice, if it enhances the attitude of any kind of urban area, it is not explicit with the letter of the law and with the spirit of the law, with the understanding of the law, which is why you are supposed to take a quarter mile of an embankment on either side of the designation and keep it free from development, for preservation pur-

poses, not economic discovery and not economic development.

I have great concerns, and I have expressed this many times, with the process that we have. At no time in the debate on this floor have we had more than perhaps a half dozen Members who have heard the debate and participated in it, perhaps a larger number are listening, but what will soon happen is we will call for the vote on this bill, and through those doors will come 300 Members who have not heard the debate and do not understand the issue of this bill. They will look up on the screen and say, it's an issue, it's a bill for Mr. FRANK, and they will say, I like him. He may be of my party. I'll vote for him. He's an influential chairman. I'll support him. He is a very nice person. He is a very funny person. He is probably the best debater we have on the floor, and I'll vote for it.

But that is not the reason, and that is not a rationale for changing law by vote instead of changing the words. Words have meaning.

And if we ever deny that words have meaning, we no longer have the rule of law. All we have is what Aristotle warned and threatened and criticized that our attitude is going to be what drives us in the future, not what we should do, but what we want to do at the time.

So, yes, it is important what the 1968 bill says. Yes, it is important. Yes, the upper Taunton River has all the qualities for which the gentleman wants. And, yes, the lower Taunton River does not. I don't care whether you are talking about LNG ports or not, it doesn't meet the qualifications of a wild and scenic river.

Until we change the law, we should not, by a simple majority vote on this bill, try and change the definitions of those words. That is why I, from Utah, care about this river.

Because if we can change the meaning of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by this vote, there is no river in America that is not in danger of being made wild and scenic if you have enough votes to do it. There is no law that can stand if you have enough votes to do it, which is why this is supposed to be a republic, why the words have meaning and the words of the law are significant and important.

That's why I beseech the handful of Members of this floor who actually are listening to this debate to please understand the rudiments of this debate and the significant issue that we are doing right here. That's why we are making this significant. That's why we are putting this. That's why I am opposed to this bill.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, notwithstanding the wonderful personal attributes of Mr. FRANK, this bill, in and of itself, has tremendous merit, and that is why we brought it here for support by our colleagues. I should remind all our colleagues that this par-

ticular scenic river, the Taunton, was studied under the 1968 law, met the criteria for designation and, consequently, that is what the study recommended after 7 years of study.

Another point I think is important, as I pointed it out in the opening statement, the lower portion of the Taunton River from Muddy Cove to the Route 195 bridge in Fall River is being designated a recreational river, rather than a wild and scenic designation.

This designation is reserved for river stretches that are accessible by road or railroad, may have development, may have undergone some impoundment or diversion, but that offer outstanding opportunity for recreation.

□ 1800

The lower Taunton fits that description perfectly. The National Park Service, as I mentioned, spent 7 years studying this river, working with local communities. And I mention that because if we are going to value opinions, as my colleague from Utah was speaking, then I think a very democratic response needs to be a supportive response as well to the near unanimity of support for this designation by local communities, the elected officials, and the delegation from the State. I think that merits a value, and that value should be to extend support and credibility to their desires to have this designation occur.

I would also caution, on that note, caution my colleagues against substituting our own judgment when we do not represent the area, have not participated in or reviewed the study. This is an 80-page study that found this designation appropriate and recommended that designation.

Further, we were talking about precedent. There are several examples of other rivers, the Lower Delaware in New Jersey, the Allegheny in Pennsylvania, the Sudbury, Assabet and Concord Rivers in Massachusetts, which have similar levels of nearby development and represent very successful designations under the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. At least, I might mention, at least two of these rivers I just mentioned, by the way, passed the House under Republican rule on suspension.

H.R. 415 is an important piece of legislation. It incorporates the designation, it incorporates the use by urban communities of the designation. It is fitting and it has been verified through study and through the cooperative work of all the communities and the delegation. I ask for its support and urge a "yes" vote.

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources, which reported the pending legislation sponsored by the gentleman from Massachusetts, Chairman BARNEY FRANK, in support of this measure.

The 106th Congress authorized a study of the river to determine whether it is eligible for such designation. The National Park Service released a report in June of last year, finding that the river is eligible and identifying designation of the entire 40-mile segment as the environmentally preferred alternative.

H.R. 415 implements the study's findings by amending the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to add the Taunton River.

Some apparently feel that, in their opinion, the lower portion of the Taunton River is not deserving of designation. I would first point out that the bill designates this portion of the river as a recreational river—not as a wild or scenic river. This is a designation intended for river segments just like the lower Taunton.

More important, the experts at the National Park Service, the entire Massachusetts congressional delegation, and the 10 local communities along the banks, all think the river does qualify for designation and, with all due respect, their opinions are more informed. Opponents of this river designation have attempted to link this legislation to the apparent demise of a liquefied natural gas facility that had once been proposed along the banks of the Taunton.

Approval for the LNG facility was denied—twice—by the United States Coast Guard for reasons having nothing to do with the wild and scenic designation. In fact, the designation was proposed long before the LNG facility was announced.

This is a good piece of legislation, the river is worthy of designation, and I urge the adoption of this measure.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this bill.

Many of my Republican friends seem to think that they know better than the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and its elected representatives when it comes to meeting our state's energy needs. They claim to know not only how much LNG we need in our region, but also where these LNG terminals should be located.

I have some news for my Republican friends: you have been sold a bill of goods by the developer of the failed Weaver's Cove project, a project that was rejected by the Coast Guard which will never be built. Before you shed another crocodile tear about our need for LNG, I would like to share with you some facts about LNG in Massachusetts.

The fact is that the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has more LNG terminals in operation or approved by both Federal and State regulators than any other State in the Union! We already have two LNG importation terminals in operation, and we also have a third terminal that will become operational by next year.

Now that is a larger number of LNG terminals than is currently in place in any other State of the Union. In fact—when all three terminals are in place, we will have more LNG terminals in Massachusetts than Texas and Louisiana have today.

So, my Republican friends should stop shedding those crocodile tears about the need for more LNG in Massachusetts. Our State has already seen that need, and we have already responded to it.

Since 1971, there has been an LNG terminal in my district in Everett, Massachusetts. That terminal has been in operation longer than any other LNG importation terminal in the country. In fact, between 1971 and 2003, the Everett terminal has received about half of all of the LNG imported into the United States. The Everett terminal has two LNG storage tanks that have a combined storage capacity of 3.4 billion cubic feet, and the terminal can vaporize this LNG into natural gas at a rate of

approximately 1 billion cubic feet each day. Now, this is a facility that is located right in the middle of a densely populated urban area, and never could be built there today due to safety and security concerns.

But we need the gas that this facility produces, so we are forced to continue operating it. The Everett LNG terminal, currently operated by the Suez company, today meets 20 percent of New England's annual natural gas demand. The local natural gas distribution companies served by this terminal store the LNG that they receive from the Everett terminal in satellite terminals all around New England. That allows this LNG to meet an additional 15 percent of New England's peak natural gas demand. So, nearly 40 percent of New England's peak demand for natural gas is served by the existing Everett facility.

Now, in addition to the Everett LNG terminal, the Commonwealth of Massachusetts has also approved two additional offshore LNG terminals to meet our future demand. We learned from the lesson of Everett with these facilities, and wisely chose to locate them offshore, away from any populated areas where they could be an attractive target to terrorists.

The first offshore LNG terminal is called the Northeast Gateway. It is owned by a company called Excelerate, and it is located about 13 miles off the coast north of Boston in Massachusetts Bay. This offshore facility re-gasifies the LNG on the tanker ship, turning it back into natural gas, and then sends that gas into the existing HUB line, which is a natural gas pipeline off our coast. The Excelerate LNG facility received 1 billion cubic feet of natural gas in March, but has received no additional LNG deliveries since then because of low demand. According to Excelerate, this offshore terminal is capable of accommodating up to 800 million cubic feet of natural gas each day future growth, though they initially are projecting that it would operate at a rate of 500 million cubic feet per day and a peak capability to 600 million cubic feet per day.

In addition to this first offshore LNG terminal, there is also a second LNG terminal, which is being built by Suez, the owner of the Everett LNG terminal. Neptune, a liquefied natural gas, LNG, offshore deepwater port, is also being built approximately 10 miles off the coast of Gloucester. Neptune has received all Federal, State and local permits and approvals to proceed with construction. Pipeline construction and testing are planned for mid-July through September 2008. Work on the pipeline connection to HubLine and the buoy installation are scheduled to begin in May and end in September 2009. Neptune will be prepared to receive LNG shipments by late 2009.

When completed, the Neptune LNG project will be capable of delivering approximately 400 million cubic feet per day of natural gas to the region, or enough to heat 1.5 million homes, and 750 million cubic feet per day a peak winter day.

So, the bottom line is that with these two new facilities, we will be going from an LNG capacity of 750 million metric cubic feet per day of natural gas, and 1 billion cubic feet per day in peak periods, up to 1.65 billion cubic feet per day routine delivery capacity, and 2.45 billion peak delivery capacity.

The proposed LNG terminal at Weaver's Cove has been rejected by the Coast Guard. It is opposed by virtually every elected official in Massachusetts. It would be located right in

the middle of an urban area, just like Everett. It makes no sense from a security standpoint in a post-9/11 world. The Coast Guard has already said no to Weaver's Cove. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts has already said no. The developer doesn't like that, but his proposal has been rejected. It is going nowhere. It's not going to happen.

It also makes little economic sense to build this facility, at this location, at this time. There is not sufficient economic justification for this facility in light of the three existing or planned LNG terminals in our State. These three existing LNG facilities can meet our State's needs for natural gas for many, many years, and if we need to build another LNG terminal in the future, our State has already demonstrated that we are willing to move quickly to approve the siting of offshore LNG terminals that allow LNG to be imported into our State without any of the safety or terrorism risks associated with the siting of another urban LNG terminal.

So, don't pretend that this bill to designate the Taunton River as a wild and scenic river has anything to do with LNG. The Commonwealth of Massachusetts does not need this facility. Federal regulators have already rejected it. We already have two LNG terminals in our State, with a third on the way, and if we need more LNG in the future we can build more offshore terminals. We've demonstrated a willingness and ability to do so.

I urge the adoption of the bill.

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

The CHAIRMAN. All time for general debate has now expired. Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill 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 committee amendment is as follows:

H.R. 415

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

SECTION 1. DESIGNATION OF TAUNTON RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.

Section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“() TAUNTON RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.—*The main stem of the Taunton River from its headwaters at the confluence of the Town and Matfield Rivers in the Town of Bridgewater downstream 40 miles to the confluence with the Quequechan River at the Route 195 Bridge in the City of Fall River, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior in cooperation with the Taunton River Stewardship Council as follows:*

“(A) *The 18-mile segment from the confluence of the Town and Matfield Rivers to Route 24 in the Town of Raynham, as a scenic river.*

“(B) *The 5-mile segment from Route 24 to 0.5 miles below Weir Bridge in the City of Taunton, as a recreational river.*

“(C) *The 8-mile segment from 0.5 miles below Weir Bridge to Muddy Cove in the Town of Dighton, as a scenic river.*

“(D) *The 9-mile segment from Muddy Cove to the confluence with the Quequechan River at the Route 195 Bridge in the City of Fall River, as a recreational river.”.*

SEC. 2. MANAGEMENT OF TAUNTON RIVER, MASSACHUSETTS.

(a) TAUNTON RIVER STEWARDSHIP PLAN.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Each river segment added to section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

by section 1 of this Act shall be managed in accordance with the Taunton River Stewardship Plan, dated July 2005 (including any amendment to the Taunton River Stewardship Plan that the Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this section as the "Secretary") determines to be consistent with this Act).

(2) *EFFECT.*—The Taunton River Stewardship Plan described in paragraph (1) shall be considered to satisfy each requirement relating to the comprehensive management plan required under section 3(d) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1274(d)).

(b) *COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.*—To provide for the long-term protection, preservation, and enhancement of each river segment added to section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by section 1 of this Act, pursuant to sections 10(e) and 11(b)(1) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1281(e) and 1282(b)(1)), the Secretary may enter into cooperative agreements (which may include provisions for financial and other assistance) with—

(1) the Commonwealth of Massachusetts (including political subdivisions of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts);

(2) the Taunton River Stewardship Council; and

(3) any appropriate nonprofit organization, as determined by the Secretary.

(c) *RELATION TO NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM.*—Notwithstanding section 10(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1281(c)), each river segment added to section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by section 1 of this Act shall not be—

(1) administered as a unit of the National Park System; or

(2) subject to the laws (including regulations) that govern the administration of the National Park System.

(d) *LAND MANAGEMENT.*—

(1) *ZONING ORDINANCES.*—The zoning ordinances adopted by the Towns of Bridgewater, Halifax, Middleborough, Raynham, Berkley, Dighton, Freetown, and Somerset, and the Cities of Taunton and Fall River, Massachusetts (including any provision of the zoning ordinances relating to the conservation of floodplains, wetlands, and watercourses associated with any river segment added to section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by section 1 of this Act), shall be considered to satisfy each standard and requirement described in section 6(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1277(c)).

(2) *VILLAGES.*—For the purpose of section 6(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1277(c)), each town described in paragraph (1) shall be considered to be a village.

(3) *ACQUISITION OF LAND.*—

(A) *LIMITATION OF AUTHORITY OF SECRETARY.*—With respect to each river segment added to section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by section 1 of this Act, the Secretary may only acquire parcels of land—

(i) by donation; or

(ii) with the consent of the owner of the parcel of land.

(B) *PROHIBITION RELATING TO ACQUISITION OF LAND BY CONDEMNATION.*—In accordance with section 6(c) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1277(c)), with respect to each river segment added to section 3(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act by section 1 of this Act, the Secretary may not acquire any parcel of land by condemnation.

The CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in House Report 110-758. 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 con-

trolled by a 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 CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110-758.

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

The CHAIRMAN. 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 24, insert a close quotation mark and period after "river."

Page 3, strike lines 1 through 4.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1339, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Once again, I appreciate the discussion we have had on this bill. I think that is perfunctory. We have to say that. But let's once again make common the facts of this particular bill.

The Department, the National Park Service, has not supported this bill. They have asked that we refrain from it until the study is final. They have also, though, in that study, given options, three different options of what to do with this river. This bill happens to take the worst of the options, an option that has no precedent, an option that is problematic.

My amendment makes this a legitimate bill. The area to which I object, the area that does not meet the standards of a wild and scenic river, those areas I am asking to be removed. The Upper Taunton River, that is the area this Congress, in the Year 2000, mandated the study and paid for a study, and that what the study should have done, has those wild and scenic qualifications that match the law.

That is my amendment, to remove the offending sections of this bill and limit just to those which meet the meaning of the words in the law.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I claim the time in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield myself 2 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, who has the right to close?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Utah has the right to close.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I yield myself 2 minutes.

These are the portions of the river bank that would be excluded by the gentleman's amendment. These would not be protected. The historic park enshrining the battleship *Massachusetts* would not be protected.

The gentleman made an argument I found hard to follow. It was because the 1968 Act said one thing, it would be a violation of the rule of law to pass a law. I have never heard that. We are here in the House of Representatives debating a law. If it gets a majority and is passed by the Senate, never to be taken for granted, it will become an addition to the law. The notion that a law being passed somehow distorts the law is a grave error.

The gentleman talked about the will of the people. The overwhelming will of the people in this area is to have this designation. No, it is not wild and scenic in the dictionary definition. It is recreational, which is one of the provisions that the law calls for.

And the question is today, 40 years after the original passage of the law, do we, as a Democratically elected House—the gentleman will forgive me for using the word "democratic" affirmatively. Unlike Aristotle, I don't think "democracy" is a bad word. Do we have the right to say to urban dwellers, the people in the city of Fall River who are targeted by the gentleman's amendment, the people in the city of Fall River, an industrial area. They are the ones that are being told the environment is not for you. Environmental enhancement, the ability to use this law to get the planning right, you don't get that. You are not entitled to it because you have been an industrial area.

I don't think the House wants to deny the right to environmental improvement and enhancement to working people who live in an urban area.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Let me continue to reserve until we are done.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. While the gentleman from Utah is thinking of something to say, I will yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) such time as he may consume.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Let me state my opposition to the amendment offered by my colleague from Utah.

As I stated before, the portion of the Taunton River which will be struck out by this amendment is deserving of this designation and has nothing to do with the decisions that have already stopped the Weaver's Cove LNG facility. As we pointed out, the lower portion of the Taunton River is being designated as a recreational river, rather than a wild or scenic designation.

The designation is actually intended for river stretches that look like the Lower Taunton because they are accessible and may have some development and undergone some impoundment or diversion.

The designation is similar, as I mentioned before, to other urbanized river segments in Pennsylvania, New Jersey and Massachusetts.

There has been 7 years of study. The National Park Service thinks this segment qualifies for this designation. The towns along the river think it qualifies, and the Members of Congress from the State think it qualifies.

And I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and preserve the integrity of the legislation that is before us.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am prepared to close whenever the gentleman from Massachusetts is.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. How much time do I have remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Utah has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. I will close.

I appreciated the kind words the gentleman from Utah had to say about me. I only wish he would extend those courtesies to my constituents who have, I think, been unfairly denigrated.

And I again want to stress there was nothing inappropriate about 40 years later the Congress deciding, by a vote, this is no fiat here, to look at the law and say, we now believe that this is an appropriate designation. It is to say to an area that has been subjected to de-industrialization, you get the support of this planning mechanism, which is necessary because it is on a navigable waterway, so it can't be entirely done by State authorities. It is supported by all of the locally elected officials, overwhelmingly by the people there, by all of the Members of Congress nearby, by the four United States Senators who would be affected. You get this ability to enhance the quality of your life and, at the same time, to find, as my colleague from Rhode Island said, a new economic pattern. And that is engaging in self-help. We are trying to help them tear down an elevated highway that is a barrier to this river. There is a coordinated set of planning activities to improve it.

And I have to say, the gentleman, I think, has helped me prove the point. In his diligent search to defeat this bill, he came up with three people in the area who were against it. Well, I don't think three people in an area of hundreds of thousands gives you, even under Aristotle's definition, the right to impugn the legitimacy of this, particularly since we are following the regular order.

I would say to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, please don't tell the people, the hardworking people of an industrial area who are trying to improve the quality of their lives for themselves and the lives of their children, don't tell them that this environmental designation stops where they live, and that they are to be, by a specific vote of the Congress of the United States, excluded from this set of benefits.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I appreciate that. And to be honest, I anticipated going first in the closing of this, so the gentleman from Massachusetts could have had the last word. So I will try and be kind with that.

But to be very honest with you, Mr. Chairman, it doesn't matter how many property owners may or may not object

to it. Under our constitutional system of laws, if there are three people with property rights, they must be respected. It doesn't matter how many dislike it. They must be respected.

The gentleman has very nice people in his district. I am positive. Look who they elected. But that is not the issue. The issue is the language of the law. The language in section 16 talks about free-flowing rivers, natural waterways, existing and flowing in a natural condition. There should not be low dams, diversion works or other minor structures at the time the river is proposed.

This ain't minor structures. This is a large urban development. It does not meet the definition of those terms. We say it over and over again.

It is not the House that is denying the constituents the right to have this designation. The State of Massachusetts could do the same thing if you just used local ordinances and State authority. It is not the House that will be denying them. It is the law that denies them. It is the law that does not allow this lower river to meet definition of wild and scenic rivers. Period.

Pass the amendment, and I can easily and happily support the bill because if you pass the amendment, the parts that do qualify as wild and scenic rivers will be included as wild and scenic rivers, and the parts that do not qualify will be exempt.

I yield back.

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

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SHULER

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110-758.

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. SHULER:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. HUNTING, FISHING, TRAPPING, AND RECREATIONAL SHOOTING.

Nothing in this Act shall be construed as affecting the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts 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 CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1339, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. SHULER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I commend the gentleman from Massachusetts for introducing this bill to protect the Taunton River. I have the privilege of representing the mountains of western North Carolina, and I have seen the positive impact that sensible resource management has on a community.

□ 1815

I share the gentleman's commitment to protect America's wild and scenic rivers. However, I feel that additional clarification is needed to ensure that sportsmen will continue to enjoy the river and its surroundings. My amendment makes it clear that H.R. 415 does nothing to eliminate the access of the Taunton River for the purposes of hunting, fishing, trapping, or recreational shooting. These activities are an important element of the outdoor lifestyles enjoyed by thousands of families in this area.

The management and regulations of these activities traditionally have been the responsibilities of the States. This amendment makes it clear that this practice will not be interrupted by the Federal designation.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the amendment and the underlying legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition, though to be honest, I'm not in opposition to this amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. The words of this amendment are hauntingly familiar. As Yogi Berra would say, "It's déjà vu all over again," but I don't like to use clichés that are that old. However, this amendment is a wonderful, positive, good amendment. It's been mine up until the last couple of bills.

I like this amendment. I am proud that the gentleman from North Carolina has seen conversion to this point of view. To be honest, in our committee, on H.R. 1528, this same amendment, you voted against. I'm happy for your conversion. I welcome you over to the side of truth, right, and justice and where words have meaning.

For that reason, we are more than happy to accept this amendment. We will be supportive of this amendment. It's the right thing to do. It's the positive thing to do. It's brilliant verbiage because, to be honest, we wrote it a long time ago.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SHULER. Mr. Chairman, once again, I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. SHULER).

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 110-758.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, as Mr. PEARCE's designee, I offer amendment No. 3 made in order under the rule.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. ENERGY AND CONGRESSIONAL REVIEW.

The Secretary of the 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 segments of the Taunton River designated under section 2 of this Act. 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 cubic feet of natural gas, natural gas transmission and storage potential, megawatts of geothermal, wind and solar energy that could be commercially produced, annual available biomass for energy production, and any megawatts of hydropower resources available, including tidal, traditional dams, and in-stream flow turbines.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1339, 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. Thank you, sir. If I had known we were having a vote on the last one, I might not have fished for the first one.

It's a wonderful opportunity for me to introduce this particular amendment from the gentleman of New Mexico who spends so much time in this area and understands it so well. We're facing, obviously, an energy crisis in the United States, and we do have a dearth of solutions that have been forthcoming in this particular body. And we have repeatedly passed legislation that actually has, over the last 30 years, restricted access, limited our resources.

This amendment is once again simple. It calls upon the Secretary of Interior to provide us the full accounting of the resources this bill may take away from the American people. Simply, the

Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Energy and private industry, if it remains, shall complete and submit a report accounting for the energy resources withdrawn from future development by designation of this land and waters included in the Taunton River bill. Specifically, the report shall identify, among other sources, the amount of geothermal, wind, solar, biomass energy and any impact on electrical transmission.

The amendment is simple. If Congress is acting to take energy resources away from the people, we should know if there is a true impact by these actions.

I would urge your support of Mr. PEARCE's well-thought-out and significant amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. The amendment offered by Mr. BISHOP for Mr. PEARCE is unnecessary because the designation of the Taunton River is not going to have any impact whatsoever on energy resources in the country. As a result, this amendment requires a report that will likely be only a sentence or two long.

The energy debate is ongoing in this country and here in Congress, and I can assure you that no matter where you come down on the issues raised by the debate, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act does not even make the top 100 list of the reasons we're paying so much for gas at the pump. Reports on the impact of the Bush-Cheney energy policies or the energy policies enacted by the former Republican majority would provide significantly more insight into the problems we now face than a report on one wild and scenic river designation.

To go even further, we will debate, and I hope adopt, an amendment sponsored by Representative BOYDA making it absolutely clear that H.R. 415 will have no impact on the supply of domestically produced energy. However, Mr. Chairman, as with most amendments that are completely unnecessary, this amendment does no harm to this legislation, so we will not oppose it.

I yield back the balance of our time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest a wise choice of action, and I will yield back my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MRS. BOYDA OF KANSAS

The CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 110-758.

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. DOMESTICALLY-PRODUCED ENERGY RESOURCES.

Nothing in this Act shall impact the supply of domestically-produced energy resources.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1339, the gentlewoman from Kansas (Mrs. BOYDA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Kansas.

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 415, and I offer it to clear up any misconceptions there may be about the impact of this bill.

As the amendment states, "nothing in this act shall impact the supply of domestically produced energy resources." Those on the other side of the aisle have held up designating the Taunton River as a national scenic and recreational river because of supposed energy concerns.

I support domestic drilling, and I believe domestic oil production is important to our energy supply. This amendment makes it clear that we are not going to stop energy development in this bill, and we're not going to impede exploration of domestic resources. We're simply taking steps to protect the Taunton River.

We must drop the rhetoric and have a national debate about our real energy priorities by finding real solutions for the rising price of oil and gas. From the cost of fuel to increased fertilizers that are killing our farmers back in Kansas, everyone is hurting. We all know that our country needs a comprehensive energy plan to address our future.

The plan that was developed by Big Oil in the White House 8 years ago has brought us nothing but higher fuel prices, and we've sent trillions of our dollars to unfriendly governments overseas.

If you have heard me talk about the energy policy, then you have heard me talk about the three-legged stool. First and foremost, it's conservation. It's the cheapest, most fastest, and easiest piece of this puzzle. Second is an absolute determination by this country to finally break our addiction to oil through new technologies like plug-in hybrid vehicles that rely on wind or solar or nuclear or alternative sources.

Energy prices are driven by supply and demand, and we have to increase the supply of not only oil, but certainly of alternative fuels.

Third, even with these alternatives and with conservation, we must continue to have oil and gas to play a significant role in our energy policy. But we can use the lands, and we must use the lands that are currently open to drilling, like the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, and we need to invest in technologies that make it easier and more environmentally friendly to access.

My home State of Kansas holds wind, solar, biofuels, and yes, even nuclear

potential. If we take the simple step of just making a plug-in hybrid vehicle common and affordable, we can turn off the oil spigot and turn on the energy grid that's powered by alternatives to oil.

Today I think we've said it over and over and over again, Mr. Chairman. There are 68 million acres that are currently leased and are not being drilled. Today the leases are in place, the environmental hurdles have been cleared, but there's not drilling going on. And the American people, certainly the people of Kansas, they want to know why and so do I.

So let's talk about Big Oil's dirty little secret. They don't have the equipment necessary to drill. Eighty percent of the oil that's available on the Outer Continental Shelf is already available for offshore leasing and for drilling. But here is their little secret. There won't be any new rigs available for 1 to 2 years. According to the American Petroleum Institute, the API, that in time of increasing demand when they should have been keeping up with supply, they've been making an enormously high profit. The oil companies haven't even been growing their own stock of drilling equipment even for the lands they currently hold leases on. Mr. Chairman, I find it, and I think the good people of Kansas, as well as America, finds it just simply unbelievable.

My mom always taught me to clean up my plate before I asked for more. But the oil companies aren't following my mom's advice. They've been collecting lease after lease after lease, but they're not drilling on these lands. And it's time they get started.

The high price of oil, it's very clear that it certainly helps the big oil industry. And I don't debate that it's a very good decision to them to limit supply. But it's killing American families. It is hurting our farmers, and it is hurting our businesses.

Congress can't force these oil companies to go out and drill, but we can pass legislation that stops the hoarding of these leases on Federal lands. And we voted to do that here just 3 weeks ago. But like other important energy bills, it's gone right down partisan lines, and it's been opposed by the President.

As important as it is that we get this right, Mr. Chairman, let me go back and say, again, the people of Kansas are too smart to buy all of this. They know that ultimately, though we need that oil to bridge to the new alternative future that we're talking about in energy, we cannot drill our way out of this mess.

America uses 24 percent of the world's oil, yet we only have 2 percent of the world's reserves.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise to claim time in opposition, kind of.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I think the other side of the aisle will be happy to know that this amendment does nothing to prevent a proposed LNG port in the Taunton River. The legislation does, but the amendment does not. I'm not really sure exactly what the amendment does. About the most you can say is it doesn't appear to do anything negative, and for that purpose I will be happy to support this amendment, because at least it recognizes that energy is important, and that's an excellent first step. A curious one, I admit, but an excellent first step, especially if it's accepted by those who are supporting the underlying legislation without the first Bishop amendment to be added to it.

It is curious also to understand what domestically produced energy source will come in this particular area unless maybe you actually do have the Park Service use their eminent domain power and actually condemn all of the land a quarter mile from either side of the river in the way a real wild and scenic river should be done. But let's see what happens.

An LNG port, if it was actually produced there, would be able within 3 years, according to best estimates, to reduce the amount of energy needs for the people that live in this area by 10 percent or more, just from this one port. But the issue at hand is not domestically produced energy because an LNG port does not bring in domestically produced energy. It's all coming from abroad.

□ 1830

The countries that produce LNG are Australia, Trinidad, Malaysia, Algeria, Nigeria, Oman, Brunei, Qatar, with other developments in Norway, Venezuela, Egypt, Bolivia, Peru, Angola, Equatorial Guinea, and Russia.

It is true that some is produced in Alaska, which I don't know if the gentlelady actually accepts that as part of the United States, but that doesn't go all the way around to the east coast. That stays up here in the West.

That's the issue. So I accept this amendment, but we're actually talking not about domestic production. The LNG port was about foreign production coming in to the country, but because it at least addresses the issue that energy is important, I'm happy to accept it.

I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mrs. BOYDA).

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

Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now

resume on those amendments printed in House Report 110-758 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. SHULER of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 4 by Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 189, noes 235, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 503]

AYES—189

Aderholt	Emerson	LoBiondo
Akin	English (PA)	Lungren, Daniel E.
Alexander	Everett	
Bachmann	Fallin	Mack
Bachus	Feeney	Manzullo
Barrett (SC)	Ferguson	Marchant
Bartlett (MD)	Flake	McCarthy (CA)
Barton (TX)	Forbes	McCaul (TX)
Biggert	Fortenberry	McCotter
Bilbray	Fossella	McCrery
Bilirakis	Fox	McHenry
Bishop (UT)	Franks (AZ)	McHugh
Blackburn	Frelinghuysen	McKeon
Boehner	Galleghy	McMorris
Bonner	Garrett (NJ)	Rodgers
Bono Mack	Gerlach	Mica
Boozman	Gingrey	Miller (FL)
Boustany	Gohmert	Miller (MI)
Brady (TX)	Goode	Moran (KS)
Broun (GA)	Goodlatte	Murphy, Tim
Brown (SC)	Granger	Musgrave
Brown-Waite,	Graves	Myrick
Ginny	Hall (TX)	Neugebauer
Buchanan	Hastings (WA)	Nunes
Burgess	Hayes	Paul
Burton (IN)	Heller	Pearce
Buyer	Hensarling	Pence
Calvert	Hergert	Peterson (PA)
Camp (MI)	Hobson	Petri
Campbell (CA)	Hoekstra	Pickering
Cannon	Hulshof	Pitts
Cantor	Inglis (SC)	Platts
Capito	Issa	Poe
Carter	Johnson (IL)	Porter
Castle	Johnson, Sam	Price (GA)
Chabot	Jordan	Pryce (OH)
Coble	Keller	Putnam
Cole (OK)	King (IA)	Radanovich
Conaway	King (NY)	Ramstad
Crenshaw	Kingston	Regula
Culberson	Kirk	Rehberg
Davis (KY)	Kline (MN)	Reichert
Davis, David	Knollenberg	Renzi
Davis, Tom	Kuhl (NY)	Reynolds
Deal (GA)	LaHood	Rogers (AL)
Dent	Lamborn	Rogers (KY)
Diaz-Balart, L.	Lampson	Rogers (MI)
Diaz-Balart, M.	Latham	Rohrabacher
Doolittle	LaTourette	Roskam
Drake	Latta	Royce
Dreier	Lewis (CA)	Ryan (WI)
Duncan	Lewis (KY)	Sali
Ehlers	Linder	Saxton

Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Souder
Stearns

NOES—235

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bordallo
Boren
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyd (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cramer
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Faleomavaega
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords

NOT VOTING—15

Blunt
Boswell
Cubin

Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)

Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Insee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano

NOT VOTING—15

Fortuño
Gilchrest
Green, Al

Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 1900
Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Mr. CHANDLER, Ms. HIRONO, and Messrs. GUTIERREZ and WELCH of Vermont changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. LAHOOD and Ms. GINNY BROWN-WAITE of Florida changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. SHULER
The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. SHULER) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE
The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded. A recorded vote was ordered. The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 425, noes 0, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 504]

AYES—425

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

Shimkus
Smith (TX)
Solis
Weiner
Giffords
Gillibrand
Gingrey
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchev
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hulshof
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Issa
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jones (OH)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Camp (MI)
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
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loeb sack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lungren, Daniel
E.
Lynch
Mack
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)

NOT VOTING—14

Barton (TX)
Blunt
Boswell
Cubin
Royce
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Sestak
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Nunes
Oberstar
Obey
Oliver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Payne
Pearce
Pence
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
E.
Ros-Lehtinen
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard

Fortuño
Gilchrest

Green, Al Lucas Shimkus
Hunter Miller, Gary Solis
Johnson, E. B. Rush

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1908

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MRS. BOYDA OF KANSAS

The CHAIRMAN. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Kansas (Mrs. BOYDA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIRMAN. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 421, noes 0, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 505]

AYES—421

Abercrombie Buyer Dent
Ackerman Calvert Diaz-Balart, L.
Aderholt Camp (MI) Diaz-Balart, M.
Akin Campbell (CA) Dicks
Alexander Cannon Dingell
Allen Cantor Doggett
Altmore Capito Donnelly
Andrews Capps Doolittle
Arcuri Capuano Doyle
Baca Cardoza Drake
Bachmann Carnahan Dreier
Bachus Carney Duncan
Baird Carson Edwards (MD)
Baldwin Carter Edwards (TX)
Barrett (SC) Castle Ehlers
Barrow Castor Ellison
Bartlett (MD) Cazayoux Ellisworth
Bean Chabot Emanuel
Becerra Chandler Emerson
Berkley Childers Engel
Berman Christensen English (PA)
Berry Clarke Eshoo
Biggert Clay Etheridge
Billray Cleaver Everrett
Bilirakis Clyburn Falleomavaega
Bishop (GA) Coble Fallin
Bishop (NY) Cohen Farr
Bishop (UT) Cole (OK) Fattah
Blackburn Conaway Feeney
Blumenauer Conyers Ferguson
Boehner Cooper Filner
Bonner Costa Flake
Bono Mack Costello Forbes
Boozman Courtney Fortenberry
Bordallo Cramer Fossella
Boren Crenshaw Foster
Boucher Crowley Fox
Boustany Cuellar Frank (MA)
Boyd (FL) Culberson Franks (AZ)
Boyd (KS) Cummings Frelinghuysen
Brady (PA) Davis (AL) Gallegly
Brady (TX) Davis (CA) Garrett (NJ)
Braley (IA) Davis (IL) Gerlach
Broun (GA) Davis (KY) Giffords
Brown (SC) Davis, David Gillibrand
Brown, Corrine Davis, Lincoln Gingrey
Brown-Waite, Davis, Tom Gohmert
Ginny Deal (GA) Gonzalez
Buchanan DeFazio Goode
Burgess DeGette Goodlatte
Burton (IN) Delahunt Gordon
Butterfield DeLauro Granger

Green, Gene Matsui Ryan (WI)
Grijalva McCarthy (CA) Salazar
Gutierrez McCarthy (NY) Sali
Hall (NY) McCaul (TX) Sánchez, Linda
Hall (TX) McCollum (MN) T.
Hare McCotter Sanchez, Loretta
Harman McCrery Sarbanes
Hastings (FL) McGovern Saxton
Hastings (WA) McHenry Scalise
Hayes McHugh Schakowsky
Heller McIntyre Schiff
Hensarling McKeon Schmidt
Herger McMorris Schwartz
Herseth Sandlin Rodgers
Higgins McNeerney Scott (VA)
Hill McNulty Sensenbrenner
Hinchey Meek (FL) Serrano
Hinojosa Meeke (NY) Sessions
Hirono Melancon Sestak
Hobson Mica Shadegg
Hodes Michaud Shays
Hoekstra Miller (FL) Shea-Porter
Holden Miller (MI) Sherman
Holt Miller (NC) Shuler
Honda Miller, George Shuster
Hookey Mitchell Simpson
Hoyer Mollohan Sires
Hulshof Moore (KS) Skelton
Hunter Moore (WI) Slaughter
Inglis (SC) Moran (KS) Smith (NJ)
Inlee Moran (VA) Smith (TX)
Israel Murphy (CT) Smith (WA)
Issa Murphy, Patrick Snyder
Jackson (IL) Murphy, Tim Solis
Jackson-Lee Murtha Souder
(TX) Musgrave Space
Jefferson Myrick Speier
Johnson (GA) Nadler Spratt
Johnson (IL) Napolitano Stark
Johnson, Sam Neal (MA) Stupak
Jones (NC) Neugebauer Sullivan
Jones (OH) Norton Sutton
Jordan Nunes Tancredo
Kagen Oberstar Tanner
Kanjorski Obey Tauscher
Kaptur Olver Taylor
Keller Ortiz Terry
Kennedy Pallone Thompson (CA)
Kildee Pascrell Thompson (MS)
Kilpatrick Pastor
Kind Paul Thornberry
King (IA) Payne Tiahrt
King (NY) Pearce Tiberi
Kingston Pence Tierney
Kirk Perlmutter Towns
Klein (FL) Peterson (MN) Tsongas
Kline (MN) Petri Turner
Knollenberg Pickering Udall (CO)
Kucinich Pitts Udall (NM)
Kuhl (NY) Platts Upton
LaHood Poe Van Hollen
Lamborn Pomeroy Velázquez
Lampson Porter Visclosky
Langevin Price (GA) Walberg
Larsen (WA) Price (NC) Walden (OR)
Larson (CT) Pryce (OH) Walsh (NY)
Latham Putnam Walz (MN)
LaTourette Radanovich Wamp
Latta Rahall Wasserman
Lee Ramstad Schultz
Levin Rangel Waters
Lewis (GA) Regula Watson
Lewis (GA) Rehberg Watt
Lewis (KY) Reichert Waxman
Linder Renzi Weiner
Lipinski Reyes Welch (VT)
LoBiondo Reynolds Weldon (FL)
Loeb sack Richardson Weller
Lofgren, Zoe Rodriguez Westmoreland
Lowey Rogers (AL) Wexler
Lungren, Daniel Rogers (KY) Whitfield (KY)
E. Rogers (MI) Wilson (NM)
Lynch Rohrabacher Wilson (OH)
Mack Roskam Wilson (SC)
Mahoney (FL) Ros-Lehtinen Wittman (VA)
Maloney (NY) Ross Wolf
Manzullo Rothman Woolsey
Marchant Roybal-Allard Wu
Markey Royce Yarmuth
Marshall Ruppertsberger Young (AK)
Matheson Ryan (OH) Young (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIRMAN

The CHAIRMAN (during the vote). Members have 2 minutes remaining in the vote.

□ 1915

So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. SMITH of Nebraska. Mr. Chairman, on rollcall No. 505, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "aye."

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

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

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CAPUANO) having assumed the chair, Mr. McNULTY, 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. 415) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Taunton River in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as a component of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, pursuant to House Resolution 1339, 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.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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 RECOMMEND OFFERED BY MR.

WITTMAN OF VIRGINIA

Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommend at the desk.

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

Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia. I am, in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia, moves to recommend the bill H.R. 415 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: At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

SEC. 3. SAVINGS CLAUSE.

Nothing in this Act or the stewardship plan referred to in section 2 shall be used as a basis to restrict current and future—

(1) development and management of energy infrastructure;

NOT VOTING—18

Barton (TX) Graves Peterson (PA)
Blunt Green, Al Rush
Boswell Johnson, E. B. Scott (GA)
Cubin Lucas Shimkus
Fortuño McDermott Smith (NE)
Gilchrist Miller, Gary Stearns

(2) easements and environmental mitigation related to paragraph (1); or

(3) business and economic activities or expansion of such activities.

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

Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, Americans are facing an energy crisis. High fuel costs are cutting short summer vacations, impacting family budgets, shuttering small businesses, increasing food costs and threatening the economic well-being of this country.

Recently, I learned of a small business in the rural part of my district that can't even receive shipments because the delivery trucks can no longer afford to drive all the way down to his shop.

This small shop owner, who operates on already tight margins, has to incur extra costs to meet the delivery truck closer into town. And this is just one of countless similar stories throughout America and throughout Virginia's First District.

The majority's response to this crisis has been to repeatedly deny the American people relief from skyrocketing fuel prices. Defying basic economics, they refuse to increase supply and encourage production of American-made energy.

The majority party decries the timeline of domestic drilling as too long, saying the American people won't see any relief for at least 5 to 10 years, as if it is somehow a bad thing for Congress to act with foresight in order to avert a deeper energy catastrophe in the near future.

In the face of "all of the above" energy policy offered by Republicans, one that includes American-made energy, encourages aggressive conservation and invests in and incentivizes clean, renewable energy, Democrats offer misdirected solutions like "use it or lose it" and recycle failed ideas of the past, like the windfall profits tax.

Today's consideration of H.R. 415 is another such mistake. Instead of restricting energy development in the name of political partisanship, we need to throw every option on the table. And I'm reminded of a story that a constituent told me about the *Apollo 13* astronauts and how they solved problems where Mission Control took everything they had at their avail, every tool, every piece of equipment at their disposal, to survive and get those astronauts back to Earth. Today, Mr. Speaker, Congress is Mission Control, and we have an energy problem.

This bill abuses the definition of Wild and Scenic Rivers by designating the urban and heavily developed lower section of the Taunton River as wild and scenic. Not coincidentally it's on this lower section of the Taunton River that a liquefied natural gas facility has been proposed. And thus this bill is yet another roadblock to increasing our energy supply. Not only could this legislation encourage budget-busting heating bills, but it will also bury local

shipbuilders in an avalanche of bureaucratic red tape. Shipbuilding facilities often need to be modified to meet job specifications. By further complicating the permitting process, this bill stymies these business' ability to meet their customers' needs.

Additionally, Mr. Speaker, the headline in the Fall River Herald News also reads about the impact on businesses where it says, "scenic river designation could sink waterfront businesses," again, another negative impact on businesses.

Congress cannot afford to remain tone deaf to the suffering of our country. This motion to recommit returns our focus on what is truly important to the American people: Relief of skyrocketing energy prices. It prohibits restrictions on the development or management of energy infrastructure. And more importantly, it expands on the language offered by Representative BOYDA to include sources of energy like clean-burning natural gas, which will play a critical role in our development of an "all of the above" energy policy.

I urge all Members to support this motion to recommit H.R. 415.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I rise to claim time in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, let me just read an amendment that passed this House unanimously just previous to this discussion, the amendment to H.R. 415 offered by Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, "section 3, domestically-reproduced energy resources. Nothing in this Act shall impact the supply of domestically-produced energy resources."

The point being that this motion to recommit has nothing to do with the protection of domestic energy resources. It has to do with the ability by putting promptly in the motion to recommit to effectively kill this legislation.

This legislation has the support, almost unanimous support, of communities, elected officials, the delegation of the State, the Governor, and has had 7 years of study in order to receive the recommendation for the designations that are before us in this legislation.

I understand the need to talk about energy on any topic. This particular legislation has nothing to do with the high cost of gas. It has nothing to do with domestic energy supply. If we are looking for reasons, perhaps we could walk over the last 8 years of this administration and a Republican-controlled Congress and look at the failed efforts at really bringing an energy policy to the American people. That is the root cause of our problem. The root cause is not this designation today.

Let me yield now to the sponsor of the legislation, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. FRANK).

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first, let's note the non-seriousness of this. It says "promptly." It kills the bill. If you want to vote

against the bill, you can vote against the bill. This says "promptly." If it were seriously intended to be a legislative act, it would have said "forthwith."

Beyond that, it is not simply about energy. The last two lines say "nothing shall be used as a basis to restrict current and future business and economic activities." This is a license to do any business whatsoever. Now I know a couple of businesses down there that I didn't think the Republican Party would be all in favor of. They would love to have this. They will expand it and invite you down and give you a discount.

This isn't just about energy. First of all, it's about killing the bill. But what does it say? The gentleman from Arizona read the amendment we have adopted about energy. "Nothing shall be used as a basis to restrict current and future business and economic activities or expansion of such activities." It is hardly about energy.

The LNG plant has been rejected twice by the Coast Guard and once by that radical environmentalist, the Secretary of Commerce, Carlos Gutierrez, appointed by George Bush.

I'm about to yield to my colleague from Massachusetts. He and I represent hardworking people, working class people. Many of them are Portuguese immigrants and others who became American citizens who have lost their industrial base. They are trying to enhance the quality of their environment and at the same time offer an alternative economic mode.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, don't take it out on them. If we've got a political fight over energy, let's carry it out among the big boys and girls. Don't turn to these working people and say, do you know what? You're not classy enough. You don't deserve environmental protection. That is for the elite. That is for the wealthy.

I yield, finally, to my colleague from Massachusetts.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Speaker, this debate has been, to say the least, strange. My friends on the other side of the aisle have come to the floor with pictures of the Taunton River that are not even part of the designation that we're talking about. They have said that this is about LNG and that Massachusetts doesn't want to do its fair share. Yet we have three LNG facilities up and running, and a third that has already been permitted. They have confused their energies. They don't know the difference between liquefied natural gas, oil and the gasoline you put in your automobile. I mean their ignorance on energy is stunning. No wonder why they lost the last election.

And finally, they have tried to make political points at the expense of the constituents that I represent and that BARNEY represents. As BARNEY said, these are hardworking people. The tone

of this debate and the way my constituents have been characterized is insulting. It's a new low even for some of the people on the other side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me just say that the Bush administration's National Park Service says that this is a good idea. It was good enough for them. It should be good enough for you. Defeat this motion and vote for the bill.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

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 the majority leader and the Speaker of this House could call a vote at any time on increasing U.S. oil production to lower the gas prices for Americans?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has not stated a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman may state his first parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Speaker, if this motion did pass, it could be recommitted back to the—and I doubt it will—it could be recommitted back to the committee from which it came and brought forth on the next legislative 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.

□ 1930

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, parliamentary inquiry.

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

Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, is asking the same unfounded inquiry repeatedly a violation of the House under dilatory tactics?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Recognition for parliamentary inquiries is within the discretion of the Chair.

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 yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia. 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 the passage of the bill, if ordered, and the motion to suspend with regard to House Concurrent Resolution 295.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 188, nays 227, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 506]

YEAS—188

Aderholt Fossella
Akin Foxx
Alexander Franks (AZ)
Altmire Frelinghuysen
Bachmann Gallegly
Bachus Garrett (NJ)
Barrett (SC) Gerlach
Barrow Gingrey
Bartlett (MD) Gohmert
Biggart Goode
Bibray Goodlatte
Bilirakis Granger
Bishop (UT) Graves
Blackburn Hall (TX)
Blunt Hastings (WA)
Boehner Hayes
Bonner Heller
Bono Mack Hensarling
Boozman Herger
Boustany Hobson
Brady (TX) Hoekstra
Broun (GA) Hulshof
Brown (SC) Hunter
Brown-Waite, Inglis (SC)
Ginny Johnson (IL)
Buchanan Johnson, Sam
Burgess Jordan
Burton (IN) Keller
Buyer King (IA)
Calvert King (NY)
Camp (MI) Kingston
Campbell (CA) Kirk
Cannon Kline (MN)
Cantor Knollenberg
Capito Kuhl (NY)
Carter LaHood
Castle Lamborn
Chabot Lampson
Coble Lamtham
Cole (OK) LaTourette
Conaway Latta
Crenshaw Lewis (CA)
Culberson Lewis (KY)
Davis (KY) Linder
Davis, David LoBiondo
Davis, Tom Lungren, Daniel
Deal (GA) E.
Dent Mack
Diaz-Balart, L. Manullo
Diaz-Balart, M. Marchant
Doolittle McCarthy (CA)
Drake McCaul (TX)
Dreier McCotter
Duncan McCrery
Ehlers McHenry
Emerson McHugh
English (PA) McIntyre
Everett McKeon
Fallin McMorris
Feeney Rodgers
Ferguson Mica
Flake Miller (FL)
Forbes Miller (MI)
Fortenberry Moran (KS)

NAYS—227

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

Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Nunes
Paul
Pearce
Pence
Petri
Pickering
Pitts
Platts
Poe
Porter
Price (GA)
Pryce (OH)
Putnam
Radanovich
Ramstad
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Souder
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sanchez, Linda
T.

NOT VOTING—19

Barton (TX) Johnson, E. B.
Boswell Lucas
Capps Miller, Gary
Cubin Murphy, Tim
Gilchrest Peterson (PA)
Green, Al Rush
Issa Saxton

□ 1947

Messrs. STUPAK, NADLER and HOYER changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 506, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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 yeas 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 242, nays 175, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 507]

YEAS—242

Abercrombie Altmire
Ackerman Andrews
Allen Arcuri Baca
Baird
Baldwin

Barrow
 Bean
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Berry
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Blumenauer
 Boren
 Boucher
 Boyd (FL)
 Boyda (KS)
 Brady (PA)
 Braley (IA)
 Brown, Corrine
 Butterfield
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carson
 Castle
 Castor
 Cazayoux
 Chandler
 Childers
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crowley
 Cuellar
 Cummings
 Davis (AL)
 Davis (CA)
 Davis (IL)
 Davis, Lincoln
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dicks
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doyle
 Edwards (MD)
 Edwards (TX)
 Ehlers
 Ellison
 Ellsworth
 Emanuel
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Farr
 Fattah
 Filner
 Fossella
 Foster
 Frank (MA)
 Frelinghuysen
 Giffords
 Gillibrand
 Gonzalez
 Gordon
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutierrez
 Hall (NY)

NAYS—175

Aderholt
 Akin
 Alexander
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Barrett (SC)
 Bartlett (MD)
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Billirakis
 Bishop (UT)
 Blackburn
 Blunt
 Boehner
 Bonner
 Bono Mack
 Boozman
 Boustany

Hare
 Harman
 Hastings (FL)
 Herseth Sandlin
 Higgins
 Hill
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hodes
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hoooley
 Hoyer
 Inslee
 Israel
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jefferson
 Johnson (GA)
 Jones (NC)
 Jones (OH)
 Kagen
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 Kind
 Klein (FL)
 Kucinich
 Lampson
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lipinski
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lynch
 Mahoney (FL)
 Maloney (NY)
 Markey
 Marshall
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCollum (MN)
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McIntyre
 McNerney
 McNulty
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Melancon
 Michaud
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, George
 Mitchell
 Mollohan
 Moore (KS)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran (VA)
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy, Patrick
 Murtha
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal (MA)
 Oberstar
 Obey
 Oliver

Conaway
 Crenshaw
 Culberson
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, David
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Doolittle
 Drake
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Emerson
 English (PA)
 Everett
 Fallin

Feeney
 Ferguson
 Flake
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Franks (AZ)
 Gallegly
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gerlach
 Gingrey
 Gohmert
 Goode
 Goodlatte
 Granger
 Reichert
 Reyes
 Richardson
 Rodriguez
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Ross
 Rothman
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruppertsberger
 Ryan (OH)
 Salazar
 Sanchez, Linda
 T.
 Sanchez, Loretta
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schwartz
 Scott (VA)
 Serrano
 Sestak
 Shays
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Shuler
 Sires
 Skelton
 Slaughter
 Smith (WA)
 Snyder
 Solis
 Space
 Speier
 Spratt
 Stark
 Green, Al

NOT VOTING—18

Barton (TX)
 Boswell
 Cole (OK)
 Cubin
 Gilchrest
 Johnson, E. B.
 Lucas
 Miller, Gary
 Peterson (PA)
 Royce
 Rush

□ 1954

Mr. INGLIS of South Carolina 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.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. STEARNS. Mr. Speaker, on rollcalls Nos. 505–507, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted on rollcall No. 505, Boyda—“yea”; rollcall No. 506, Wittman—“yea”; rollcall No. 507, Pas-sage—“nay.” I was unavoidably detained.

EXPRESSING APPRECIATION OF CONGRESS TO THE FAMILIES OF MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The un-finished business is the vote on the mo-tion to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 295, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the con-current resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent reso-lution, H. Con. Res. 295.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-vice, and there were—yeas 415, nays 0, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 508]
 YEAS—415

Abercrombie
 Ackerman
 Aderholt
 Alexander
 Akin
 Alexander
 Allen
 Altmire
 Andrews
 Arcuri
 Baca
 Bachmann
 Bachus
 Baird
 Baldwin
 Barrett (SC)
 Barrow
 Bartlett (MD)
 Bean
 Becerra
 Berkley
 Berman
 Berry
 Biggert
 Bilbray
 Billirakis
 Bishop (GA)
 Bishop (NY)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blackburn
 Blumenauer
 Blunt
 Boehner
 Bonner
 Bono Mack
 Boozman
 Boren
 Boucher
 Boustany
 Boyd (FL)
 Boyda (KS)
 Brady (PA)
 Brady (TX)
 Braley (IA)
 Broun (GA)
 Brown (SC)
 Brown, Corrine
 Brown-Waite,
 Ginny
 Buchanan
 Burgess
 Burton (IN)
 Butterfield
 Buyer
 Calvert
 Camp (MI)
 Campbell (CA)
 Cannon
 Cantor
 Capito
 Capps
 Capuano
 Cardoza
 Carnahan
 Carney
 Carson
 Carter
 Castle
 Castor
 Cazayoux
 Chabot
 Chabot
 Chandler
 Childers
 Clarke
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Coble
 Cohen
 Cole (OK)
 Conaway
 Conyers
 Cooper
 Costa
 Costello
 Courtney
 Cramer
 Crenshaw
 Crowley
 Culberson
 Cummings
 Davis (AL)
 Davis (CA)

Davis (IL)
 Davis (KY)
 Davis, David
 Davis, Lincoln
 Davis, Tom
 Deal (GA)
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delahunt
 DeLauro
 Dent
 Diaz-Balart, L.
 Diaz-Balart, M.
 Kagen
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Donnelly
 Doolittle
 Doyle
 Drake
 Dreier
 Duncan
 Edwards (MD)
 Edwards (TX)
 Ehlers
 Ellison
 Ellsworth
 Emanuel
 Emerson
 Engel
 English (PA)
 Eshoo
 Etheridge
 Everett
 Fallin
 Farr
 Fattah
 Feeney
 Ferguson
 Filner
 Flake
 Forbes
 Fortenberry
 Fossella
 Foster
 Foxx
 Frank (MA)
 Franks (AZ)
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallegly
 Garrett (NJ)
 Gerlach
 Giffords
 Gillibrand
 Gingrey
 Gohmert
 Gonzalez
 Goode
 Goodlatte
 Gordon
 Granger
 Graves
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutierrez
 Hall (NY)
 Hall (TX)
 Hare
 Harman
 Hastings (FL)
 Hastings (WA)
 Hayes
 Heller
 Hensarling
 Herger
 Herseth Sandlin
 Higgins
 Hill
 Hinchey
 Hinojosa
 Hirono
 Hobson
 Hodes
 Hoekstra
 Holden
 Holt
 Honda
 Hoooley
 Hoyer
 Hulshof
 Hunter
 Inglis (SC)
 Inslee

Israel
 Issa
 Jackson (IL)
 Jackson-Lee
 (TX)
 Jefferson
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson (IL)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones (NC)
 Jones (OH)
 Jordan
 Kanjorski
 Kaptur
 Keller
 Kennedy
 Kildee
 Kilpatrick
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Kingston
 Kirk
 Klein (FL)
 Kline (MN)
 Knollenberg
 Kucinich
 Kuhl (NY)
 LaHood
 Lamborn
 Lampson
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Latham
 LaTourette
 Latta
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (CA)
 Lewis (KY)
 Linder
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loeb sack
 Lofgren, Zoe
 Lowey
 Lungren, Daniel
 E.
 Lynch
 Mack
 Mahoney (FL)
 Maloney (NY)
 Manzullo
 Marchant
 Markey
 Matheson
 Matsui
 McCarthy (CA)
 McCarthy (NY)
 McCaul (TX)
 McCollum (MN)
 McCotter
 McCreery
 McDermott
 McGovern
 McHenry
 McHugh
 McIntyre
 McKeon
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McNeerney
 McNulty
 Meek (FL)
 Meeks (NY)
 Melancon
 Mica
 Michaud
 Miller (FL)
 Miller (MI)
 Miller (NC)
 Miller, George
 Mitchell
 Mollohan
 Moore (KS)
 Moore (WI)
 Moran (KS)
 Moran (VA)
 Moran (KS)
 Murphy (CT)
 Murphy, Patrick