

law by President Clinton. In 2002, a clean 5-year reauthorization received similar unanimous support in Congress and was signed into law by President Bush. Last year, an identical bill, H.R. 5540, passed the House by an overwhelming bipartisan vote.

H.R. 965 will permanently reauthorize this bipartisan program, which the White House Conference on Cooperative Conservation, headed by the Department of the Interior, has called a success story. It's worth noting that the National Park Service has also recommended permanent reauthorization of the network.

I encourage all my colleagues to vote for this rule and the underlying bill and to continue to support the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network.

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

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from New York, my good friend, Mr. ARCURI, for the time.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the House of Representatives is spending 1 hour debating the rule that will be used to consider the underlying legislation being brought to the floor today, the Chesapeake Bay Watertrails Continuing Authorization Act. That simple and noncontroversial legislation, barely two pages in length, passed last Congress, as my good friend has mentioned, by an overwhelming vote. In fact, it passed by 321-86. That is a pretty impressive margin. I believe it will pass today by, at the very least, that margin.

So I would ask why the majority is going through all of this trouble of having the House consider a special rule for a two-page bill. Why is the House going to spend 2 hours today, approximately, discussing a bill that could have been handled in just a few minutes under suspension and ultimately pass by an overwhelming majority vote in this House?

□ 1030

I'm not sure of the answer. But I think it's noteworthy that the majority spends a week's worth of Congress' precious time on water trails and the Chesapeake while Americans face unemployment levels we have not seen in 26 years.

The majority is requiring the House today to consider the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network Continuing Authorization Act, a bill that spends \$5 million over 5 years through a process that requires hours of debate. But yesterday, we considered the Wind Energy Research and Development Act of 2009 with only 40 minutes total of debate, and that bill authorized the expenditure of \$1 billion.

So I would ask, how is it appropriate for the majority to require up to 2 hours of debate to spend \$5 million, but it authorizes 40 minutes of debate for

\$1 billion? It may not be appropriate, but it is certainly common practice under this majority to rush important legislation through the House. I fear we may see that again when the House considers the majority's health care reform legislation.

Consider that this Chesapeake Bay water trails bill was introduced in February; it has remained unchanged since then, giving Members months to consider and read the two-page bill. And that is consistent with the Speaker's pledge, still on her Web site, that "Members should have at least 24 hours to examine bills and conference reports and texts prior to floor consideration." But will the majority live up to their pledge to allow Members time to read the health care bill when it finally comes together?

Perhaps if the majority had lived up to their promise, Members would have had time to properly read and consider the cap-and-tax as well as the so-called "stimulus" bill and voted them down. So let's see, Mr. Speaker, let's see if they live up to their promise when we consider the health care legislation. I won't be holding my breath.

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

Mr. ARCURI. Mr. Speaker, we are here today to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network. This is a program that did not have a single Member of Congress oppose its creation or its subsequent reauthorization. The program has been heralded as a success by the Bush administration and was unanimously reauthorized during that administration. This rule provides for consideration of the legislation that would now permanently extend the authorization for this bipartisan program, a move endorsed by the National Park Service.

We all agree that the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network is a good program that has had a positive impact on preservation and recreation within the Chesapeake Bay watershed, but it's clear that some of us disagree on whether to make the reauthorization permanent, which is why we've made in order a substitute amendment that would reauthorize the program for 5 years to allow a full debate.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the previous question and on the rule.

I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CHESAPEAKE BAY GATEWAYS AND WATERTRAILS NETWORK CONTINUING AUTHORIZATION ACT

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 726, I call up the bill (H.R. 965) to amend the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 to provide for the continuing authorization

of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 726, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 965

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

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

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

#### SEC. 2. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

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

"(c) Authorization of Appropriations.— There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as are necessary to carry out this section."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, it shall be in order to consider the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in House Report 111-249 if offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) or his designee, which shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for 20 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

#### 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 insert extraneous material on H.R. 965.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 965, introduced by our friend and colleague, Representative JOHN SARBANES. H.R. 965 is a simple, straightforward bill that would permanently authorize the highly successful Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network.

Over 10 million people each year visit one of the 166 gateway sites supported by this program. They come to kayak or canoe, hike or bike, picnic, hunt or fish, or to watch wildlife. Others come to visit the Chesapeake's many maritime museums or to renew their acquaintance with the turning points in our Nation's history, such as the sites at Fort McHenry and Yorktown battlefield.

Each of these visitors comes away with a strengthened awareness of the crucial role the Chesapeake Bay plays in our national story and as the ecological and economic heart of the mid-Atlantic. And that is the goal of the gateway network, to renew our connection with that great Bay. The program

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

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

Anyone who reads The Washington Post knows that the Bay's oyster population is in trouble. That situation is both a symptom and one of the causes of the precarious health of the Bay. Keeping people connected and concerned about the Bay is vital to each step in restoring that great estuary, from its headwaters to its oyster beds. The Gateways Network does just that. This program is a proven success and should be permanently authorized.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 965.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. HASTINGS of Washington asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I must begin the debate today by expressing my sympathy to the Democrat sponsors of this legislation for the poor luck that has befallen this bill for now 2 consecutive years. It seems like when the going gets tough and there is a need to fill a void on the House floor, someone on the Democrat side says, hey, let's roll out the Chesapeake water trails bill.

Last year, when gas prices were at record levels, at an average of \$4.19 in my home State of Washington, Democrat leaders put this bill on the floor to be debated for several hours as they sought to avoid voting on a Republican plan to lower gas prices and open additional offshore areas to drilling. And so now here we are this year, after the vigorous debate over health care that took place all across America in August, after the President's speech last night, with the government takeover of health care in America very much alive and a threat in these halls of Congress, with the economy struggling, with more and more Americans losing their jobs, with unemployment nearing 10 percent, Democrat leaders have once again sent this Chesapeake Bay bill to the floor to fill a void.

Mr. Speaker, this bill passed last year with over 300 out of 435 votes; in fact, specifically 321 Members voted for this bill. This bill could be considered and passed by the House in just a few minutes under the expedited process of the suspension calendar. Yet, Mr. Speaker, here we are this morning with several hours dedicated to debate on water trails when this Congress should be focused on creating jobs and getting

control over massive government spending—spending. I might add, that has led to a \$1 trillion budget deficit in just a few months of this new Obama administration.

So, Mr. Speaker, just like last year, Republicans will explain our concerns with this bill, and then we will focus on the higher priorities facing our country and the American people.

Chairman GRIJALVA has very clearly explained this bill. It is a very simple bill that renews a government program that has bipartisan support from the States surrounding the Chesapeake Bay. In fact, after the August discussion around the country of a more than 1,000-page health care bill, I am pleased, very pleased, that this Chesapeake Bay bill is not even one-half page in length. Despite the shortness of the bill, however, Republicans believe it can be improved upon and have proposed an alternative that is even shorter and that recognizes the need for this Congress to exercise some degree of fiscal discipline.

As currently written, this bill would extend the current Chesapeake Bay program forever without any constraints or limits on how much money can be spent on the program. Mr. Speaker, this may be a popular program in the mid-Atlantic region of our country; yet I don't believe the Natural Resources Committee and this Congress should be in the habit of granting eternal life and unlimited sums of money to government programs.

Bills creating or renewing government programs are typically renewed for a set period of time, usually 5 years, to ensure that there is accountability in these programs, there is a review of these programs, and to ensure that taxpayer dollars are not being misused, wasted, or unnecessarily spent. There is simply no reason to exempt this Chesapeake Bay program from a periodic review of 5 years, and there is certainly no reason to lift the cap on spending for this program.

The substitute amendment by Congressman BISHOP of Utah, who is the ranking Republican on the National Parks Subcommittee, would renew the bill for 5 years and retain the current limit on spending. This Chesapeake Bay program has previously existed on 5-year periods of time and can continue to do so in the future if that amendment is agreed to.

So I urge all of my colleagues to support the Bishop amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, at this point, let me yield as much time as he may consume to the sponsor of the legislation, Mr. SARBANES.

Mr. SARBANES. I want to thank Chairman GRIJALVA, and Chairman RAHALL as well, for their strong support of the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network.

This is a bill that is, I believe, quite noncontroversial. We are here today debating it because there is some difference of perspective with respect to

whether there ought to be a permanent authorization to this bill or not. That is something I strongly support because I think it sends a very powerful message to the citizenry in the Chesapeake Bay watershed that the Federal Government is ready to be a partner on a permanent basis. If we want people to step forward and take ownership at the community level and across the watershed, we need to send that message to them, and there is no better way to send that message than to permanently authorize this program.

The Chesapeake Bay has a tremendous story to tell. I'm from Maryland, of course, and we consider ourselves in many ways principally stewards of the Chesapeake Bay. It is a national treasure. It is the largest estuary body in the United States. But it doesn't just touch the State of Maryland; it touches six States and the District of Columbia. It touches New York, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, Virginia and West Virginia.

□ 1045

The watershed stretches from MICHAEL ARCURI's district, where he represents Cooperstown, New York, where it begins, to BOBBY SCOTT's district in Virginia. The cosponsors of this bill are both Democrat and Republican, indicating the strong support that it has had from the beginning of the program.

Some of you know I have introduced other legislation which is focused very specifically on how we engage the next generation, engage our young people in the environment and get them outdoors learning.

The Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network is a wonderful resource for that. There are over 156 sites, historic, natural, cultural, recreational sites across the watershed that are available because of the funding that comes through technical assistance and other grant funding, that are available as a resource for the next generation to take advantage of, available for older generations to pass on the history of this area and this region to the next generation.

So I am excited. And I appreciate the gentleman's sympathies to me, but I must say any opportunity that I have to talk about the importance of this network is one that I would seize happily.

I do want to reiterate that this represents the National Park Service's component of a larger partnership that exists on behalf of the Chesapeake Bay on the part of the Federal Government that includes the National Park Service, that includes the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, that includes the Environmental Protection Agency, and this is a partnership that has just worked fabulously over many, many years.

In closing, let me just emphasize again, and I know we will debate it a little bit later with respect to the amendment that is going to be proposed by Congressman BISHOP, but let

me just emphasize again how important it is that this be a permanent authorization. We need to send a message, a powerful message, to the citizens that are part of the Chesapeake Bay watershed that the Federal Government is here to stay when it comes to preserving and protecting this incredible resource that we have.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have several Members that are not on the floor, so at this point I will reserve my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to our majority leader, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. I thank my friend, Chairman GRIJALVA, for yielding, and I thank Mr. SARBANES for his leadership on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for H.R. 965, legislation introduced by Representative JOHN SARBANES, whose father established this program some years ago and who was one of my closest friends, and still is, and with whom I worked very closely on this particular piece of legislation and so many other items directed at the environment in general and the Chesapeake Bay in particular.

This bill permanently reauthorizes the National Park Service's Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network Program. Those of us fortunate enough to live in the region have been blessed with a multitude of magnificent national resources, not the least of which is the Nation's largest estuary, the Chesapeake Bay, a body of water that has played such an important role in shaping the cultural, economic, political and social history of our region.

Unfortunately, the Chesapeake Bay of 2009 is not the pristine body that Captain John Smith first chartered on his expedition some 400 years ago. Indeed, earlier this year, the EPA Chesapeake Bay Program released the Chesapeake Bay's 2008 Health and Restoration Assessment which found the overall health of the bay remained degraded and that the Bay Program is still far short of most restoration goals. Shortly thereafter, the University of Maryland's Center for Environmental Science issued a report card grading the bay's health as a C-minus for the second year in a row. That obviously is not good news, nor is it acceptable.

Over the years, I have joined with many of my colleagues in supporting a number of legislative initiatives and securing millions of dollars focused on the restoration effort. While some progress has been made, clearly, as those reports indicate, much remains to be done.

I am heartened, Mr. Speaker, by the commitment of President Obama and his administration to the Chesapeake Bay. On May 12, President Obama issued an Executive order declaring that the restoration of the Bay requires a renewed commitment to controlling pollution, protecting habitat,

conserving land, and improving management of natural resources. I have the privilege of living on one of the tributaries that flows into the Chesapeake Bay, the Patuxent River, and I know how critical it is. We have the Anacostia River here and the Potomac River here in our city.

The President declared that the Federal Government should lead this effort and established a Federal Leadership Committee for the Chesapeake Bay consisting of relevant agencies which would be chaired by the EPA administrator. The agencies were directed to draft and submit reports to the committee making specific recommendations for protecting the Chesapeake Bay. The initial reports are slated to be made public today, which makes this effort very timely.

H.R. 965, the legislation we are now considering, takes another important step forward in our efforts by permanently authorizing a program that has already done so much to raise awareness of the fragile health of the bay and directly engage our region's citizens and visitors to take an active role in fulfilling our shared goal of restoring the Chesapeake.

The Chesapeake Bay Gateways Network, which includes more than 150 museums, State parks, wildlife refuges, and other sites in six States and the District of Columbia was established, Mr. Speaker, to link together these wonderful places in the hopes of enabling visitors to better understand and appreciate the role they can play in the bay's survival.

Unfortunately and tragically, much of the bay's stress is man-made. The program enables sites to compete for grant funding which must be fully matched for projects that will help conserve, restore, and interpret their roles in the bay's natural, cultural, and social history. The Gateways Program is a critical component to fostering a commitment among our citizens to restore the bay, and I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

In closing, let me thank Mr. GRIJALVA for his leadership in bringing this to the floor and Mr. SARBANES for his sponsorship and continuing the extraordinary legacy that his father over 30 years in the United States Senate and 6 years in the House of Representatives contributed to this country and to the Chesapeake Bay and our environment in particular.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, this will be a debate on a bill of complete congeniality, because I don't think any of us are really opposed to a lot of what is attempted in this underlying bill.

I certainly am not, Mr. Speaker, one who likes to say "I told you so," but I told you so. You see, it was said in the history of this particular bill, the first

time it was passed it was passed with a 5-year reauthorization and it passed unanimously in both houses. The second time it was reauthorized 5 years and it passed unanimously in both houses. Last year you decided to take the reauthorization away, not impose the 5-year limit, and we said on the floor if you actually put that back in there it would have a significant enhancement of its ability to pass the Senate, and you didn't do it. It didn't pass the Senate, so we are back here a year later doing the same thing again.

So I don't want to say I told you so, but to quote that great philosopher Yogi Berra, this is like *deja vu* all over again. For, indeed, a year ago, last year, instead of talking about energy issues, which were primarily on the minds of the American people, we brought up this particular bill and apparently did the same thing we are doing this year when health care is primarily on the minds of most people.

This is a particular bill which, in fact, is the only bill we are going to debate this week under a rule. I appreciate the majority leader being here and his statements on this particular bill. I don't know if I appreciate flying back for 4 hours just to do this bill this week. But, nonetheless, it is still the only one we are going to have here, even though there are significant issues we should be discussing, that the American people want us to discuss.

The majority leader was slightly in error in what he said though. Everything he said about the cleanup of the Chesapeake Bay was accurate. But this is not a cleanup bill. This is not an environmental protection bill. This is not an EPA bill. This is a recreation bill. I don't oppose that, but it is clear this is a recreation bill. And the National Park Service has made several suggestions, because once again there are no Federal waters or Federal assets associated in this particular area, the National Park Service did say that we should give technical assistance to this area, but they did not recommend fully funding on a nonrenewable basis other types of grant programs to this particular area. Indeed, the Obama budget does not have money in it for this particular bill.

So one of the things we need to talk about is if we are going to abrogate our oversight responsibilities, and if we decide not to abrogate our oversight responsibilities and treat this bill as other bills from the Resource Committee have been treated, we will probably have a better chance of actually passing the bill this year in both Houses of Congress and not coming back for a third try next time around.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I flew back 4 hours to deal with this very important piece of legislation, but also to listen to our President last night, which I thought was worth the trip.

I now yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. KRATOVIL), a cosponsor of the legislation.

Mr. KRATOVIL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 965, the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network Continuing Authorization Act offered by my friend and colleague from Maryland, Representative JOHN SARBANES.

This act is vital to the residents of Maryland's First Congressional District and all those who rely on a healthy Chesapeake Bay for commercial, recreational and historical purposes. The act provides grants to parks, volunteer groups, wildlife sanctuaries, historic sites, museum and water trails. A network has been developed that ties sites together that provide meaningful experiences and fosters citizen stewardship of the Chesapeake Bay, not only by those who have the good fortune to live within its watershed, but all who come to visit or are able to benefit economically from it.

Since 2000, the network has grown to include 156 gateways in six States and the District of Columbia and over 1,500 miles of established and developing water trails, many of which are located in my district, within the boundaries of Maryland's First Congressional District.

From Sandy Point State Park on Maryland's western shore, traversing the Bay Bridge to the schooner Sultana in Chestertown, the Blackwater Wildlife Refuge in Dorchester County, down the lower shore to the Smith Island Center and the Tawes Museum in Crisfield, network destinations literally dot the landscape of the First Congressional District with historical, environmental and cultural landmarks.

The ultimate goal of this network is to create an atmosphere of natural, cultural, historical and recreational sites throughout the Chesapeake Bay region. Residents and visitors are able to visit these places to learn about the bay's diverse stories, experience its history and enjoy its natural beauty. Whether it is a family paddling a water trail, riding on a ferry or driving a scenic tour route, each and every visitor will hopefully develop a greater sense of appreciation for our Nation's largest estuary.

For these reasons, I support the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network Continuing Authorization Act and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Thank you again to Mr. SARBANES for sponsoring the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), a very distinguished and valuable member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman for yielding time.

I rise in support of H.R. 965, the legislation to reauthorize the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network. I represent Virginia's First Congressional District, better known as

America's First District, which is largely defined by the Chesapeake Bay. My constituents live, work and play in the bay watershed.

My district includes many components of the Gateways Network, from historic Yorktown and Jamestown to George Washington's birthplace in Westmoreland County. The Gateways Network links together over 100 parks, museums, wildlife refuges, and other cultural and historic sites into a comprehensive system.

□ 1100

The gateway program connects visitors with the natural beauty and rich history and recreational opportunities within the Chesapeake Bay watershed, and I've had the privilege to travel the trail, specifically the Captain John Smith Water Trail. It is an amazing asset that we have. I've heard from many constituents that realize how valuable that is and what a great experience it brings to them to travel up and down the bay to link all the history and the resources that are there in our wonderful bay watershed.

One of those recreational opportunities, as I said the network provides, is the chance to kayak or sail the Captain John Smith Water Trail. It's an amazing experience, and that traces John Smith's 17th century voyage of discovery, and you can put yourself in the place of Captain John Smith and the experience that he had when he first arrived on these shores.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I offer my support of this bill and I want to commend my friend from Maryland, Mr. SARBANES, for his effort in leadership in our efforts to focus on the bay and its restoration.

Mr. GRIJALVA. If I may inquire of Mr. HASTINGS if he has any additional speakers.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I have a few others, but they're not here. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman have anymore speakers on his side?

Mr. GRIJALVA. No, Mr. Speaker.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate on the bill has expired.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

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

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. REAUTHORIZATION.**

Section 502 of the Chesapeake Bay Initiative Act of 1998 (16 U.S.C. 461 note; Public Law 105-312) is amended by striking "2008" and inserting "2014".

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 726, the gen-

tleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity of presenting this particular amendment, not because we have any antipathy towards the Chesapeake Bay or the recreational purposes that may be there, and I appreciate the fact that you enjoyed the first speech, but because it's about time we do it right way. Surely we can bully through this any way we want to, but we need to do it the right way, the way it was done the first time and the second time and the way it should be done this particular time.

When this bill last year came out of the Resources Committee, it was compiled with six other bills, all of which had 5-year reauthorizations. Some of the bills that Resources has sent out here have not had those type of reauthorizations. However, they had another factor which put a cap on the kind of appropriations that could be there, and that's why a 5-year reauthorization process is the perfect kind of compromise.

It's a position between the National Park Service which last year said there should be technical assistance, but was opposed to any kind of grant process going through this because they said this program had matured to the point it no longer needed to be supported by the Federal Government, or the sponsor's approach, which simply says, take off limit and continue on with what has been now close to \$9 million of earmarks for this program.

It's not a problem. The appropriations is not a problem. What is the problem is we are now giving up our rights to review these types of programs, which is not what an authorizing committee ought to do. There is, in past experience, not here but in past experience, where sites that no longer have to be renewed by Congress do become lethargic and no longer have that desire for innovation to produce results. That's not necessarily to say it will happen here, but that has been the process that we have learned through history.

The purpose of an authorizing committee is to authorize and then review those authorizations, which is why it has been tradition for committees to put in an authorization period for those particular reviews. And it is not wise for Congress to abrogate our congressional responsibility for those purposes. What we're talking about is simply saying, look, what we need, as a Congress, are the options to review this in the future and not take the options off the table.

That's the one thing all Americans are talking about more than anything else is the idea of options. Like my family just gave me an Ipod. And I don't know how to download stuff, but they can put music on there. When I was growing up, if I wanted a song and,

Mr. Speaker, you're probably in the same situation I was, I had to buy the entire record to get the song. I don't need to do that. I now have more options. If I want to go and buy cereal, I look at an entire store and there is an entire wall of potential cereals up there which I can buy. I am given options. If I want to order vanilla ice cream, I can still go to a store that offers me 31 flavors. There are 59 different kinds of Eggo waffles.

Our entire life is provided by options. And yet, as a Congress, we decide and seem to have this tendency to take options off the table so we don't have them for the future. That, to me, is just a mind-boggling approach to it. It's the same thing that we're talking about in health care, which is the topic on the minds of the American people which we should be talking about today on this floor, rather than reauthorizing a bill we all like and support.

But in that, the issue once again, is options for the American people. There are myriad types of proposals being put out there by some of my Republican colleagues, all which deal with the concept of giving options to the American people: options to buy their own health care, options to get HSAs, options to have new association pools, option in which they can buy across lines, options in which we can have tort reform. All those things should be on the table, and that's what we should be doing.

In like manner to this particular bill, we are, once again, limiting our options, which is the exact opposite thing government should be doing. Now, that's what's important, and that's where we should be going. Like I said, a year ago we had this particular bill, this particular amendment again, which would have made it better and probably then had helped the Senate to actually include it in their list of bills to be passed.

If we do this particular amendment, to do what we have traditionally done with other bills, what we are doing is simply providing Congress with the options Congress should accept, and make sure that we are always reviewing the programs we have to see what they are doing, and a 5-year period is the norm. It is traditional.

This simply would say we're going to do this bill and we're going to do it the right way, do it totally the right way, so once again it might be passed unanimously, as it was the first time when they had a review in there and the second time when they had a review in there, and was not passed the third time when they decided not to put a review in this particular piece of legislation.

We've got options. We should be doing it. Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment offered by my friend, Representative BISHOP.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, the National Park Service has found that this is a very, very successful program in large part because the Federal commitment leverages funding and support from State, local and nonprofit partners who care deeply about the health of the Chesapeake Bay. There is a broad agreement that making the Federal commitment to this program permanent will send a strong signal to the program's partners and make the program even more effective in the long run.

I would point out that both the Save America's Treasures and Preserve America programs have permanent authorizations. Conversely, amending the bill to make the authorization time-limited would cause funding partners to question the level of Federal commitment and could cause private contributions to drop off.

The purpose of granting this program a permanent authorization is to avoid having to return to Congress every 5 years to get new legislation for what is, by all measures, a successful program. I should add that, despite my friend's arguments about a permanent authorization, this program will continue to receive annual oversight through the appropriations process.

Regarding the existing cap on annual funding for the program, such a cap may have been appropriate when the program was first authorized in 1998. However, as more and more people become aware of the importance of the bay, the challenges it faces, Congress should provide more funding for the grant program. Proponents would like to be able to seek increased funding through the appropriations process and not have to get new authorization legislation each time they seek more funding.

This is an important and successful program. It deserves a permanent authorization. I urge Members to vote against the Bishop amendment and for H.R. 965 to permanently authorize this very excellent program.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. FLEMING).

Mr. FLEMING. I thank my friend, Mr. BISHOP from Utah, for letting me speak. I enjoy serving on Natural Resources and certainly this is an important topic; but I do want to bring up what happened on this very floor last night with regards to health care.

The Congressional Research Service, which, as you know, are experts when it comes to whatever happens in terms of academics in Congress, came out with a report this morning on the controversial topic of does ObamaCare, or H.R. 3200, or whichever Democrat version of the bill we're talking about, does it cover illegal immigrants. And let me give you a quote from the CRS. It says: "Under H.R. 3200, an insurance exchange would begin operation in 2013 and would offer private plans alongside a public option. H.R. 3200 does not con-

tain any restrictions on noncitizens, whether legally or illegally present or in the United States."

So it's very clear that despite the fact that our President claims that this does not cover illegal immigrants, it absolutely does. In fact, in the SCHIP bill earlier this year, we tried, on our side of the aisle, to get language that was specific to require some sort of proof before someone could sign up for coverage under SCHIP that would show that they were not illegal immigrants. And, of course, that tougher language was removed.

Also, with regard to \$900-or-so billion that our President mentioned last night, cost of the health plan, which really most believe is more like \$1.6 trillion, he talked about savings that would come as a result of removal of fraud, waste, and abuse. Now, these programs, Medicare and Medicaid, which are government-run programs, have been in existence for around 45 years. What have we learned recently that we haven't known for all of these years that we can now remove fraud, waste, and abuse that we couldn't for 45 years?

In a 48-minute speech last night, the President did not bring up one new idea, any new strategy or techniques that would allow us to remove fraud, waste and abuse any better than we have been able to for all these years. The truth of the matter is that in order to reduce what we already have as waste in the system, we would have to create even another level or two of extremely expensive bureaucracy that would cost even more than what we would recover.

The fact of the matter is that a government system, whether it's running Cash for Clunkers, or the post office, is inept at controlling fraud, waste and abuse. It creates many new bureaucracies, in this case 53 new bureaucracies in the health care system; and, consequently, without moving to a private industrial form this wouldn't be possible.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. FLEMING. Yes, to kind of summarize, I think that there were, I was personally offended last night when our President insinuated, if not coming out right and condescendingly saying that somehow we've been lying about what we've been saying about these health care bills. But the fact is, if you look at the details, if you look at the truth, you find that what we've been saying we can back up with facts, whether it is taxpayer-funded abortions, which is definitely covered in all versions of the bill on the Democrat side, coverage of illegal immigrants, definitely covered, and then of course the cost of this monstrosity, which is going to start at \$1.6 trillion, and after about 10 years it's going to go up from there, never bending the cost curve down.

So, again, I would like to suggest that rather than being called out for

so-called myths, I think we should really get to the bottom and the real truth of this matter.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, in an effort to reintroduce germaneness to the debate on the amendment, let me recognize Mr. SARBANES for 3 minutes.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I agree there's going to be plenty of time to debate the health reform bill and to demonstrate very clearly that it does not extend benefits to those who are here unlawfully. But I hope the American people have the confidence that we can debate the health bill at the appropriate time and in the appropriate ways, while also conducting other business that faces the Nation which, of course, is what we're trying to do this morning with respect to the Chesapeake Bay Gateways and Watertrails Network.

And responding to some of the points raised by my colleague, Congressman BISHOP, I do just want to emphasize we understand that it's not maybe standard to move to a permanent authorization that typically would go to 5-year reauthorizations.

□ 1115

I want to make sure people understand that this is not being done lightly. This is being done for a very specific reason. There are times when, based on the experience of a program and an initiative, as in this case, you reach the conclusion that the program is worth authorizing on a permanent basis because you want to send a message, and it's particularly important to do that in circumstances where a key ingredient of the success of the program is the fact that you have thousands of ordinary citizens through community groups and nonprofits and other organizations stepping forward on a daily basis, saying, Yes, we want to be partners in this effort.

The last thing we want to do at that moment when so many people are saying, Yes, you can count on me at the community level to take up this charge to protect and preserve the Chesapeake Bay, is say to them, Well, we're not sure this commitment on behalf of the Federal Government is going to be there for the long term. That's why it is critical to this program that we authorize it on a permanent basis, so I want to urge that we do that.

I do also want to note that this program couldn't be further away from an earmark program. There was a suggestion made there. In fact, the National Park Service makes judgments on which partners to recognize based on applications that come in for grant funding, and the Congress has never approved an earmark as part of the Chesapeake Bay Gateway program.

So this is a good program. I think it's one that deserves to be authorized on a permanent basis for the reasons that I indicated, and I would urge that we oppose the Bishop amendment.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. I am ready to use my final minute if I might, Mr. Speaker.

I don't want to be cantankerous about this. We are talking about a decent bill from a decent program with a decent sponsor, but we are not in the system of sending out messages. We are a legislative body that is supposed to review and that is supposed to budget, and in that way, we should not be abrogating our responsibilities over to the appropriators. It's an authorizing concept. It's what authorizers ought to do. It's what we should be doing. NEPA is renewed. Endangered Species is renewed, as is the Clean Water Act. In fact, the only thing we have not renewed—and it's on a permanent basis—is the Nautical Charting Act that was started in the 1700s by Thomas Jefferson.

So what we are talking about is doing what is the norm and doing what is rational and doing this bill the right way and actually—I hate to say this—but once again, to try and not limit what we are doing as a body.

Health care is what we should be talking about. The bill that PELOSI has put on the floor is not the only idea. There are better bills out there that think outside of the box, but unless we put the Price bill, the Shadegg bill, the Ryan bill, and the Gohmert bill on the floor to be discussed and debated, we will not have all of the options open to us. That is also why I am arguing that we should have a permanent review, a review every 5 years, of this program. It is what Congress does, and we should do it and do it the right way.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, in closing, the NPS, the National Park Service, gave the subcommittee testimony, and they said, through technical and financial assistance, the National Park Service has assisted Gateways to develop hundreds of partnerships across the watershed to help people understand and appreciate the Chesapeake Bay.

It has been mentioned, nevertheless, that the Bush administration testified that it opposed this financial assistance or the grants program. When I asked the Park Service witness at that 2007 hearing about that contradiction, he said that the Park Service would love to continue the grants program, but it was a financial decision made by OMB, by the Bush administration.

This is a good program. It is all linked together. A permanent authorization would secure this program for the future. It is a vital environmental link to the Mid-Atlantic which must be saved. With that, I urge a “no” vote on the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 726, the previous question is ordered on the bill and the amendment by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP).

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

The amendment was rejected.

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

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

#### MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. In its present form, I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Hastings of Washington moves to recommit the bill H.R. 965 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following new section:

#### SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The amendments made by section 2 shall not take effect until the national deficit is less than \$1,000,000,000,000.

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, this is a very, very simple motion to recommit.

Many times in this body—and I think rightfully so—we are accused of not reading bills or amendments that are before us. I cite, of course, the cap-and-trade or cap-and-tax bill, when we were thrust an 800-page amendment only 8 hours or so before we debated it. We had an 1,100-page health care bill that America is now seeing and is digesting, and they are responding back to us. This is a very short bill, as I have mentioned, and this motion to recommit is also very, very short. In fact, I am going to read it, Mr. Speaker, so that everybody can hear it. It is that short.

It says at the end of the bill, Add the following new section: Section 3. Effective date. The amendments made by section 2 shall not take effect until the national deficit is less than \$1 trillion.

It is a small, small measure of fiscal discipline.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I have been here for 15 years; you've been here slightly longer than I have, but I have to say that this is the first Congress that I can ever remember using the term “\$1 trillion” in terms of fiscal budgets in this country. In fact, I would suggest everybody take this little test. Go back to your offices, and write down yourself what “\$1 trillion” is. It's a “one” followed by 12 zeros. It would kind of wake you up.

The reason I offer this motion to recommit, Mr. Speaker, is with unemployment approaching 10 percent, with upside-down mortgages and with homeowners facing foreclosure, I think it is hardly time to add eternal life and unlimited money to a very nice but unnecessary Federal program at a time when we are contemplating adding several massive new government programs such as health care, which I just mentioned, and cap-and-trade or cap-and-tax.

As I mentioned, I think it might be time to pause and consider the difference between things we need and things that we merely want. Of course, additional water trails and interpretive centers are nice to have, but increasing their numbers is not a necessity at this time. I am not opposed to them, by the way, but I am not prepared to support a law that says that this particular earmark program must be extended for all time with unlimited funds regardless of the deficit.

One of the popular jokes of our constituents when they want to disparage Washington is that the only earthly thing that has perpetual life is a government program. We need not add to their low view of how we operate, so I urge my colleagues to support this MTR, and we will add a degree of fiscal restraint to this legislation. I think that that restraint is badly needed.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to do something that probably has never been done. I am going to reread this motion to recommit because it is so short.

At the end of the bill, add the following new section: Section 3. Effective date. The amendments made by section 2 shall not take effect until the national deficit is less than \$1 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, the motion doesn't tell us who would have the certification power or how we would meet the standard that the motion to recommit attempts to make. It's like saying we on the Republican side ran up a huge deficit. Now we want to penalize this one little program until you clean up the mess.

Why this program? Why not a program that was done this morning during the Natural Resources Committee meeting where the sponsor of the motion to recommit, the gentleman from Washington, had legislation that passed for a road which runs through his district? Should we put the same standard on that legislation?

This is arbitrary, this motion to recommit. While it attempts to score political points, it also, if passed, jeopardizes a very valuable resource that, if not restored and protected through the legislation, will cause disastrous economic, environmental, cultural, and health consequences—bad consequences for the Mid-Atlantic and for the Nation as a whole. The motion to recommit, while an attempt to score points, has no merit. It is arbitrary and I urge its defeat.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of passage.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 194, nays 229, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 694]

YEAS—194

Aderholt	Foxx	Miller, Gary
Adler (NJ)	Franks (AZ)	Mitchell
Akin	Frelinghuysen	Moran (KS)
Alexander	Gallely	Murphy, Tim
Altmire	Garrett (NJ)	Myrick
Arcuri	Gerlach	Neugebauer
Austria	Giffords	Nunes
Bachmann	Gingrey (GA)	Nye
Bachus	Gohmert	Olson
Barrett (SC)	Goodlatte	Paul
Bartlett	Granger	Paulsen
Barton (TX)	Graves	Pence
Biggert	Griffith	Peters
Bilbray	Guthrie	Petri
Bilirakis	Hall (TX)	Pitts
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Platts
Blackburn	Hastings (WA)	Poe (TX)
Blunt	Heller	Posey
Bocchieri	Hensarling	Price (GA)
Boehner	Herger	Putnam
Bonner	Hoekstra	Radanovich
Bono Mack	Hunter	Rehberg
Boozman	Inglis	Reichert
Boustany	Jenkins	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Johnson (IL)	Rogers (AL)
Bright	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)
Broun (GA)	Jones	Rogers (MD)
Brown (SC)	Jordan (OH)	Rohrabacher
Brown-Waite,	King (IA)	Rooney
Ginny	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Kingston	Royce
Burgess	Kirk	Ryan (WI)
Burton (IN)	Kline (MN)	Scalise
Buyer	Lamborn	Schmidt
Calvert	Lance	Schock
Camp	Latham	Sensenbrenner
Campbell	LaTourrette	Sessions
Cantor	Latta	Shadegg
Cao	Lee (NY)	Shimkus
Capito	Lewis (CA)	Shuler
Carter	Linder	Shuster
Cassidy	LoBiondo	Simpson
Castle	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Chaffetz	Luetkemeyer	Smith (NJ)
Childers	Lummis	Smith (TX)
Coble	Lungren, Daniel	Souder
Coffman (CO)	E.	Stearns
Cole	Mack	Sullivan
Conaway	Maffei	Taylor
Crenshaw	Manzullo	Teague
Culberson	Marchant	Terry
Davis (KY)	Marshall	Thompson (PA)
Deal (GA)	McCarthy (CA)	Thornberry
Dent	McCaul	Tiahrt
Diaz-Balart, L.	McClintock	Tiberti
Diaz-Balart, M.	McCotter	Turner
Dreier	McHenry	Upton
Driehaus	McHugh	Walden
Duncan	McIntyre	Wamp
Ehlers	McKeon	Westmoreland
Emerson	McMorris	Whitfield
Fallin	Rodgers	Wilson (SC)
Flake	Melancon	Wittman
Fleming	Mica	Wolf
Forbes	Miller (FL)	Young (FL)
Fortenberry	Miller (MI)	

NAYS—229

Abercrombie	Berkley	Brady (PA)
Ackerman	Berman	Brale (IA)
Andrews	Berry	Brown, Corrine
Baca	Bishop (GA)	Butterfield
Baird	Bishop (NY)	Capps
Baldwin	Blumenauer	Capuano
Barrow	Boren	Cardoza
Bean	Boswell	Carnahan
Becerra	Boucher	Carney

Carson (IN)	Jackson (IL)	Polis (CO)
Castor (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Pomeroy
Chandler	(TX)	Price (NC)
Chu	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Clarke	Johnson, E. B.	Rahall
Cleaver	Kagen	Rangel
Clyburn	Kanjorski	Reyes
Cohen	Kaptur	Richardson
Connolly (VA)	Kennedy	Rodriguez
Conyers	Kildee	Ross
Cooper	Kilpatrick (MI)	Rothman (NJ)
Costa	Kilroy	Roybal-Allard
Costello	Kind	Ruppersberger
Courtney	Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Rush
Crowley	Kissell	Ryan (OH)
Cuellar	Klein (FL)	Salazar
Cummings	Kosmas	Sánchez, Linda
Dahlkemper	Kratovil	T.
Davis (AL)	Kucinich	Sanchez, Loretta
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Sarbanes
Davis (TN)	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Schauer
DeGette	Lee (CA)	Schiff
DeLauro	Levin	Schrader
Dicks	Lewis (GA)	Schwartz
Dingell	Lipinski	Scott (GA)
Doggett	Loebsock	Scott (VA)
Donnelly (IN)	Lofgren, Zoe	Serrano
Doyle	Lowe	Sestak
Edwards (MD)	Lujan	Shea-Porter
Edwards (TX)	Maloney	Sherman
Ellison	Markey (CO)	Sires
Ellsworth	Markey (MA)	Skelton
Engel	Massa	Slaughter
Eshoo	Matheson	Smith (WA)
Etheridge	Matsui	Snyder
Farr	McCollum	Space
Fattah	McDermott	Speier
Filner	McGovern	Spratt
Foster	McMahon	Stark
Frank (MA)	McNerney	Stupak
Fudge	Meek (FL)	Sutton
Gonzalez	Meeks (NY)	Tanner
Gordon (TN)	Michaud	Thompson (CA)
Grayson	Miller (NC)	Thompson (MS)
Green, Al	Miller, George	Tierney
Green, Gene	Minnick	Titus
Grijalva	Mollohan	Tonko
Gutierrez	Moore (KS)	Towns
Hall (NY)	Moore (WI)	Tsongas
Halvorson	Moran (VA)	Van Hollen
Hare	Murphy (CT)	Velázquez
Harman	Murphy (NY)	Visclosky
Hastings (FL)	Murphy, Patrick	Walz
Herich	Murtha	Wasserman
Herseth Sandlin	Nadler (NY)	Schultz
Higgins	Napolitano	Waters
Hill	Neal (MA)	Watson
Himes	Oberstar	Watt
Hinche	Obey	Waxman
Hinojosa	Olver	Weiner
Hirono	Ortiz	Welch
Hodes	Pallone	Wexler
Holden	Pascrell	Wilson (OH)
Holt	Pastor (AZ)	Woolsey
Honda	Perlmutter	Wu
Hoyer	Perriello	Yarmuth
Inslee	Peterson	
Israel	Pingree (ME)	

NOT VOTING—10

□ 1207

Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. CHU, Ms. KILROY, Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. MURPHY of Connecticut, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Messrs. HONDA, WELCH, CUMMINGS, CARNAHAN, WEINER, ACKERMAN, PATRICK J. MURPHY of Pennsylvania, LANGEVIN, FATTAH, JOHNSON of Georgia, NADLER, RANGEL, WALZ and Ms. BALDWIN changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. JORDAN of Ohio, AKIN, SULLIVAN, NEUGEBAUER, TIAHRT, Ms. GIFFORDS, and Mr. ROGERS of Alabama changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

**MOMENT OF SILENCE IN MEMORY OF FORMER REPRESENTATIVE W.G. "BILL" HEFNER OF NORTH CAROLINA**

(Mr. PRICE of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on September 2, we received the sad news of the passing of W.G. "Bill" Hefner, the Representative for 12 terms from the Eighth District of North Carolina. He served from 1975 to 1998.

Bill Hefner was a beloved and respected Member of this body, a man who never lost his sympathy for the underdog and never lost his capacity to advocate for the working people of our State and our Nation.

Bill was probably best known for his impact on the quality of life of our military men and women, our service men and women, through his chairmanship of the Military Construction Appropriations subcommittee.

I would, at this point, like to yield to LARRY KISSELL who currently represents the Eighth District of North Carolina and who on Tuesday night convened a Special Order to pay tribute to this wonderful man.

Mr. KISSELL. Mr. Speaker, Mr. Hefner was my Congressman for 24 years. He was a Congressman that was beloved by the people of the district because he never forgot where he came from. He came to North Carolina having grown up in Alabama as the son of a sharecropper. He had a gift given to him by God to sing music, and he came to North Carolina as a very successful gospel singer. Having never run for office before, he ran for Congress.

We in the Eighth District miss him and pass on our thoughts to his widow, Nancy, and his daughters, Stacye and Shelly.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I would now like to yield to the dean of our delegation, HOWARD COBLE.

Mr. COBLE. I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding.

Bill Hefner's district was contiguous to my district. On one occasion, a friend of mine decided to run against Bill and asked me to come and say a good word for him. I did that, but I did not say a bad word against Bill. But we House Members have a way of guarding our district lives very jealously. And Bill said to me, the next time you come into my district, I'm going to bring a gospel quartet into your district and get your attention. I said, well, Bill, when you do, will you promise to sing "Sweet Beulah Land" and "I'll Meet You in the Morning"? He was so taken aback that I knew those songs, he said,

oh, forget about it, I'll talk to you about it later.

But DAVID, as you said, as Mr. PRICE said, he was indeed a friend of the veterans. He was a good man, and we will miss him.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of Congressman Bill Hefner, who served North Carolina's eighth Congressional District for 24 years with distinction. In addition to his service in the United States House of Representatives, Mr. Hefner served as a Marshall County Commissioner in my home state of Alabama. He spent his later years in my hometown of Huntsville.

Congressman Hefner was a fine example of a public servant. He fought for the interests of his constituents, bucking party lines time and time again in the process. He was a champion of our military, working tirelessly on behalf of our veterans to ensure they received the tools needed to do their jobs and the benefits earned through service.

Congressman Hefner lived a full life, spending time in a myriad of positions from a Southern Baptist gospel singer to radio station owner. His dedication and commitment to public service made Alabama, North Carolina, Washington, DC, and our nation as a whole a better place, and he will be sorely missed.

Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory and life of former Congressman Bill Hefner.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of my 1-minute.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. I ask that all Members rise and that we observe a moment of silence in memory of our dear departed colleague.

**MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE**

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1243. An act to provide for the award of a gold medal on behalf of Congress to Arnold Palmer in recognition of his service to the Nation in promoting excellence and good sportsmanship in golf.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 1023. An act to establish a non-profit corporation to communicate United States entry policies and otherwise promote leisure, business, and scholarly travel to the United States.

The message also announced that, pursuant to Public Law 106-567, the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2001, the Chair, on behalf of the Republican Leader, appoints the fol-

lowing individual to serve as a member of the Public Interest Declassification Board:

General Michael V. Hayden of Virginia.

The message also announced that, pursuant to provisions of Public Law 110-343, the Chair, on behalf of the Republican Leader, appoints the following individual as a member of the Congressional Oversight Panel:

Mr. Paul S. Atkins of Virginia, vice John Sununu of New Hampshire.

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

**CHESAPEAKE BAY GATEWAYS AND WATERTRAILS NETWORK CONTINUING AUTHORIZATION ACT**

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

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

**RECORDED VOTE**

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 311, noes 107, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 695]

AYES—311

Abercrombie	Castle	Fattah
Ackerman	Castor (FL)	Finer
Adler (NJ)	Chandler	Forbes
Alexander	Childers	Fortenberry
Altmire	Chu	Poster
Andrews	Clarke	Frank (MA)
Arcuri	Cleaver	Frelinghuysen
Baca	Clyburn	Fudge
Baird	Cohen	Gallegly
Baldwin	Connolly (VA)	Gerlach
Barrow	Conyers	Giffords
Bartlett	Cooper	Gonzalez
Bean	Costa	Goodlatte
Becerra	Costello	Gordon (TN)
Berkley	Courtney	Grayson
Berman	Crowley	Green, Al
Berry	Cuellar	Green, Gene
Biggart	Cummings	Griffith
Bilbray	Dahlkemper	Grijalva
Bilirakis	Davis (AL)	Guthrie
Bishop (GA)	Davis (CA)	Gutierrez
Bishop (NY)	Davis (TN)	Hall (NY)
Bishop (UT)	DeFazio	Halvorson
Blumenauer	DeGette	Hare
Blunt	DeLauro	Harman
Bocchieri	Dent	Hastings (FL)
Boren	Diaz-Balart, L.	Heinrich
Boswell	Diaz-Balart, M.	Herseth Sandlin
Boucher	Dicks	Higgins
Brady (PA)	Dingell	Hill
Bralley (IA)	Doggett	Himes
Bright	Donnelly (IN)	Hinchee
Brown, Corrine	Doyle	Hinojosa
Buchanan	Driehaus	Hirono
Butterfield	Edwards (MD)	Hodes
Cantor	Edwards (TX)	Holden
Cao	Ehlers	Holt
Capito	Ellison	Honda
Capps	Ellsworth	Hoyer
Capuano	Emerson	Inslee
Cardoza	Engel	Israel
Carnahan	Eshoo	Jackson (IL)
Carney	Etheridge	Jackson-Lee
Carson (IN)	Fallin	(TX)