

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

□ 1354

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. 3667) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers in the State of Vermont for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, with Mr. SALAZAR 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 as much time as I may consume.

H.R. 3667, the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers Wild and Scenic River Study Act, was introduced by our colleague from Vermont, Representative WELCH. This bill would amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to authorize the National Park Service to study specific sections of the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers in Vermont for their potential inclusion into the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

I want to thank our colleague from Vermont, Congressman WELCH, for his hard work on this measure. This is a good piece of legislation, which will help showcase the natural heritage of Vermont.

We are coming upon the 40th anniversary of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act in October. It's important to celebrate the legacy of this act, the preservation of some of our wildest rivers and the safeguarding of our scenic waterways for generations to come, and to acknowledge the essential role that stewardship and a conservation ethic play in the management of our Nation's rivers and streams.

The Missisquoi is a tributary of Lake Champlain, located in northern Vermont. The Trout is a tributary of the Missisquoi. With its headwaters in Lowell, Vermont, the Missisquoi extends almost 100 miles, flowing north into Quebec, then returning to Vermont to flow west before finally ending its journey at Lake Champlain.

As it runs its course through open pastoral fields, scenic gorges and native hardwood forests, the river is a remarkable example of a northeastern ecosystem. It is bordered by the largest and perhaps highest quality silver maple floodplain forest remaining in the State of Vermont. American elm, white ash, white oak, and red maple are found along its banks.

The river is home to diverse fish and wildlife, including native rainbow and brown trout, rare freshwater mussels, spiny soft-shell turtles and river otter. While on the river's banks, bobcat,

white-tailed deer, and moose can sometimes be spotted, and the surrounding marshes host large flocks of migratory birds.

In addition to these natural qualities, there are numerous Abenaki Indian archeological sites along the floodplain.

And the river is well-known for its outstanding recreational opportunities as well. It is part of the Northern Forest Canoe Trail—a historic 740-mile water trail through New York, Vermont, Quebec, New Hampshire, and Maine—and outfitters consider the northern part of the river to be the pre-eminent flat-water paddling spot in Vermont.

It is also renowned for its waterfalls, and the Great Falls on the upper river is recognized as Vermont's largest undammed waterfall.

Simply put, this river is a superb illustration of Vermont's postcard perfect national scenery.

During a hearing on this bill, the administration testified in support of the bill, but recommended that changes be made to clearly specify which segments should be included in the study, as not all of the sections of the river in the original bill were appropriate for consideration. They recommended other technical changes as well.

The Natural Resources Committee amended the bill to respond to those recommendations and clarified which sections of the river would be studied for the wild and scenic attributes.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3667 simply authorizes a study of this river. It is a preliminary step, not a final designation.

Its enactment would simply trigger a process which will allow the National Park Service the opportunity to gather information from, listen to, and coordinate with State officials and local communities; with farmers, business owners, and river outfitters; and with hunters, anglers, birders, paddlers, and hikers—all those who value this river. Only then, after careful consideration and with input from all the stakeholders, will the National Park Service provide recommendations to Congress about the potential of this river.

That is all the legislation does. It is that simple. Let's not lose sight of what this bill is about.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3667.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1400

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and it will be quite awhile.

Well, Mr. Chairman, here we are in a 15-day session. We're now one-fifth of the way through our final session before we end. The Democrat leaders, who have set the agenda and run this floor for almost 2 years now, have had 5 weeks in preparation for this day. So the first issue of significance, the only issue we may have this week that has a rule, the most significant piece of

NOT VOTING—15

Baird	Lee	Pitts
Cannon	Levin	Scott (VA)
Cazayoux	McNulty	Sensenbrenner
Hodes	Melancon	Thornberry
Hulshof	Peterson (MN)	Weller

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1352

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5977

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, DUNCAN HUNTER was mistakenly added to the list of cosponsors on H.R. 5977. I ask unanimous consent to have his name removed.

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

There was no objection.

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. 3667.

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

There was no objection.

MISSISQUOI AND TROUT RIVERS WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1419 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. 3667.

legislation we're talking about today is a study that, if passed, may perhaps someday, if conditions allow and the elements are conducive, possibly create a compromise that would might possibly pass an additional 70 miles being added to the inventory of the national government, and only costing the taxpayers \$300,000 to do it. That's what we're doing today.

I would like to make a couple of points about this particular bill, not necessarily in opposition to it. But one point that is significant; we talk a great deal in government about transparency. It's important to government to be transparent. It's good to be transparent—until it deals with how we treat people.

One of the things that the Republican Party has tried to do on almost every bill that has come either to committee or to the floor that deals with a trail, a heritage area, an historic area or a scenic river is to ensure that the people who will be involved in that area are informed up front about what may or may not happen to them. Because once we go to the next step and actually create this wild and scenic river, the Federal Government is given—not in this bill, but is given in the existing powers they have—the right of condemnation of any of that land that will be in that area. They have almost unlimited rights of easement. They always have the ability of dealing with local officials to create zoning ordinances that have a huge impact on the people in those areas.

Almost always these studies are done with small groups. And then citizens will come back to us afterwards and say we were unaware of what was actually happening at this time. The dairy farmers along this river—who may or may not need protection and may or may not be happy and satisfied with what will result to them—may or may not have any idea what will happen as they go through this study.

The first year I was here in Congress I passed a wilderness bill. I made sure that I went to every single property owner in that area that would be impacted by that wilderness bill, even the guy who was dead and had no heirs, which was a neat trick. But we went to every one of them to make sure they were well aware in advance of what was to take place. And yet when we tried to add an amendment, both in committee and once again before the Rules Committee, to make sure that everyone who may be impacted by this new designation and this study was made aware and they had to respond affirmatively that they wished to be part of the study, it was again rejected.

Why do we not treat Americans with respect? We will pass these types of provisions to empower government, but we will not ask the citizens who will be impacted by our decisions to be part of this particular process. It's something that used to be standard language that we would add to these types of provisions, and it should be added again. That's a flaw.

For 2 years Speaker PELOSI has been the one who was to set the agenda for our discussions here on the floor. One of those issues that I think people would like us to talk about is obviously energy. We have been talking about that for a long time. When this new leadership took over the House, on day one, when the energy prices started to climb and it was \$2.22, the topic of discussion we had on this floor was congratulating the University of California-Santa Barbara soccer team. When energy reached \$4 at the pump, I was here to spend a rollicking hour and a half talking about monkey bites. And today, after our 5-week adjournment, after people have been talking to us, after our constituents have said what is affecting them, after 5 weeks of preparation, what we are proposing to talk about today as the significant issue on the agenda is to study two rivers in Vermont. The only bill we will have with a rule, to study two rivers in Vermont.

And I hate to say this; I'm not opposed to it. There's no reason to be. It's fine. The bill is a nice bill. It can be improved significantly, but there's nothing wrong with it. The question is, why are we here talking about that after 5 weeks of getting prepared to talk about significant issues?

I had a couple of my constituents come to me. They said what they wanted to see Congress do is something in a bipartisan way; that we should come back here and show that we can work together. Indeed, the Senators have already told us that there is only a bipartisan energy plan of theirs, that's the only thing that can be passed, therefore, we should come together and support what they are trying to do in the spirit of bipartisanship, not only between two political parties, but between two branches of Congress. I am sure maybe someday this week we might even have another energy bill proposed for discussion on this floor, and I'm sure somebody will say this is the only thing we can pass; let us now embrace this in a spirit of bipartisanship so that we can show that we can work together.

Sometimes I have the feeling that we on this floor believe that if we toast one another or we slap one another on the back or we have congratulatory comity, that that, indeed, is the end of the discussion; that is the goal, not the means to reach some kind of discussion; when the end should be, have we solved the problem?

We have now had eight votes over 3 days on this floor, each of them getting around 400 plus votes. That is bipartisanship, that is comity, that is coming together. But have we solved what the needs of the American people are? Those eight votes, we've named three post offices, we said we're against hunger and we're for the Red Cross. That's good. But that does not solve the problems plaguing Americans.

If I was to go to a hospital and I was on the gurney being rushed into the

surgery room, is it logical that I would look up at the assembled doctors and nurses and say, "Look, when you open me up, I don't really care what you do inside just as long as you do it together in harmony, in a bipartisan way"? Or would it be much more logical for me to say, "Ladies and gentlemen, when you open me up, solve the problem"? And that is, indeed, what the American people are looking at us to do here today is not necessarily find out how many bills we can pass on suspension, how much comity we can have, but how we can solve the problem.

To simply pass a political statement does not make a difference to individuals. We are supposed to be here to try and solve the problem. And it is very clear that the problem has to be some way in which we have an overarching, comprehensive energy proposal. That is the problem that we're facing. We need to come to this floor and actually encourage people to conserve, not by mandating conservation efforts, but by rewarding Americans for conservation efforts and they will take it from there.

We must come to the floor and finally realize that our problem is supply and demand, and that we have to increase production of that supply, that we do not have a logical pattern of funding alternative energy sources. But if we could actually increase the amount of oil and coal and oil shale and natural gas, that we could use the royalties this government would then create to actually fund a comprehensive energy program for alternative energies—for solar, for wind power, for anything else that happens to be there—if we simply decided to use an "all of the above" approach. We can solve our problem in the emergency, for the beginning, for the present time, as well as coming up with a long-term strategy for the future that actually would be funded.

We could finally realize that this country does not have an infrastructure that will allow energy to be moved from one part of the country to the other. There are good friends in New England who will face high costs of heating their homes this fall. We have a good pipeline that goes, but it stops before it ever gets to their part of the country.

We need to solve those problems. We need to make sure we have more refineries. We need to make sure we do something on the electric grid. And we are not. That is the solution to the problem for the American people.

We need to finally realize that the future of this country is not going to be solved by bringing experts into Washington to sit around a room and come up with an idea, but the ability of America to solve its problem rests with the people out there. Because within the American people, without their soul and heart, is the ability and the creativity to come up with real solutions if we just empower them to find those solutions and then reward them

for the creativity that they can expound.

We need to realize that the solution to our problem is that the next time we lose 84,000 jobs it is not exacerbated by the lack of energy; that the next time an airline doesn't have enough energy to run 100 planes, they don't have to fire 1,100 people because of it; that the cab driver in Washington, D.C. who now drives 2 hours extra every day because he needs that to provide enough funds for the new energy he has to provide could actually be back at home meeting his kids after school the way he used to; or that we provide enough energy in here so the father in Virginia can finally go with his son to a father and son outing; or the family in Maryland can finally have enough energy so they can re-enroll their daughters in dance and gymnastics; so that school kids in the middle of this country can finally make it to field trips this year; or the teachers in our districts throughout this country will not find their salaries to be depressed or in some cases slashed because of unusual and unexpected energy costs in their districts; so that home heating oil will not drive people out of existence; so the farmer in the field will have enough energy to put in diesel in his tractors to produce the food so that truckers will have enough energy to drive them to market so that the prices of food that we have to pick up at those markets will not be spiraling this winter and this next year. And all of those is what we should be talking about.

The river is nice; it's okay. The study is okay. But it is not where we should be at this particular time because it doesn't solve the problem.

There are a lot of rich people in this body. For them, this energy crisis is an annoyance. But for those people on fixed incomes, those people at the bottom of the scale, those people in the middle class, we're not talking to them about energy policy. We're talking about the way they cook their food, the way they heat their homes, whether they have a job or not.

Three days into the last 15 days of this session, and the most significant issue is a study bill on two rivers in Vermont. This country is aching for legislation that will nourish the body politic, and yet we continue to put up, day after day on this body, pieces of legislation that are as nutritional as cotton candy. We need to do it differently.

But, on the plus side, we will probably do this bill in a bipartisan way. Doesn't it make you feel proud?

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I'm encouraged by the newfound populism of my good friend from Utah. And I agree that a comprehensive approach to energy has to be something that this Congress accomplishes within the week. This does not negate what I believe to be a good piece of legislation that is before us.

And it is considerable work. We have to unravel 8 years of failed energy policies. We have to unravel the relationship between Big Oil and the administration so that the consumer, the average Joe out there, will get the kind of break and attention that he needs and she needs with regard to energy costs and the rising cost all around us.

Having said that, let me now turn to the sponsor of this good piece of legislation, the gentleman from Vermont, Congressman WELCH, for as much time as he may consume.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I very much appreciate the excellent work you did and your eloquent description of a beautiful river. If I have any say about it, we're going to make you an honorary Vermonter and bring you down that river and make you paddle your way from one end to the other and have you see for yourself how beautiful what you described really is. Thank you.

I want to respond to some of the comments.

Mr. Chairman, my opinion is that one of the greatest Presidents of the United States was Theodore Roosevelt. He came to the Presidency when his predecessor was assassinated. It was a time of great turmoil, social and labor unrest, a need for corporate reform, trust busting. President Roosevelt had his hands full taking on those economic challenges.

He was a war President. The skirmish in Cuba and the Philippines were still very much alive, and he had to deal with that as President. Very serious issues with the Supreme Court. And in the midst of all of that he still found time to be a peacemaker and was the winner of the Nobel Prize for the work that he did in bringing together the Soviet and Japanese conflict and helping those folks resolve the end of that war.

But Theodore Roosevelt was also a person who respected and did more, perhaps, than anyone else to protect our environment. And amidst his responsibilities, where he had to simultaneously deal with enormous economic anxiety in this country, when he had to deal with foreign affairs that involved making America a strong country and bringing together peace in other countries, he would never, ever, busy as he was, urgent as his demands were, belittle the work of the House of Representatives when they were taking up what is now being characterized as a "waste-of-time bill" because it involves two rivers in the State of Vermont. He wouldn't do it. He's a bigger man than that.

He reflects the leadership that we can provide to the American people where we simultaneously take on the challenges, as President Roosevelt did, but also pay attention to the posterity that is our responsibility to leave behind.

I just want to say as a Vermonter, I want to say as a Member of the House of Representatives that if we can't find

time to do those things that are going to allow us in Utah, in Arkansas, in Arizona and in Vermont to save our rivers and to do what is going to preserve our country and leave behind legacies like President Teddy Roosevelt did with the National Park Service that we revere and enjoy, then we don't deserve the vote of confidence that we get from the folks who send us here. We can do both.

Now my friend from Utah has essentially made an argument that there is more important business to be done, as if that suggests we don't have time to do other important business about protecting and preserving our environment and having mutual respect for the particular concerns, in this case, of Vermont.

□ 1415

But it's that same comity that has allowed us to come forward and step up as Vermonters and Arizonans to help the folks in the Midwest from their flood and to respond to the gulf coast with the damage that they sustained. It's political. That's what we know.

The reality is our friends on the other side had 12 years in control here and their energy policy was one thing: give tax breaks to oil companies. You can't make that up. Oil companies are doing well. I don't begrudge them their profits. But why do you reach into the taxpayers' pocket and ask taxpayers to give the most profitable corporations in the world, running a mature industry, doing well, why do we ask the taxpayers to give them \$13 billion? When you reveal that fact, they don't even know how to respond because you can't make that kind of stuff up.

So this House of Representatives, under the leadership that now is being castigated for a failure of leadership, has repeatedly passed legislation against the objections, almost unanimous, of our friends on the other side, to stop filling up the Strategic Petroleum Reserve, to squeeze out the speculative premium in the price of a gallon of gas at the pump. That can provide some short-term relief. We did that. We passed comprehensive energy reform, again, against the objections of our friends on the other side. We took away the tax breaks from the oil companies, not because oil companies are a target. They're doing important work. They know how to do their work and they know how to do it well. But why in the world would our friends on the other side want to give \$13 billion in tax breaks to a mature and profitable industry when that money comes directly out of the pockets of American consumers who need that money in their pocket to pay the price at the pump? They've resisted that. They opposed it.

Our friends on the other side are also aware that even though we have passed legislation against their objection, it has gotten stalled in the other body, threatened with veto by the President, we're ready to do it again. Our motto is

try again, try again, and keep going because, bottom line, we want to address that problem. And we have actually been doing things in our 2 years on the watch despite their resistance when they had 12 years to get the job done and essentially caved into the interests of the oil companies.

So, Mr. Chairman, as a Vermonter and the sponsor of this bill, I want to object to what is really a rhetorical and political device, and that is ridiculing the importance of these two rivers to the people of my State for a partisan political argument. Energy is incredibly important and we have delivered. We've put substantive proposals on the floor. They have been debated and they have been passed. They've been stalled in the Senate or threatened with veto by the President. We're prepared to do it again. We're also prepared to reach out to the other side because we all know that in the end if we are going to be successful, we do have to work together, particularly where we have divided government. But it takes two sides, two bodies, and a President to be willing to do that, and it has not been forthcoming.

So I want to go back to a very simple fact. This legislation is about allowing Vermonters to have a study for scenic status on two rivers that are very precious to us, places where moms and dads have taken them are kids, taught them how to hunt, taught them how to fish, taught them how to be families, taught them responsibility. And there is a place for us and a time for us to do that as well as face these large issues like energy, like the war in Iraq, like redefining our foreign policy. So this is a very important piece of legislation to us, and I, as one Member of Congress, object to having it be held hostage to what is essentially a political game that's been going on far too long.

And I want to thank the chairman for the tremendous work that he's done. And, Vermonters, thank you as well.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the discussion especially about Teddy Roosevelt, a famous President. But I would remind my friend that William Howard Taft, who came after him, created more national parks, created more land in the national forests, and busted more trusts in 4 years than Roosevelt did in 8. The difference was he didn't use public relations.

Our issue is still the same. Talk about these issues after we have had a debate on real issues for a real solution on the real problem of energy that affects real Americans here on the floor. That should be our priority.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Utah for yielding, and I stand with him on these issues.

Mr. Chairman, this is a matter of setting priorities. I just got back Monday

evening for votes. I left my home State of Louisiana, my district of southwest Louisiana, that was just hit by Hurricane Gustav. Folks are suffering. Seniors are suffering back home. Seniors are suffering all over the country. Seniors in Vermont are suffering and they're going to suffer with high prices of heating oil this coming winter. Farmers, I have got farmers that lost their crops just last week, and they're faced with high diesel costs and high gasoline costs and high fertilizer costs because this country doesn't have an energy policy. What are our priorities? This is the most important bill we have done so far this week, and it's a study and it's a study based on what the subcommittee found there to be no risk involved. So I have to question what are the priorities of this Democratically led Congress.

We in Louisiana have been bearing the burden of providing energy in this country for quite a long time, and we have seen our coasts, our precious wetlands devastated, and now we are trying to rebuild those wetlands. Is that a priority? It's certainly a priority to me. But clearly getting an energy policy has to be one of the top priorities for this country. We should all recognize that. And I think my colleagues across the aisle, after spending August back home hearing from folks in their districts, would understand that.

We in Louisiana know that energy policy and environmental policy and economic policy all march together. That's good policy. We're also talking about jobs. Mr. Chairman, every time I fly home on the little stretch between Houston and Lafayette, Louisiana, I run into folks from Louisiana who are coming back or going to countries all over the globe, Equatorial Guinea, Angola, Thailand, Vietnam, countries throughout the Middle East, Louisianians with oil and gas expertise who wish they could be back in this country closer to their families. No, they're having to travel all over the globe and be away from their families for months on end to make a living in the energy industry. These are jobs that were lost to this country. These were manufacturing jobs that were lost to this country in the 1980s when a Democratically controlled Congress imposed a windfall profits tax on the oil and gas industry. And what's their answer today? Well, let's get rid of the manufacturing tax credit on oil and gas companies. Let's single out the oil and gas companies. Well, on one hand you say you want good jobs and good manufacturing jobs, but then you propose policies that drive these jobs out of this country. I don't get it. I just don't get it, and the folks back home in Louisiana don't get it.

I talked about the environment. Down in my district we've got a beautiful stretch of wetlands and marsh. It's a bird habitat for ducks, a breeding ground for ducks. White Lake, a beautiful lake, a pristine lake, is down there in Vermilion Parish. That land is

managed by BP Amoco, and they have done an outstanding job with the environment. Just yet another example of good environmental policy working hand in hand with energy policy because what does it mean? Jobs, good American jobs.

Explain that to the folks in Michigan. Explain that to the folks in Ohio who are struggling right now. If you want good American jobs, you get a good energy policy, an all-of-the-above energy policy. An energy policy that looks at oil exploration in the Outer Continental Shelf and Alaska, shale oil, nuclear energy, looks at building refining capacity, and also invests in renewables and alternatives. That's what we're advocating over here. We want to work in a bipartisan fashion.

But, no, the other side, our friends across the aisle are finding ways to avoid the issue. That's not what the American public wants today. Everybody knows what the polls are showing. Seven out of ten Americans want a comprehensive energy policy. How can you go home and explain to the seniors, an elderly woman back in your district who can't afford gasoline for her car to go to the grocery store to pick up a few essential items, so then she has to carpool with three others and now they can't afford it?

I'm all for conservation. I believe conservation is a critical part of our energy policy, but yet conservation is not enough. We need a real energy policy, an all-of-the-above approach.

Our friends across the aisle are proposing all kinds of things that we're hearing about. They're proposing a policy that permanently locks up 80 percent, 80 percent of American energy on the Outer Continental Shelf. Our friends are proposing permanently locking up 1 trillion barrels of oil from oil shale in the inner-mountain west. How can you explain that to the American public? What's your explanation? How can you say we want to permanently lock up more than 10 billion barrels of oil on Alaska's remote North Slope? And how do you explain no to nuclear power when countries like France rely on nuclear power for 80 percent of their electricity? People around this country are struggling with high utility bills.

We ought to be looking at ways to diversify our sources of energy and putting this country on a sound footing, putting America first. How can our friends across the aisle do nothing about constructing clean coal and looking at that type of new technology? This is critical. And yet again they propose additional tax increases on the energy companies that are trying to provide energy for this country. I just don't get it. I don't get it.

Mr. Chairman, I think everybody in this Chamber ought to look at that plaque up there. Look at that plaque. It quotes from Daniel Webster, who says, "Let us develop the resources of our land." The resources of our land. We shouldn't be holding back. This is

the only country holding back on this. Let us develop the resources of our land. Let us call forth its power and build its institutions. That's what this Congress should be doing. Not wasting time. I have got to go back home and explain why I spent a week up here while folks back in Louisiana are struggling after another hurricane and I have got to explain to those folks that I came up here and we didn't do anything substantively in this Congress and we didn't do anything that they care most about: getting an energy policy.

Read that plaque again: "Let us develop the resources of our land."

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I realize the political statements that are being made by my friends on the other side of the aisle. I understand them. I think relative to this bill I don't appreciate them, but I really believe that there has to be an understanding that our leadership and the Democrats on this side of the aisle can actually walk and chew gum at the same time, that we can deal with an issue that we are dealing with here today that affects the State of Vermont and deal with the very pertinent issue which is the energy policy for this country.

With that, Mr. Chairman, let me yield to the gentlewoman from New Hampshire (Ms. SHEA-PORTER) for such time as she may consume.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Chairman, first let me say that I support the bill in front of us, for these two rivers in Vermont. And I think that it's unfortunate that we can't seem to work on the particular bills in front of us because of the issue that the friends on the other side of the aisle keep bringing up.

What I find particularly disturbing is that for 8 years we have had two oilmen in the White House with no energy policy and my colleagues on the other side have sat silent for 2 long years, nothing since I have been here talking about it, 8 years since President Bush has come into office, and suddenly in the waning hours of this session, they are now talking about an energy policy.

I certainly welcome them to this. I think we do need an energy policy. I wish they had started talking about an energy policy 8 long years ago. What they allowed to happen in the past 8 years is for us to lose ground on an Apollo-type project to bring a real energy policy to the United States. They have allowed the oil companies to reap the greatest profits in history while they have allowed the American taxpayer to suffer while they subsidize these oil companies. That's just outrageous that they are now at this point 8 long years into it and getting near an election and they're suddenly talking about the lack of an energy policy.

□ 1430

Thank you, gentlemen, for bringing this to our attention. We have been speaking about this lack of an energy policy for a long time.

I would like to say that their idea of drill, just drill, drill, drill, and we heard it at their convention, drill, baby drill. That is a Fred Flintstone policy. Drill, baby drill, I heard a reporter say, is like people standing there at the edge of the technology revolution yelling, Electric typewriters, electric typewriters.

We are now right at the edge of this wonderful, wonderful future for our country. If you decide to join us and invest in an Apollo-type program, a program for energy independence, a program that would allow us to be independent of these nations, to have an economic base here in this country, to create jobs in a green technology, and to have renewables.

One of your own party, T. Boone Pickens, who has talked often about, and has run ads, by the way, about the fact that we can't drill our way out of this, that we only hold 2 to 3 percent of the oil and that we are consuming 25 percent. Yet I haven't heard the word "conserve" over there until just now. I heard one mention it.

We've ignored conservation, we've ignored wind, we've ignored solar, we've ignored all kinds of renewables. And when we have the drill, baby drill plan and drill baby, drill only. Well, you know what? We have simply got to face these issues. We should have faced them 8 long years ago, and we should have faced them when I got here in this 110th Congress. But I certainly welcome you to the debate now.

So why don't we do this? Why don't we first take away the subsidies from the oil company and invest in renewables? I think that would be a good start to show Americans that we hear them. Why don't we take the speculators out of the market, since we are all very concerned about the price of energy. I am particularly concerned about what is happening in New Hampshire, where the oil is so high and the winter is coming on us. I am concerned that the President of the United States put in his budget a cut in the Low Income Heating Energy Assistance Program.

So why don't we do this? Why don't we take the speculators out of the market? Why don't we say Drill now, drill, to the oil companies who had 68 million acres and they would not drill on. That would be helpful.

There's a number of things that we could have done, and I agree with you that we are at the last moments here, and it's outrageous. But we have the future of America in our hands. We have the ability, as T. Boone Pickens said, to take the wind from—he named Sweetwater, Texas to Hastings, Nebraska—we have great wind capacity, and to take solar from Sweetwater, Texas to California, and catch that. And biomass. And, yes, drilling. Drilling on land and leases that we have.

Why didn't you agree to take the leases away if the oil companies wouldn't drill? Why not? Why not do something except stand there with the same, tired drill, baby drill.

We are on the eve of this wonderful technology. We have so many people and businesses ready to invest in it. Oil companies certainly have their role. And we are dependent on oil. We are more dependent on oil than we were when George Bush came into office. That's true. But where have you been for 8 long years?

I welcome you to this discussion. But I think we should have the discussion in the appropriate place and not block every piece of legislation that is coming through right now, and let's have a comprehensive energy plan. And the first thing the other side could do to show their good faith in this would be to vote against the tax subsidies for the oil companies. If we really want to protect the American taxpayer, why don't we stop forcing them to subsidize oil companies? That would be my first question. Thank you.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. In my 6 long years of being here on this floor, and I welcome my freshman colleague from New Hampshire, we have been involved in many issues that deal with energy, and I found that what was not stopped by filibuster in the Senate, was stopped by litigation in the court, and that is part of the overall reform we are talking about, which is why we desperately need a real vote on a real solution, the American Energy Act.

May I just inquire how much time we have remaining.

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Mr. Ross). The gentleman from Utah has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. With that, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WESTMORELAND).

Mr. WESTMORELAND. I want to thank my friend from Utah for giving me this opportunity to come and to speak. As I was listening to the gentlelady from New Hampshire speak, she must not have read the American Energy Act. My colleagues and I, at least about 135 of my Republican colleagues and I, have been coming back to this floor ever since August 1, when Speaker PELOSI decided to adjourn this Congress and go on a 5-week vacation rather than address the energy crisis that we have in this country.

Mr. Chairman, it's awfully strange that all of the debate, most all of the debate that I have heard on the floor today, has dealt with energy. Yet we refuse to bring an energy bill to the floor under regular order.

I think what also needs to be said, Mr. Chairman, and I hope the American people are picking up on this, is that the Democrats have been in control of this Congress for the last 20 months. The Democrats have been the majority, the controlling party in this Congress for the last 20 months. In the House, they have 236 Members, I believe. Close to it. I think the Republicans have 199. It only takes 218 to pass any legislation in this body. In fact, you can have a good idea, you can have a great idea, you can have a life-saving, wonderful, world-changing idea,

but if you don't have 218 votes, you don't have anything except an idea. If you have the worst bill in the world, or something that really hurts the American people and hurts our economy and our future and future generations, if you have 218 votes, you can pass that.

So I guess my question to the majority is that rather than continually laying the blame on the executive branch of our government, and most all Americans know that we do have three branches of government. We have got the executive branch, we have got the judicial branch, and we have got the legislative branch. The legislative branch, who the Democrats are in control of, have the responsibility for passing laws. So we can't help it. It's not our fault. If the unemployment was 4.2 percent, Mr. Chairman, when your party took the majority, and now it's 6.1, we can't help that. This comes from the legislation that you had 218 votes for to pass.

Now we can't help it because gas was \$2.06 a gallon when you took over, and that it's over \$4, or close to \$4 a gallon now. It's been as high as \$4.50. We can't help that. You were in control. You had the 218 votes to do anything you wanted to do.

But what has happened? The Democratic majority decided that rather than have a bill that would go through regular order and have subcommittee hearings and committee hearings and be brought to the floor under a rule that would be an open rule that would allow input for all 435 Members and the seven delegates from U.S. territories to be able to have amendments on the floor to speak to what their constituents had felt and what they had been told at home, they have been brought under a suspension rule.

Mr. Chairman, a suspension does not have to go through committee. It does not have a rule. There's 20 minutes of debate for each side. And then you have to have two-thirds of the vote. Well, these have been snake oil or shams or, I guess, covers to hide under, maybe, that you could go home and say that you had voted for an energy bill.

I say let's bring it under regular order. If you bring it under regular order, let's give us an opportunity to have a motion to recommit, or an alternative. But the best thing to do, the thing that I think the American people want to happen, is an open rule come to the floor, where we can all—this is a House where we are supposed to come and debate and share ideas. Let this House work its will. Let's vote on every amendment that comes to the floor. Limit it to one amendment per person.

If we have to stay here over the weekend, let's hear all the good ideas that will come out of this place. There's not just a certain number of people in this body that have good ideas, there's a lot of good ideas that come from a lot of people, and there's a lot of people here who have good ideas that never get to share them.

With that, Mr. Chairman, I encourage, I encourage the majority to bring out of mothballs that commonsense energy plan that in April of 2006 Minority Leader NANCY PELOSI said that she had. I hope that she will bring it out soon because not just my constituents in the Third District of Georgia, but constituents, people, citizens all over this country are hurting. So, hopefully, we will get to see this commonsense plan at some point in the near future.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER).

Mr. PERLMUTTER. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for allotting me this time. I just want to bring us back to basics, for one thing. Whether it's the Kiwanis or the Cub Scouts or the PTA, ordinarily you talk about the issue that is at hand. And the issue that is at hand, ladies and gentlemen, and to my friends on the other side of the aisle, is we are talking about the Missisquoi and the Trout Rivers, the Wild and Scenic Rivers.

I want to thank my friend, Mr. WELCH, for bringing this matter before the House of Representatives as to trying to maintain wild and scenic streams in Vermont. That is what is being debated. That is the bill on the floor, although our friends would like to completely change the subject.

Whether it's the Kiwanis or the PTA or the boardroom or the Cub Scouts, you try to have a relevant conversation. But they decided that is not the issue. They must love this bill. They would rather talk about something else. So let's talk about the something else, which is energy.

Now my friends on the other side of the aisle, the GOP, the Republicans, in 2005 passed what they said was a landmark energy bill. I want to quote the former Speaker of the House, Dennis Hastert, on July 28, 2005:

"Americans need this (GOP energy) legislation to lower their energy costs, to drive economic growth and job creation, and to promote greater energy independence."

The minority whip, Mr. BLUNT, said on that same day:

"This (GOP energy) plan relies on simple economics. If we create a larger market for a greater amount of gasoline, we'll help drive prices down. This proposal moves the country one step closer to lowering the sky-high price of gas for consumers."

The President, a few days later, said, "I am confident that one day Americans will look back on this (GOP energy) plan as a vital step toward a more secure and more prosperous Nation that is less dependent on foreign sources of energy."

Well, ladies and gentlemen, that energy plan that was promoted by the Republicans and supported by the President back in 2005 I think now turns out to be a really bad joke on the American people. We have had our prices of oil and gas going up by almost double, sometimes during this summer

they almost tripled after that plan was implemented by a Republican Congress and a Republican President.

But that shouldn't surprise us. With two oilmen in the White House, what did you expect? This is exactly what we have gotten. Skyrocketing energy prices.

Now what we have got to do, and I can't believe that my friend from Utah, when he says that what we need to be doing is drilling here, and drilling now, really wants to drill in the middle of Salt Lake City or in any of the glorious places in Utah. This is something where it has got to be sensible energy policy. It's a comprehensive energy policy, which includes oil and gas.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the gentleman 30 additional seconds.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. It includes oil and gas, it includes coal, it includes nuclear, it includes renewable energy, and it includes overall energy efficiency, because a barrel of oil saved is a barrel of oil earned. A Btu saved is a Btu earned.

We need a comprehensive plan. And to pull a bad joke on the American public of drilling here, drilling now, drill, baby drill, is simply a sham, and we cannot go forward with that alone. We need a comprehensive energy plan, and that is what the Democrats are going to provide.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Let me yield 3 minutes to my colleague from Ohio, Congresswoman MARCY KAPTUR.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and also rise in support of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers measure related to including Vermont's Missisquoi and Trout Rivers for further assessment.

Let me also say I think it's really sad that our GOP colleagues here are trying to divert attention from this bill and trying to change the subject to something that they have a pretty dismal record on.

□ 1445

In fact, since the Bush administration took office, our country is now importing over 1 billion more barrels of oil a year, the price of gasoline has doubled, as every American knows, and oil company profits are through the roof. Exxon alone, Exxon alone last year, made \$40.6 billion in profits, one company; BP, \$20 billion; Shell, \$31 billion in profits; Conoco, \$15.5 billion; Chevron, \$17.1 billion. That is a total, just of those companies, of \$125.3 billion.

They are loving every minute of this, friends. And the question for America is, do we want our people to be dependent on a diminishing global resource that becomes more precious every day, where blood for oil is now shed around the world? That is the real question. Are we going to grow up and live in the 21st century? It is a real choice.

One of the fellows over there on the other side of the aisle said, well, we got enough votes in the House. We sure do. We passed a couple of bills and sent them over to the Senate, where they sit unpassed. For example, our bills for extension of our renewable energy credits for solar and for wind, they are sitting over in the Senate. Do you know why? There isn't a majority of Democratic votes over there. The Senate is divided. It is 49D-49R. Our Senators are sitting on their hands over there, half of them. I would say to the gentleman who says we have got enough votes here, go get your friends over there to put their blood on the line over on the other side for the American people. They are wasting an awful lot of time.

I want to say too that the President has to sign these bills. Look what he did to the agriculture bill, one of the most important bills we have brought to this floor to try to create a new biofuels industry for this country, which rural America wanted and wants and is leading into an energy independent future for this country. What did the President of the United States do? He vetoed it. We had to override the veto here and in the other body. That is the kind of mess we have got here in Washington.

Boy, do we ever need a working majority in the Senate. And we need a bigger working majority here in the House to do what the American people sent us here to do, and that is to help our children have a better future, to have an independent energy future for this country, and not to try to say that "business as usual" is the course of the hour. Oh, no. Our people expect us to play the piano on all keys.

Where have you been for the last 8 years and where has the President of the United States been for the last 8 years?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 30 seconds.

Ms. KAPTUR. I thank you very much for yielding.

Let me just say that I represent one of the solar centers of this country, one of the three top places that are inventing the future for our people. We need the help of the President of the United States. We don't need him to hold up renewable energy credits in this body or over in the Senate. Our people have seen the future, and they are building it. We don't need to have this administration produce an energy plan back in their first year that didn't even include agriculture, not even a mention of it, and renewables, and then defunded renewables for most of the years that they sat over there on Pennsylvania Avenue.

We do need new leadership. We need a working majority in the Senate. And we need a greater working majority

here and a President who will stand at the side of the American people.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I was about to be critical of the remarks of the gentlewoman from Ohio, but once she said the Senate is a problem that should be working, how can I reject that?

I would, though, remind you, if you really want to help Exxon, don't do anything. Sixty-eight percent of all the oil and 87 percent of all the natural gas is being drilled by small entrepreneurial companies. If you want competition, allow those to be successful.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Utah for his great comments.

You know, I like Congressman PETER WELCH. We are on opposite ends of the aisle philosophically, but he is a nice guy. But I will tell you, I would like to be able to support this issue of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. However, what the American people want are lower gas prices, so they will have a chance to go and visit wild and scenic rivers. Right now, the Democrats have let the gas prices get so high, nobody can go on vacation, nobody can visit these rivers, nobody can do the kinds of things they want to do.

But the good news is during the month of August, when Republicans stayed here working while the Democrats went on vacation, we alerted the American people to the fact that we are here trying to bring down prices and that the Democrats are in charge of this Congress. It is not the President of the United States who can take action. He has already taken action. He lifted the moratorium on Outer Continental Shelf drilling.

Let me tell you, my colleague just before my colleague from Ohio was giving quotes, but let me give you a quote. Here is the best one, and the one that we are going to come back to over and over and over again. Speaker PELOSI, when she was asking for the majority in this House: "Democrats have a plan to lower gas prices. Join Democrats, who are working to lower gas prices now."

What happened? Gas prices have doubled under the Democrats. They can do their best to blame this on the Republicans. But they are in charge, and we are going to continue to inform the American people that Democrats are in charge of the Congress, that they have the ability to do something.

Republicans believe in alternatives. Certainly we want solar, wind, hydro, all the alternatives. We believe in conservation. Republicans are the original conservationists. But we cannot get to those places immediately, and we can bring down the price of gasoline by providing additional supply.

Democrats think they can ignore and maybe even repeal the basic law of economics, supply and demand. We have to have more supply. They are preventing

that. They do not want us to bring down the price of gasoline. Why, is difficult to understand.

But I say it is a simple choice for the American people this fall: Are you going to believe the people who are pro-American energy, or are you going to believe the people who are anti-American energy? The Democrats want us to remain dependent on foreign oil. They are not interested in creating additional American energy. And you can see that.

Let's talk some more about quotes. Here is another one: "This leadership team will create the most honest, most open, most ethical Congress in history." Speaker-elect NANCY PELOSI.

What have we had? Closed rules. The appropriations committees aren't even meeting, because they are scared to death that we will bring up bills that they will have to vote on that they know will pass because their Members are feeling the heat in their districts. Their constituents are hurting too.

This is not a Republican issue. It is not a Democratic issue. It is an American issue. We begged our Democratic colleagues to come and join us, vote with us, speak to the American people about this. She knows they will vote for additional American energy. There is no bill on the floor this week. Why? Because her caucus is so divided. The pro-American energy Democrats want to vote on increasing supply. They are not being allowed to do that.

Let me speak about the farm bill just a little bit. Ethanol is creating a major problem for us in this country. We are not allowing ethanol to come in here from other countries. We could get it in here cheaper than we are producing it in this country. They will not allow that. That was part of that farm bill that the President vetoed.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the chairman of our full Resources Committee, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. RAHALL).

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to the distinguished subcommittee chairman, Mr. GRIJALVA, for bringing this bill forward, and the ranking member, Mr. BISHOP. Also I want to thank Mr. PETER WELCH for the tremendous leadership he has provided.

Certainly I am in support of the legislation. I recognize that much of the debate that has occurred thus far has not really been on the legislation itself, but rather has surrounded the energy issue. As all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle know, we are working toward bringing an energy bill to the floor of the House of Representatives in the very near future.

I have heard a lot of finger pointing. We all have been doing that, are guilty of that, for the last several months on this issue. Each side is trying to blame the other for the high price of gas today, ignoring the fact that the price of gas when President Bush took office was \$1.47, both houses of Congress were

in Republican hands, and the price of gas is where it is today.

But that is the past. We must look forward. Now we are all talking about using all of our domestic sources of energy in order to free ourselves from that dangerous reliance upon foreign oil. And certainly I am one of those in the category, if not 99.9 percent of my colleagues, that want to see all of our domestic sources of energy used. I dare say that in the not-too-distant future, when we do address the energy bill, if not in the next several days on the floor of this body, that we will see the most broad-ranging, most comprehensive energy bill come to this floor that we have had in several years. It will be an all-of-the-above. It will be a start toward progressive, comprehensive energy legislation.

In that, it will be a pro-drilling bill as well, although it will not be all-drilling. It will not be all my-way-or-the-highway, as some on the other side continually preach, but rather it will be a bill that will show the sacrifices that will be necessary, the compromises that are always necessary in the legislative process if we are going to address the common good of this country. So that is what we are going to see.

One important factor of that bill that we have not seen in previous energy bills is accountability and transparency. After all, these are the American people's resources, our public resources we are talking about on the OCS or with Federal leasing on on-shore Federal lands. That means the American people have the right to receive a fair dispensation for the use of their resources, as well as an accountability of royalties and fees collected thereupon.

One of the areas in which we will seek to provide much-needed reform and more oversight is in the area of royalty collection and the royalty-in-kind program specifically.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. RAHALL. Thank you. And I say we will provide that additional oversight, because the Interior Department's own Inspector General, Mr. Devaney, is today coming out with a report of his investigation of the royalty-in-kind program in which he says we have also discovered a culture of substance abuse and promiscuity in the RIK program, both within the program, including the supervisor, who engaged in illegal drug use, had sexual relations with subordinates, and is in consort with industry. Internally, several staff admitted to illegal drug use as well as elicit sexual encounters, and it goes on and on about what has been happening with this oversight program. We will strengthen this program and make the reforms necessary.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I certainly hope when my chairman rolls me into the surgery room and opens me up, he will solve the problem.

May I inquire of the other side if they have additional speakers left up and how much time remains.

Mr. GRIJALVA. We have no additional speakers.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Each side has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. With that, Mr. Chairman, I will yield back my last 30 seconds.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion let me say I associate myself with the comments that our chairman, Mr. RAHALL, made about transparency and about the deeply needed reform in that agency, given the disclosure and the investigation by the Inspector General. This is a good piece of legislation. I urge its approval.

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

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

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill pursuant to part 2 of House Report 110-668 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. 3667

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Missisquoi and Trout Rivers Wild and Scenic River Study Act of 2008".

SEC. 2. DESIGNATION FOR STUDY.

Section 5(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(a)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"() MISSISQUOI AND TROUT RIVERS, VERMONT.—The approximately 25-mile segment of the upper Missisquoi from its headwaters in Lowell to the Canadian border in North Troy; the approximately 25-mile segment from the Canadian border in East Richford to Enosburg Falls; and approximately 20 miles of the Trout River from its headwaters to its confluence with the Missisquoi River."

SEC. 3. STUDY AND REPORT.

Section 5(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1276(b)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(19) MISSISQUOI AND TROUT RIVERS, VERMONT.—Not later than 3 years after funds are made available to carry out this paragraph, the Secretary of the Interior shall—

"(A) analyze the potential impact of the designation on private lands within the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers, Vermont, described in subsection (a)() or adjacent to that area;

"(B) complete the study of the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers, Vermont, described in subsection (a)(); and

"(C) submit a report describing the results of that study to the appropriate committees of Congress."

The Acting CHAIRMAN. No amendment to that amendment is in order except those printed in House Report 110-834. Each amendment shall be considered only in the order printed in the report; by a Member designated in the report; shall be considered read; shall be debatable for the time specified in the

report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment; and shall be not subject to amendment; and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

□ 1500

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110-834.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer the amendment as the designee for Mr. RAHALL.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. GRIJALVA: Before subparagraph (A) in the quoted material adding a new paragraph (19) to section 5(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, insert the following and redesignate the subsequent provisions accordingly:

"(A) analyze any potential impacts on the possession or use of a weapon, trap, or net, including a concealed weapon, on the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers, Vermont, described in subsection (a)() or on lands adjacent to that area;"

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1419, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would require that the study authorized by H.R. 3667 analyze any potential impacts a wild and scenic river designation for this river might have on the possession or use of a weapon, trap or net, including a concealed weapon.

As with many of the amendments offered today, I do not believe this amendment is necessary. The underlying legislation already is more than sufficient in what it directs the Secretary to study when considering a wild and scenic river designation. Further, the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act already makes perfectly clear that these river designations are not intended to infringe upon existing State authority to manage hunting or fishing.

Nevertheless, Chairman RAHALL has filed this amendment in an overabundance of caution, and as a good-faith effort to dispel any rumors that this bill will impact existing policies on hunting and fishing. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, though not in opposition, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, we find ourselves in a unique situation on this particular amendment. The gentleman who proposed it thinks it is unnecessary. I think this is a wonderful amendment. It was great when

somebody first wrote it, and now that you have incorporated it into the general discussion on these bills, I am equally as enthralled with that amendment.

Mr. Chairman, at this time I wish to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GINGREY).

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

I, too, want to rise in support of the amendment of Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. BISHOP in regard to this amendment. But, Mr. Chairman, I want to state rather emphatically that I rise to express concern that this committee, the Resources Committee, which has jurisdiction over the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, has jurisdiction over the miles and miles and hundreds if not thousands of miles of Outer Continental Shelf on both coasts of this country and also the Gulf of Mexico, this committee, the Natural Resources Committee chaired by Mr. RAHALL, has jurisdiction, and yet here we are, Mr. Chairman, taking up the time of this body to delay the work that we clearly need to do in regard to a sound energy policy. And to think that we have 2 more weeks left before the majority leadership has decided that we are going to leave this place and not come back until the 111th Congress, ladies and gentlemen, that is next January. So starting from August 1 until the end of the year, that means we will have worked, what, 13 days in 5 months. That makes this congressional job, Mr. Chairman, a part-time job. If I had known that, I would go back home and deliver babies for 6 months out of the year.

We ought to be doing an energy bill right now, this week. There is no excuse for it. And there was really no excuse, Mr. Chairman, for us adjourning and going home to our districts for whatever reason for 5 weeks. We could have stayed here and in 3 days, 5 days at the most, done exactly what Mr. RAHALL just a few minutes ago on the floor of this Chamber said that you were going to do; you, the majority, were going to introduce a comprehensive bill allowing 99 percent of all United States energy resources to be utilized.

What I have seen, Mr. Chairman, of this proposal, if it looks anything like what has been suggested on the Senate side, doesn't even come close to that. This is certainly not an all-of-the-above energy bill; it is almost none of the above. And, quite honestly, the acronym for that is the NOT-A bill, none-of-the-above act. It is a NOT-A energy act.

But if the chairman is right in what he said, Mr. Chairman, that we are going to see an all-of-the-above energy bill, let's get with it. Let's get with it. There is no reason why the Committee on Energy and Commerce, with Chairman DINGELL and Ranking Member BARTON who work very well together,

very respected members on both sides of the aisle in this Chamber, we could not in a regular order go through the regular process, have an open rule, and give and take on both sides.

Put the politics aside, and let's do what we should have done 6 weeks ago to bring relief to the American people in regard to these high gasoline prices.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, just as a friendly correction for the gentleman from Georgia, nada is spelled N-A-D-A. So none of the above doesn't quite fit the acronym, so there might need to be a search for an appropriate balance.

The other thing, and he mentioned a good point. Under the jurisdiction of the Natural Resources Committee are 68 million acres under lease and not in production under the public lands of this country. So under that jurisdiction, I think the committee has made that effort to try to extend the public lands as a source for energy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I wish to defend my good friend from Georgia. Actually he said NOT-A, which is N-O-T-A. It is just that Georgian accent, it's hard to get the letters straight there. That's something we don't face in Arizona or Utah, I realize that.

Mr. Chairman, in all sincerity, we support this particular amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 110-834.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 offered by Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

After the new paragraph (19)(A) added to section 5(b) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent subparagraphs accordingly):

“(B) include in the study completed under this paragraph an assessment of any effect a wild and scenic designation in the study area is likely to have on energy production, transmission, or conveyance;”

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1419, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity of talking about a bill that asks us to review energy issues with this particular piece of legislation.

When the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act was originally established, it was designed specifically to inhibit, if not stop, the production of dams across rivers where electricity could be the result. It is fitting and proper to see what kind of impact this wild and scenic river would have in that area, as well as the fact that this river, the Missisquoi River, translated means the great grassy meadow. It could possibly be the “great gassy meadow” if we find some kind of minerals down there, which, once again, a review of that I think would be appropriate.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is recognized for up to 4 minutes.

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, it is great to have a chance to be on the floor to talk about energy and the lack of movement from my colleagues on the other side. It's not the first time I've been down here, it's not going to be the last, and I seriously doubt that the provision that will be brought to the floor will be an all-of-the-above, comprehensive plan.

It will be a smoke screen, it will try to have some cover for votes for November, but it will not be the all-the-above strategy that we are demanding on the floor of the House.

There will not be a provision on coal in this bill. Coal is our most valuable resource we have in this country. There will not be a provision on oil shale. More energy than any other country in oil shale. We will not deal with opening up the entire Outer Continental Shelf. We will not use the revenues to fully expand the grid or go into all the renewables.

We would like regular order. We would like the chance to move a bill through the committee. I serve on the Energy and Air Quality subcommittee; I serve on the Energy and Commerce full committee. The 2005 energy bill that you all had attacked went through regular order. It went through your committee, it went through my committee, it went through the Science Committee. It went through all the committees; it was cobbled together on the floor; we had amendments on the floor, and we voted.

Democrats attacked us for the majority of the majority rule of the floor of the House. Well, we're going to turn that around, because now it's just a majority of one: It's whatever Speaker PELOSI decides, that will be the bill on the floor. And she is dissing you all. She's not allowing you all to have any

input into the legislative process. It's whatever she says goes. And you just can't deny that fact, because it is not going through any regular order.

So when you attacked the 2005 energy bill that went through the subcommittee as being written behind closed doors, there is no more closed doors than what you are doing and proposing to do in this bill, and it is a shame and it is an insult on the legislative process.

Let's see if we address coal-to-liquid. There are two provisions you all could put in the bill right now to make us more energy independent.

You could put long-term contracting Department of Defense, who are asking for coal-to-liquid applications for jet fuel, long-term contracting, and we would have coal-to-liquid refineries being built with American jobs today.

You could take a Democrat bill, the Boucher coal-to-liquid bill. You could put RICK BOUCHER's bill in this, quote/unquote, comprehensive energy bill, and we would have coal-to-liquid refineries being built in this country within a year.

But it won't be comprehensive because you're going to not address coal, the greatest resource. We have more coal reserves than any country on this planet. So you can't really say you are going to have a comprehensive energy plan when you don't address coal.

The other thing that you will not do is open up the Outer Continental Shelf. You may open up 5 percent more. This whole red area, you have seen it numerous times, off-limits.

We're going to call your bluff. We're going to shut down this government on the CR because we're going to defeat the moratorium. So you can pass all these energy bills you want. You know you can't conference it with the Senate. You know it's not going to go to the President's desk. It's a fig leaf. It's a farce. You ought to be ashamed of yourselves.

What we're going to do is we're going to wait till the spending bill comes to fund government, and then we're going to call your bluff. Are you willing to shut the government down and keep off-limits billions of barrels of oil, trillions of cubic feet of natural gas? And if you're willing to do that, fine. We'll do that before the election. We'll go back and we'll hold you accountable at the polls.

Do you know why you can't bring a comprehensive bill that comes through regular order? Because NANCY PELOSI loses, and it's her bill.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I just want a point of clarification, that we didn't attack the 2005 Republican en-

ergy bill because it was done behind closed doors. I think the point on the attack is relative to the fact that it was shortsighted, Big Oil driven, and an utter failure.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Will the gentleman yield?

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona controls the time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I thank the Chairman.

With regard to the Bishop amendment, we have no opposition after reviewing it, and we would accept this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

□ 1515

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 110-834.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 3 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 4. FUNDING.

Nothing in this Act or the amendments made by this Act shall be construed as authorizing appropriations to designate or otherwise create a new component of the national wild and scenic rivers system.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1419, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Chairman, we'll actually hear about this bill for just a minute at least before I talk about energy. But, no, I do have a serious amendment here that simply clarifies that nothing in this bill is meant to authorize appropriations for the new unit of the Wild and Scenic Rivers System.

The bill before us today authorizes a study to determine if the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers in Vermont are eligible to be designated wild and scenic rivers. Now, rivers designated as wild and scenic are managed by a number of Department of the Interior agencies, including the National Park Service, Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management and the Fish and Wildlife Service.

However, if you ask CRS about this, these four agencies have a combined maintenance backlog of between 14 and \$22 billion. That is between 14 and \$22 billion. And so we are going to be doing a study of another river, a study that often precedes designation. I think that is the purpose of this study, that will then put this river under the Park Service's jurisdiction or the Interior Department, and these agencies will

have to manage it. We're adding to a backlog of between 14 and \$22 billion. We shouldn't continue to do this. We can't continue to do this. We have parks in my State and everywhere else that have maintenance needs, that have staffing needs, that have needs that are going unmet, and we're going about just adding more to it, without seeking a funding source or anything else. We're simply adding more obligations to the Park Service, and we can't do that.

This amendment simply says that nothing in this authorization implies this appropriation will follow. Again, if an appropriation does follow, we are taking from the existing wild and scenic rivers or other designations that our Interior Department has to manage.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Upon review of the amendment of my good friend from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE), we are prepared to accept it and will not oppose the amendment.

I reserve.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the gentleman for accepting the amendment, and I thank the Chair.

Now, let me say a few words about energy, since everybody else has. I didn't plan to when I came down here, but I have to say that Republicans will charge, with some justification, that the Democrats have been in charge for the last 2 years and have failed to pass significant substantial energy legislation. Democrats will charge, with some justification, that the Republicans have been in charge for a number of years and failed to do so.

We blamed the Senate. We didn't have 60 votes in the Senate. The Democrats can do the same at this point.

But here we are today, and we can't continue to look back and say we should have done something before, because we are here today and people are asking, why aren't you passing something? With justification, I might add.

Now, one of the speakers mentioned that what the Republicans were proposing was more like a Fred Flintstone bill of some type. And I would have to ask that same speaker how she plans to get home tonight. Unless she has a Flintstone mobile, she's probably riding in something that is powered by gas, maybe a hybrid, unlikely that it's electricity. In fact, less than 1 percent of our current energy needs in this country are produced by solar, which she talked about. Less than 1 percent is produced by wind.

Now, in our plan it has plans for increased solar and wind. But if you doubled, if you tripled, if you quadrupled, quintupled, do whatever you want, to solar and wind for a number of years, we are going to rely on our traditional

energy sources. And so it makes sense that, while we are searching for the next big thing, while we wait for a hydrogen economy, or while we wait for wind and solar to really come on-line, or something else that we may not even know of, we have to use the resources that we have.

So nobody on this side is really saying drill and drill only. We're saying it has to be part of the mix and it has to be all of the above.

So there's plenty of blame to go around. I myself have not voted for one energy bill since I've been here in the past 8 years because I thought that some of them were too subsidy-laden. I didn't think that they really, really allowed us, in a free market way, to go out and use our resources.

But going forward, this is what we've got to look at; what are we going to do going forward. It doesn't do anybody any good to say well, the Democrats didn't do anything, or the Republicans didn't. We're here today, and it's time to do something on this.

Again, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee and appreciate him accepting this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion to rise.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 221, noes 193, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 580]

AYES—221

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

Hinchey	McNerney	Scott (GA)
Hinojosa	McNulty	Scott (VA)
Hirono	Meek (FL)	Serrano
Holden	Meeks (NY)	Sestak
Holt	Melancon	Shea-Porter
Honda	Michaud	Sherman
Hooley	Miller (NC)	Shuler
Hoyer	Miller, George	Sires
Inslee	Mitchell	Skelton
Israel	Mollohan	Slaughter
Jackson (IL)	Moore (KS)	Smith (WA)
Jefferson	Moore (WI)	Snyder
Johnson (GA)	Murphy (CT)	Solis
Johnson, E. B.	Murphy, Patrick	Space
Kagen	Murtha	Speier
Kanjorski	Nadler	Spratt
Kaptur	Napolitano	Spratt
Kennedy	Neal (MA)	Stupak
Kildee	Oberstar	Sutton
Kilpatrick	Obey	Tanner
Kind	Oliver	Tauscher
Klein (FL)	Ortiz	Taylor
Kucinich	Pallone	Thompson (CA)
Lampson	Pascarell	Thompson (MS)
Langevin	Pastor	Tierney
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Towns
Larson (CT)	Pomerooy	Tsongas
LaTourette	Price (NC)	Van Hollen
Lewis (GA)	Rangel	Velázquez
Lipinski	Reyes	Visclosky
Loebach	Richardson	Walz (MN)
Lofgren, Zoe	Rodriguez	Wasserman
Lowey	Ross	Schultz
Lynch	Rothman	Waters
Mahoney (FL)	Roybal-Allard	Watson
Maloney (NY)	Ruppersberger	Watt
Markey	Ryan (OH)	Waxman
Marshall	Salazar	Weiner
Matheson	Sánchez, Linda	Welch (VT)
Matsui	T.	Wexler
McCarthy (NY)	Sanchez, Loretta	Wilson (OH)
McCollum (MN)	Sarbanes	Woolsey
McDermott	Schakowsky	Wu
McGovern	Schiff	Yarmuth
McIntyre	Schwartz	

NOES—193

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

Roskam	Smith (NE)	Walberg
Royce	Smith (NJ)	Walden (OR)
Ryan (WI)	Smith (TX)	Walsh (NY)
Sali	Souder	Wamp
Saxton	Stark	Weller
Scalise	Stearns	Westmoreland
Schmidt	Sullivan	Whitfield (KY)
Sensenbrenner	Tancredo	Wilson (NM)
Sessions	Terry	Wilson (SC)
Shadegg	Thornberry	Wittman (VA)
Shays	Tiahrt	Wolf
Shimkus	Tiberi	Young (AK)
Shuster	Turner	Young (FL)
Simpson	Upton	

NOT VOTING—24

Bilbray	Gonzalez	Payne
Boustany	Hodes	Peterson (MN)
Cannon	Hulshof	Pitts
Cazayoux	Lee	Reynolds
Christensen	Levin	Rush
Edwards (TX)	Moran (KS)	Udall (CO)
English (PA)	Norton	Udall (NM)
Fortuño	Paul	Weldon (FL)

□ 1552

Messrs. WELLER of Illinois, BRADY of Texas and BURTON of Indiana changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. ZOE LOFGREN of California, Messrs. WEINER, SNYDER, COOPER, KLEIN of Florida, CHANDLER, LYNCH, Ms. KILPATRICK, Messrs. FARR, McDERMOTT, ENGEL, ETHERIDGE, BOYD of Florida, ACKERMAN, HINOJOSA, BLUMENAUER, WELCH of Vermont, BISHOP of Georgia, COSTELLO, and LAMPSON changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CAPUANO) having assumed the chair, Mr. ROSS, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3667) to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate a segment of the Missisquoi and Trout Rivers in the State of Vermont for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 3 o'clock and 53 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1727

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ALTMIRE) at 5 o'clock and 27 minutes p.m.

MISSISQUOI AND TROUT RIVERS WILD AND SCENIC RIVER STUDY ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1419 and rule