

for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Madam Speaker, I know many Democrats who love our country, who are dedicated public servants, and who are men and women of integrity. In the coming hours and days, I hope they will listen to their conscience, what they know in their heart is right, and take some action to stop a corruption of the legislative process.

If a new health care system is worthy of being enacted, it is worthy of being debated and voted on in an honest and straightforward way. Anything less is a stain on Congress and diminishes our great country.

How we conduct ourselves goes beyond a single bill. It will signal to those across the land, and perhaps to those in other lands, whether we deserve their respect or have justified their ridicule.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 54. Concurrent resolution recognizing the life of Orlando Zapata Tamayo, who died on February 23, 2010, in the custody of the Government of Cuba, and calling for a continued focus on the promotion of internationally recognized human rights, listed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, in Cuba.

□ 0915

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3644, OCEAN, COASTAL, AND WATERSHED EDUCATION ACT

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1192 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1192

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3644) to direct the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to establish education and watershed programs which advance environmental literacy, including preparedness and adaptability for the likely impacts of climate change in coastal watershed regions. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions of the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural

Resources; (2) the further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by Representative Capps of California or her designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, and shall be separately debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent; (3) the amendment to the further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Flake of Arizona or his designee, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (4) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1612) to amend the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993 to expand the authorization of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Commerce, and the Interior to provide service-learning opportunities on public lands, help restore the Nation's natural, cultural, historic, archaeological, recreational, and scenic resources, train a new generation of public land managers and enthusiasts, and promote the value of public service. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; (2) the further amendments printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules, each of which may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be in order without intervention of any point of order except those arising under clause 9 or 10 of rule XXI, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. During consideration of an amendment printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, the Chair may postpone the question of adoption as though under clause 8 of rule XX.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Colorado is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART). All time yielded during consideration of the rule is for debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. POLIS. I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend

their remarks on House Resolution 1192.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

House Resolution 1192 provides a structured rule for consideration of H.R. 3644, the Ocean, Coastal and Watershed Education Act, with 1 hour of debate in the House equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The rule makes in order the amendment in the nature of a substitute that is printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative Capps of California or her designee, which shall be separately debatable for 20 minutes. The rule also makes in order the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules, if offered by Representative FLAKE or his designee, which shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes.

The rule also provides for consideration of another bill, H.R. 1612, the Public Lands Service Corps Act of 2009, under a structured rule. The rule provides 1 hour of general debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The rule makes in order the further amendments printed in part C of the report of the Committee on Rules, each of which may be offered only by a Member designated in the report and shall be separately debatable for 10 minutes.

Finally, the rule provides one motion to recommit for both H.R. 3644 and H.R. 1612.

I think this is a very fair rule. The rule provides for consideration of two bills under a structured rule. For H.R. 3644, two of the three amendments that were submitted to the House Rules Committee are made in order, including one Republican amendment and one Democratic amendment. For H.R. 1612, two of the six amendments submitted were made in order, both of which are Republican amendments. So for both of the bills combined, three out of the four amendments that are made in order under this rule are sponsored by Republicans.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the underlying bills, the Ocean, Coastal and Watershed Education Act and the Public Land Service Corps Act. The programs within both of these bills benefit districts all across our Nation, from Florida to Alaska, Texas to Minnesota and Colorado. So it is no surprise that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle across the country support these programs.

I would like to thank Chairman RAHALL for his leadership on this important issue and my colleagues, Representatives Capps and GRIJALVA, for their hard work on these bills.

Madam Speaker, we have before us two excellent pieces of legislation, one which would expand and reinvigorate an existing program, the Public Land Corps, by streamlining its management, modernizing its scope and providing new tools to help the program accomplish its mission, and another bill which would expand two National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration grant programs that are aimed at enhancing environmental education related to water resources upon which economic development and human health depend.

H.R. 1612 will help repair and restore our Nation's public lands while employing and training thousands of young Americans and promoting a culture of public service.

This legislation will help provide real employment and training to young people who need it, particularly in a recession, while improving the condition of our priceless natural and cultural resources. We live in a time when environmental science education is just as critical for a healthy environment as land conservation or wildlife protection. Our citizens are empowered by being informed and educated enough to make important decisions in their own daily lives about environmental issues based on sometimes complicated scientific evidence. We need to supply our children and the next generation across our country with enough scientific knowledge to tackle the environmental challenges that they will face in the coming years and to make educated choices as consumers.

This bill also takes a decisive step forward in finishing desperately needed work on our national park lands, forests, wildlife refuges and historic sites. As I have said previously, protecting and maintaining our public lands is one of the most important duties that we have as citizens. I was lucky enough to grow up in Boulder, Colorado, hiking in Mount Sanitas, as I did just last weekend when I was back, the Flat Irons and Flagstaff Mountain. If we don't defend America's truly great public lands, we run the risk of being the last generation to enjoy them.

America and Colorado are really defined by our natural character. America is beautiful and needs our help to remain so. We must not let our "spacious skies," our "amber waves of grain" and our "purple mountains majesty" become nothing more than forgotten lines in a song.

The bill recognizes the importance, as well, of our coastal and marine systems and our national marine sanctuaries. Those previously have not been eligible for Public Land Corps projects but are just as worthy and just as important a part of our national heritage for those who reside on the coast.

While Members of this body as well as the American public review the historic health care reform bill we will be taking up in the next few days, we have the opportunity to consider this vital

program that has bipartisan support providing our youth the education and experience they will need to find meaningful employment while gaining civic pride, scientific education and personal responsibility while maintaining and improving our public lands and National Park System.

This program will invest in our young people, reduce youth unemployment, and prepare young people for a lifetime of work experiences. At the same time youth will be repairing and restoring our National Park System and preserving it for the next generation, we also are able to whittle away at the massive backlog of work that has doubled over the last decade to levels around the \$10 billion mark of backlog work that needs to be done. The National Park System has been called America's best idea, and it is past time we give our best attention and respect to the National Park System that it deserves.

Preparing our park system for future generations and preparing young people to face the scientific and environmental challenges that are only beginning to come to fruition is an undertaking of great national importance.

H.R. 3644, the Ocean, Coastal and Watershed Education Act, formally codifies and authorizes two existing programs that have already made great strides in expanding ocean, atmospheric, and environmental literacy in the United States. These programs, the Bay-Watershed Education and Training, which we call B-WET, and the Environmental Literacy Grant, ELG, program deserve Federal recognition and funding for their good work providing educational opportunities from kindergarten all the way through 12th grade.

This legislation gives us an opportunity to consider these vital programs, programs which provide our youth the education and experience that they will need to find meaningful employment in advancing our Nation's progress in science, technology, engineering and math to help keep America globally competitive.

H.R. 3644 codifies two existing environmental education grant programs that were established through the annual appropriations process and are administered by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Over the past 7 years, these two NOAA education programs have been essential towards advancing ocean and environmental education in the United States. Both programs are very popular in the education community, and in fact, requests for environmental literacy grants are 10 times greater than the appropriated funding levels can support.

Since 2002 and 2005, respectively, the B-WET and ELG programs have connected school children from kindergarten all the way through high school with their ocean and coastal environments. These programs help school children learn about the effects that everyday actions they take have on the environment.

Let's make no mistake about it. Our society is faced with a fundamental lack of scientific understanding, where special interests on all sides frequently undermine the vast scientific consensus on key issues simply by flashy public relations campaigns. We need to make sure that our country is the world leader in innovation and science in order to ensure that our country can overcome new challenges and protect its public health and natural wonders.

In addition to my time growing up in Colorado, I also spent a lot of time in San Diego growing up where the community is as physically, emotionally and economically tied to the ocean and coast as Colorado is to its mountains. Regardless of where someone lives in our great and vast country, whether it's the plains, the mountains, the forests, the coasts or the tundra, our Nation's public spaces, wildlife and environmental health are truly our greatest national treasures, an important part of our national character and who we are. And these pieces of legislation go a long way in our effort to protect them.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 0930

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I would like to thank my good friend, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), for the time.

I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, I would like to take a minute to contrast what the majority is doing today with what it is expected to do this weekend.

Today, the majority has brought forth a rule to provide 1 hour of debate for consideration of H.R. 3644, the Ocean, Coastal, and Watershed Education Act, and another hour of debate for H.R. 1612, the Public Lands Service Corps Act of 2009. That is a total of 2 hours of debate on bills that would direct the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration to establish education and watershed programs to advance environmental literacy, and expand the authorization to provide service-learning opportunities on public lands and train public land managers. I thank my good friend for thoroughly detailing and covering what is in those bills.

If the majority proceeds as expected later this weekend, Madam Speaker, the House will prohibit, other than in the rule, all time to debate the Senate health care bill and will send it to the President for his signature. So that bill, the Senate health care bill, would become law even though the House of Representatives would never consider it, never debate the bill. The House, in fact, has never even held a committee meeting on the Senate health care bill.

On Sunday, it is expected that the majority will deem the bill passed, and in a few days it would be law, the signature issue of this President and this congressional majority.

You would think, Madam Speaker, that they would proudly embrace their signature accomplishment. You would think that they would welcome debate on it. But they do not, because they know that the Senate bill is fatally flawed. The American people deserve a full and complete debate in the House on the Senate health care bill, but they won't get it.

Again, let's juxtapose that reality with today's actions.

Today, 2 hours of debate on two non-controversial bills that cost \$300 million and absolutely no debate, no committee hearings on a bill that costs nearly \$1 trillion, covers one-sixth of our economy, and will affect every single American. That is unfair and inappropriate.

Last year, the majority rushed through a 300-page amendment at 3 in the morning that no one was able to read on cap-and-trade. At that time, the American people rightly stood up and demanded that Congress read the bill. After this weekend's action, the people will demand that Congress not only read bills, but that we debate and vote on bills.

It would seem like common sense, Madam Speaker. But with this majority, it often seems as though common sense is the least common of the senses.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. There will be, and I certainly look forward to joining my colleague from Florida, a debate this weekend on the health care bill.

I am glad to see, on issues of our national parks and oceans, we are able to come together. And there are certainly other issues where Members of the body don't agree, but there will be a debate and there will be a rule proposed for that debate. I personally believe there should be several hours of debate, and I am hopeful that there will be 2 or 3 or more hours, which would then give Members on both sides who desire to present their positions the ability to do that.

I do take some issue with the characterization that there has not been a vetting of these issues involved. There have been, over the past year, dozens of hearings, even, very recently, a bipartisan summit that the President convened on health care. There have been many ideas and amendments from both sides of the aisle that have been incorporated into the bill that our committee will be doing a hearing on tomorrow and referring, for consideration of the House as a whole, a rule to consider that important piece of legislation.

Both of these bills that we have before us today under this rule are supported by national, regional, State, and local advocates. They are supported by leaders in education, environment, conservationists, service communities, and business communities.

Through passage of these bills, we are able to bring together the desire of this Congress of a meaningful impact

on creating jobs for young people, training for young people to occupy the jobs of the future, and doing some lasting good in preserving the historic character of our open spaces.

The B-WET and ELG programs are exactly the kind of innovative learning that we need to cultivate an environmentally minded workforce that can compete in the increasingly green economy of the future. By teaching our children not only to enjoy but also appreciate the value and effect of our endangered national treasures, we can truly create a workforce, a community, and a society that values our environment and our national heritage and in which the environment and economy are increasingly intertwined.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend for supporting 2 or 3 hours of debate on one-sixth of our economy.

I would point out that, pursuant to House rules, the deeming, which is presumed will occur with regard to the Senate bill in the debate on the rule itself, that debate is limited to 1 hour. So I would assume the 2 or 3 hours total would be after that bill, the Senate bill, is deemed to have passed by the 1 hour of debate on the rule.

But suffice it to say, it is an improvement that, with regard to one-sixth of the economy, our friends are saying that we should have 2 or 3 hours. But we will continue pressing.

Anyway, I would ask my friend if he has any further speakers. I have none.

Mr. POLIS. I have no additional speakers.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Madam Speaker, having said that, since there are no more Members on this side of the aisle who have requested time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Madam Speaker, I have here a letter which I will quote, in part, and then submit from a number of environmental groups under the auspices of the Campaign for Environmental Literacy, a group that I have also had the opportunity to work with on education legislation. What I would like to read is a paragraph that describes ELG and B-WET's contributions to our country.

"The ELG program enables NOAA, as the Nation's leading expert on weather, climate, and ocean information, to partner with the Nation's top nonprofit organizations and educators to put this information to good use." ELG funds will allow "the American Association for the Advancement of Science to update climate education standards that are used to guide science education in classrooms and across the country to reflect state-of-the-art science."

"The B-WET grants programs support environmental education which promotes locally relevant, experiential learning in the K-12 environment."

I submit the entirety of the letter for inclusion in the RECORD.

CAMPAIGN FOR ENVIRONMENTAL

LITERACY,

Mar. 18, 2010.

Hon. LOIS CAPPS,  
House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE CAPPS: We write to you to indicate our strong support for passage of the Ocean, Coastal, and Watershed Education Act (H.R. 3644). This bill authorizes and strengthens the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's existing Bay-Watershed Education and Training (B-WET) and Environmental Literacy Grants (ELG) programs.

Over the past seven years, these two NOAA education programs have been essential to advancing ocean, atmospheric, and environmental literacy in the United States, a major goal of the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy Report and the U.S. Ocean Action Plan. They have been well received by the ocean and environmental literacy communities, and in fact, ELG requests for proposals have been oversubscribed by a factor of 10.

The ELG program enables NOAA, as the nation's leading expert on weather, climate and ocean information, to partner with the nation's top non-profit organizations and educators to put this information to good use. For example, these grants have enabled more than 20 million people to gain access to compelling up-to-date weather, climate and ocean information through the Science on a Sphere and Ocean Today Kiosk from Alaska to Hawaii to California to Massachusetts. ELG funds have also allowed the American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) to update climate education standards that are used to guide science education in classrooms around the country to reflect state-of-the-art climate science. In addition, ELG grants to the National Science Teachers Association have given thousands of teachers access to the most accurate scientific information on climate, corals and hurricanes.

The B-WET grants programs support environmental education which promotes locally relevant, experiential learning in the K-12 environment. A fundamental goal of the programs are to demonstrate how the quality of the watershed affects the lives of the people who live in it. B-WET programs have now expanded to include the Chesapeake Bay, California, Hawaii, Pacific Northwest, Gulf of Mexico and New England, and this bill will add five new regions as well. B-WET awards to state and local education organizations have provided opportunities to over 125,000 students and 6,200 teachers in 2008 alone.

It is important to now establish these programs in law, consistent with the education mandates provided to NOAA in both the America COMPETES Act (PL 110-69, Sec. 4002) and the Omnibus Public Land Management Act (PL 111-11, Sec. 12304). They are vital to NOAA's ability to execute the educational function of its mission. They have demonstrated their effectiveness, as well as their value to stakeholder communities. And as our nation begins to grapple with the complexities and challenges of a changing climate (and ocean and landscape), they are timely and highly relevant.

Thank you for your consideration of this request. For questions about this letter, please contact James Elder, Campaign for Environmental Literacy (978-526-7768, [elder@FundEE.org](mailto:elder@FundEE.org)).

Sincerely,

NATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

American Fisheries Society (Gus Rassam, Executive Director);

American Fly Fishing Trade Association (Gary Berlin, President);

American Forest Foundation (Tom Martin, President);  
 American Hiking Society (Gregory A. Miller, President);  
 American Sportfishing Association (Mike Nussman, President & CEO);  
 Association for the Advancement of Sustainability in Higher Education (Paul Rowland, Executive Director);  
 Association of Zoos and Aquariums (Steve Olson, Vice President);  
 Biodiversity Project (Jennifer Browning, Executive Director);  
 Camp Fire USA (Pamela Wilcox, National Interim CEO);  
 Challenger Center for Space Science Education (Daniel Barstow, President);  
 Climate Literacy Network (Tamara Shapiro Ledley, Coordinator);  
 Coastal States Organization (Kristen M. Fletcher, Executive Director);  
 Consortium for Ocean Leadership (Bob Gagosian, President and CEO);  
 Council of Environmental Deans and Directors (Stephanie Pfirman, President);  
 Council on Environmental Education (Josetta Hawthorne, Executive Director);  
 Earth Day Network (Kathleen Rogers, President);  
 EarthEcho International (Philippe Cousteau, CEO);  
 Earth Force (Lisa Bardwell, President);  
 Ecological Society of America (Katherine S. McCarter, Executive Director);  
 Federation of Fly Fishers (Leah Elwell, Conservation Coordinator);  
 National Association for Interpretation (Tim Merriman, Executive Director);  
 National Audubon Society (Judy Braus, Vice President for Education);  
 National Council for Science and the Environment (Peter Saundry, Executive Director);  
 National Estuarine Research Reserve Association (Matt Menashes, Executive Director);  
 National Marine Educators Association (J. Adam Frederick, President);  
 National Marine Sanctuary Foundation (Jason Patlis, President and CEO);  
 National Project for Excellence in Environmental Education (Bora Simmons, Director);  
 National Science Teachers Association (Jodi Peterson, Assistant Executive Director);  
 National Service-Learning Partnership (Nelda Brown, Executive Director);  
 National Wildlife Federation (Kevin Coyle, Vice President for Education);  
 North American Association for Environmental Education (Brian Day, Executive Director);  
 Ocean Alliance (Roger Payne, President);  
 Ocean Conservancy (Vikki Spruill, President and CEO);  
 Ocean Conservation Research (Michael Stocker, Director);  
 Ocean River Institute (Rob Moir, President);  
 Project WET Foundation (Dennis Nelson, President and CEO);  
 SandyHook SeaLife Foundation (Mary M. Hamilton, Executive Director);  
 Second Nature (Anthony Cortese, President);  
 ServeNext (Zach Maurin, Co-Director and Co-Founder);  
 Sierra Club (Jacqueline Ostfeld, National Youth Representative);  
 Student Conservation Association (Dale Penny, President & CEO);  
 Tag-A-Giant Foundation (Shana Miller, Director);  
 The Ocean Foundation (Mark Spalding, President);  
 The Ocean Project (Bill Mott, Director);  
 Trout Unlimited (Charles Gauvin, President);

U.S. Green Building Council (Richard Fedrizzi, President & CEO);  
 Wildlife Conservation Society (John F. Calvelli, Executive Vice President);  
 Xerces Society for Invertebrate Conservation, Portland, OR (Scott Hoffman Black, Executive Director); and  
 Youth Service America (Steven A. Culbertson, President & CEO).

## CALIFORNIA

Aquarium of the Pacific, Long Beach, CA (Jerry R. Schubel, President and CEO);  
 Los Angeles Conservation Corps, Los Angeles, CA (Bruce Saito, Executive Director);  
 NatureBridge, San Francisco, CA (Susan Smartt, President);  
 O'Neill Sea Odyssey, Santa Cruz, CA (Dan Haifley, Executive Director);  
 Santa Barbara Zoo, Santa Barbara, CA (Rich Block, Chief Executive Officer);  
 Wilderness Arts and Literacy Collaborative, San Francisco, CA (Conrad Benedicto, Director); and  
 WildPlaces, Springville, CA (Mehmet McMillan, Director).

## CHESAPEAKE BAY REGION

Alice Ferguson Foundation, Accokeek, MD (Tracy Bowen, Executive Director);  
 Green Jobs Alliance, Hampton, VA (Randolph G. Flood, Executive Director);  
 Maryland Association for Environmental and Outdoor Education, Annapolis, MD (Bronwyn Mitchell, Executive Director);  
 Pennsylvania Association of Environmental Educators, PA (Ruth A. Roperti, President); and  
 Rivanna Conservation Society, Charlottesville, VA (Robbi Savage, Executive Director).

## GREAT LAKES REGION

Binder Park Zoo, Battle Creek, MI (Gregory B. Geise, President & CEO);  
 Buffalo Zoo, Buffalo, NY (Donna Fernandes, President and CEO);  
 Chicago Zoological Society/Brookfield Zoo, Brookfield, IL (Stuart D. Strahl, President and CEO);  
 John G. Shedd Aquarium, Chicago, IL (Ted A. Beattie, President and CEO);  
 Minnesota Conservation Federation, St. Paul, MN (Steven Maurice, President);  
 Save the Dunes Council/Save the Dunes Conservation Fund, Michigan City, IN (Debroah Chubb, President); and  
 Toledo Zoo, Toledo, Ohio (Anne Baker, CEO).

## GULF COAST REGION

Crosby Arboretum/Mississippi Native Plant Society, Picayune, MS (Janine Conklin, President);  
 Florida Wildlife Federation, FL (Manley Fuller, President);  
 Louisiana Science Teachers Association, LA (Jean May-Brett, Treasurer);  
 Louisiana Wildlife Federation, Baton Rouge, LA (Randy P. Lanctot, Executive Director);  
 Mississippi Environmental Education Alliance, Jackson, MS (Cynthia Harrell, President); and  
 Southern Association of Marine Educators (Joan R. Turner, President).

## HAWAII

Conservation Council for Hawaii, Honolulu, HI (Marjorie Ziegler, Executive Director).

## NEW ENGLAND

Provincetown Center for Coastal Studies, MA (Richard Delaney, Executive Director); and  
 Save The Bay (Narragansett Bay), RI (Jonathan Stone, Executive Director).

## NEW YORK/NEW JERSEY

Audubon New York, Albany, NY (Albert E. Caccese, Executive Director);

Citizens Campaign for the Environment, NY & CT (Dereeth Glance, Executive Program Director);  
 New York Aquarium, Brooklyn, NY (Jon Forrest Dohlin, Director); and  
 Upper St. Lawrence Riverkeeper, NY (Jennifer J. Caddick, Executive Director).

## PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGION

Arnold Creek Productions, Lake Oswego, OR (Doug Freeman, COO-Producer);  
 Association of Northwest Steelheaders, Milwaukie, OR (Jay Burris, President);  
 Center for Research in Environmental Science and Technologies, Wilsonville, OR (Bob Carlson, Director);  
 Concord Elementary Community Garden, Milwaukie, OR (Margaret Thornton, Chair);  
 Environmental Education Association of Oregon, Portland, OR (Traci Price, Board Chair);  
 Friends of the Straub Environmental Learning Center, Salem, OR (John Savage, Board President);  
 John Muir Elementary School, Seattle, WA (Awnie Thompson, Principal);  
 Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership, Portland, OR (Debrah Marriott, Executive Director);  
 NatureBridge (Susan Smartt, President);  
 Northwest Youth Corps, Eugene, OR (Art Pope, Executive Director);  
 Oregon Coast Aquarium, Newport, OR (Gary N. Gamer, President);  
 People For Puget Sound, Seattle, WA (Kathy Fletcher, Executive Director);  
 Place-Based Education Northwest, Lewis & Clark College, Portland, OR (Gregory Smith, Founder/Coordinator);  
 Rachel's Friends Breast Cancer Coalition, Portland, OR (Diane Lund-Muzikant, Board Chair);  
 Sierra Club Inner City Outings—Spokane, Spokane, WA (Chris Bachman, Project Director);  
 Siskiyou Field Institute, Selma, OR (Arnie Green, Executive Director);  
 The Freshwater Trust, Portland, OR (Joe Whitworth, President);  
 The Friends of Haystack Rock, Cannon Beach, OR (Tom Oxwang, Chair);  
 Tualatin Riverkeepers, Tigard, OR (Monica Smiley, Executive Director); and  
 Washington Wildlife Federation, Bellevue, WA (Mark Quinn, President).

## WESTERN STATES

Arizona Wildlife Education Foundation, Mesa, AZ (Karen Schedler, President);  
 Arizona Wildlife Federation, AZ (Ryna Rock, President);  
 Colorado Alliance for Environmental Education, Golden, CO (Katie Navin, Executive Director);  
 Colorado Wildlife Federation, CO (John Smeltzer, President);  
 Environmental Education Association of New Mexico, NM (Barbara Garrity, State-wide Coordinator);  
 Idaho Wildlife Federation, ID (Rob Fraser, President);  
 Iowa Wildlife Federation, Des Moines, IA (Joe Wilkinson, President);  
 New Mexico Wildlife Federation, NM (Ed Olona, President);  
 Renewable Resources Coalition, AK (Anders Gustafson, Executive Director);  
 SOS Outreach, Avon, CO (Arn Menconi, Executive Director);  
 The Wellness Coalition, Silver City, NM (Sam Castello, Executive Director); and  
 Wyoming Association for Environmental Education, WY (Susan McGuire, President);

## ALASKA INDIVIDUAL SIGNATORIES

Nils Andreassen, Executive Director, Institute of the North;  
 Bruce Botelho, Mayor, City and Borough of Juneau;

Dennis Egan, Senator, State Legislature;  
Kirk Hardcastle, Research Tech, Alaska  
Center for Energy and Power;  
Frank Holmes, Commissioner, Haines En-  
ergy and Sustainability Commission;  
Albert Howard, Mayor, City of Angoon;  
Leslie Isaacs, City Administrator, City of  
Klawock;

Ben Johnson, Director of Operations, Pe-  
tersburg Indian Association;

Lainda Jones, Economic Development Co-  
ordinator, Central Council Tlingit and Haida  
Indian Tribes;

Michael Kline, Division Manager, Ketchi-  
kan Public Utility;

Mike Korsmo, President, Southeast Con-  
ference;

Lisa Long, Director, Haida Corporation;  
Bill Lucey, Director/Coastal Planner, Yak-  
utat Salmon Board City and Borough of Yak-  
utat;

Scott McAdams, Mayor, City and Borough  
of Sitka;

Joe Nelson, Planning and Logistics Super-  
intendent, City of Petersburg;

Merrill Sawford, Assembly Member, City  
and Borough of Juneau;

Beverly Schoonover, Executive Director,  
Juneau Watershed Partnership;

Tim Shields, Executive Director,  
Takshanuk Watershed Council;

Maxine Thompson, President, Angoon Oil  
Co.; and

Alicia Wendlandt, Director/Coastal Plan-  
ner, Taiya Inlet Watershed Council.

In my experience before getting to Congress as well as in Congress, I was in the State Board of Education for Colorado before I arrived here, and I am on the Education and Labor Committee serving here. Environmental literacy and awareness is one of the most important aspects of teaching science in the schools. It can be an interdisciplinary approach that helps use examples from the environment to help teach math, science, even history through a lens that actually prepares students to be responsible consumers in the their own lives and to have responsible consumption habits that have a positive impact on the planet.

Madam Speaker, I have been amazed and impressed as I have gone to classrooms across Colorado where young children, 6-year-olds, 8-year-olds are convincing their parents to recycle. They are helping their parents to establish compost heaps in their yards. These are programs that not only have a positive impact on our planet, but a positive impact on the health of their families as well.

Given the success and popularity of these programs, educators across the country have been increasingly eager to take part as a result. One of the things we accomplish in these two bills is that we codify these formal programs within NOAA and establish them as models of innovative environmental education for the entire country to follow.

As part of our shared future, it is an important role for our public schools to help prepare our young people to succeed in the next generation and to preserve, through a legacy of individual responsibility, our planet.

And while there may be and there has been disagreement on both sides of the aisle about the top-down environ-

mental policies and regulations, I think people across the spectrum ideologically believe in the value of individual responsibility, and to inculcate the values of stewardship and preserving our environment as part of individual responsibility for the next generation can go a long way in a way that all Americans can feel good about towards preserving our natural heritage.

With regard to H.R. 1612, I want to be clear that it is not just a Parks bill. The bill restores our national forests, our wildlife refuges and other public lands, as well as our coasts and shores. H.R. 1612 protects our natural heritage; and, even more importantly, particularly as our Nation battles a severe recession and rising unemployment rates, H.R. 1612 creates an important program, the Public Land Service Corps—enhances an important program—that can help reduce youth unemployment while repairing and restoring our Nation's public lands.

Madam Speaker, I have seen the statistics with regard to the current youth unemployment rate, much higher than the overall unemployment rate, and I have heard it firsthand from my constituents in Colorado, wondering, it used to be an assumption that they would have access to a summer job, to an after-school job, increasingly finding it more difficult to be able to get those job opportunities. What better way to not only employ young people and give them job skills that can positively impact their future, but to create something of lasting benefit to all Americans.

I had the opportunity to join Boulder County's Youth Service Corps last summer, repairing some trail huts above Boulder. Not only was this terrific hands-on experience for the young people involved, but we actually made the trails wheelchair accessible in an area that previously had not been accessible to those who were in wheelchairs, above Boulder County, Colorado. It was great to see these kids working with their mentors and volunteers and members of the Parks Department to actually create something that not only would people be able to enjoy, but also to prepare and preserve our heritage for the next generation.

That is why these bills are important, and I think it is important that we, as a body in Congress, are able to come together around items that we agree on. There will always be some things that we agree on and some things that we don't, but preserving our national heritage and environmental literacy are two issues that I think are critical to our Nation's future. By emphasizing the value of individual responsibility, we could all feel good about preserving our national heritage.

This program invests in our young people, helps prepare them for the jobs of the future. The green technology sector has been one of the few sectors in my home State of Colorado that has

added jobs over the last 2 years. So while the State as a whole, like our country, has lost jobs, Colorado employs more people today in green and renewable energy than it did 1 year ago and than it did 2 years ago. And that is a trend that I believe will continue, not only in Colorado, but across our country. The type of preparation for those jobs in the future is consistent with the skills taught through environmental literacy and also in the Public Service Corps working to be stewards of our natural lands.

□ 0945

I'd like to urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to join me in support of these very important bills and thank my colleagues for bringing them to us today.

H.R. 3644 has two Republican amendments and one Democratic amendment that were submitted. H.R. 1612 has six amendments that were submitted, all by Republicans—two of which were allowed. It really is exciting to be able to present these bills to this body here today, precisely because we are trying to and we have heard from our constituents that jobs is one of the key focuses that they want us to work on.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Would my friend yield?

Mr. POLIS. I'll yield for a question.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. Actually, I was going to inquire, because I yielded my time back as my friend knows because we had no further speakers, but Mr. LUNGREN has arrived and would like to address the House.

Mr. POLIS. I will yield some of my time to Mr. LUNGREN in just a moment.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I would ask unanimous consent to reclaim our time, Madam Speaker.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank the gentleman for the courtesy on this floor. I admire courtesy and civility here. I just wish we had more of it on both sides from time to time, particularly as we are in these contentious days dealing with one of the most important issues of our time—the health care bill.

I would stand in support of all the things that the gentleman from Florida said about this rule making in order these two bills. It is not unusual for us to make in order two bills under a rule, but what I would suggest is that that is somewhat different than what we evidently are going to be asked to do later this weekend. As I understand it from the ranking member on the

Rules Committee, it is contemplated that we will have a rule that will be "self-executing" dealing with a substantial portion of the American economy, that is the entire arena of health care. I don't think enough attention has been given to the difference between the appropriate procedure that we are enacting here versus that which is to go forward later this weekend.

I served in this body in the 1980s and then left and came back about 6 years ago. In the intervening time there was an effort, on a bipartisan basis, made by this House and the Senate, with the signature of the President, on a piece of legislation that was called the line-item veto. The line-item veto was a process that was contemplated which would allow the President of the United States to receive an appropriation bill from the Congress and then to look at that appropriation bill and find out and decide whether there were certain items that he thought were not appropriate, there's too much spending in an overall appropriations bill. It would have given the President the right to sign the overall bill, but on the one hand, to take out, X out, line out certain items. And so this provided a constitutional question before the Supreme Court in the case of *Clinton v. City of New York*, because they had to wait until the President actually exercised the right presumably given to him by the legislation passed by this Congress.

And so the question was: Was that manner in which laws were passed consistent with the requirements of the Constitution? And the Constitution sets out the terms under which we're able to pass laws. Essentially, it says three things must happen: It must pass the House of Representatives; it must pass the United States Senate; and it must be presented—it's called presentment—presented to the President and signed by the President.

Interestingly enough, in the majority opinion written by Justice Stevens—I believe the longest-serving member of the U.S. Supreme Court at the present time—when he investigated it, he said this. He said, The Constitution requires that it be the exact text in all three circumstances. Those are his words. The exact text. He went on to say that if in fact a paragraph were absent from the law that the President signed, meaning the President exercised his line item veto and had taken it out, it would invalidate the constitutional requirement for passage of a law because it would not be the exact text.

So, as I understand it, contrary to the rule that we are debating here today, the contemplated rule to cover the health care bill will say something along the lines of: We incorporate a bill which will be deemed to have passed if we pass the rule; or other language to say: thereby passing. So then you will have the interesting question of whether or not we are acting on—that is, I as an individual Member of Congress representing my constituency—I am vot-

ing on the "exact text" as was voted on in the Senate, which then goes to the President for signature. And I would argue that if you cannot remove a paragraph from the "exact text," as the Supreme Court told us, in any of the three aspects of the bill, that you cannot add text. And that is, if you have a rule which incorporates the bill, you naturally have other language that goes along with it, particularly if it makes reference to other subject matter.

And so in contrast to the rule we have here, which should be supportable under the circumstances that it does not violate the Constitution in any way, shape, or form, even though it is a little different than when we adopt a rule that permits two bills to come to the floor, in the instance of having a self-executing rule we will then be presenting to the Supreme Court a constitutional issue upon which they have not directly ruled. It is, however, my interpretation of their ruling in *Clinton v. City of New York* that it is the mirror image of what the court found to be unconstitutional. That is, if the exact text requirement cannot be fulfilled by removing a single paragraph from the text; similarly, if you add language to the text in the vote that is presented to the membership, it would be not the same thing, so that we would be prohibiting the Members of this institution, the House of Representatives, from their constitutional obligation to vote on the exact question presented in the other body so that that same exact question can be presented to the President of the United States for his signature.

Now I understand that some say, Aha, there's another section of the Constitution which says that the House of Representatives and the Senate in their respective bodies shall be the sole arbiter of the rules of their Chambers. And that is true. But it is also true that we cannot, by our rules, do what is otherwise unconstitutional. And so Members should understand that while, unfortunately, when we debate rules often times there's the absence of many of our Members here, because the rules process is considered to be technical, in some ways taken for granted, in other ways nonobjectionable, not rising above the ordinary, with all due respect to the members of the Rules Committee. In the instance of a self-executing rule, so-called, on one of the most controversial issues presented to this Congress, certainly in my years of service here, we cannot blithely dismiss legitimate questions about what our obligation is here. I have said on this floor before, and I continue to say, the Constitution is an inconvenient truth.

A couple of weeks ago, I had the opportunity to be in a meeting with Justice Scalia. Justice Scalia made an interesting point. He said, The essence of a democracy or a democratic republic such as ours is, majority rules. If majority rules, you don't have a democ-

racy. But he said one of the unique things about America is that we have some limitations on majority rule. Those limitations are found in the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. They limit what the majority can do and protect minority rights. But he said, The interesting thing is, those limitations were imposed on the majority by the majority. In other words, it is through the adoption of the Constitution that the majority has limited itself. And he suggested that that should give caution to members of the court to not supersede their legitimate authority by finding new limitations on the majority that were not contemplated by those who adopted the Constitution, and if you need further limitations or protections of minority interests, the way to do that is to amend the Constitution, which is again done by the majority.

Similarly, I would suggest, that those of us who take an oath to uphold the Constitution as representatives of our constituents in this body must follow the dictates of the Constitution and the limitations of the Constitution. In some language in that case that I cited earlier, the 12-year-old case of *Clinton v. City of New York*, the court talked about how it may or may not be a good public policy that the law that was otherwise found to be unconstitutional, that the fact that it may or may not be good public policy is irrelevant to the question of whether it's constitutional.

So the argument that we have presented to us here most recently in a nationally televised interview by the President of the United States, that whatever vote takes place is going to be on health care and therefore it's okay, and he'll sign it, forgets the inconvenient truth that the Constitution does not permit us to do that, and it does not permit the President to do that. So while a lot of people are talking about the fact we're going to be here over the weekend—and that's extraordinary—I would wish that we would concentrate on the more extraordinary question of whether we are following the Constitution. Because if in fact we circumvent the Constitution by "allowing" a bill to become law in which each Member of the House and the Senate did not have the opportunity to vote on the exact language, we are not punishing the Members of Congress; we are punishing our constituents, who have a constitutional right to have laws passed in the way that is articulated in the Constitution, which provides specificity as to how that is done so that the power of the Federal Government will be exercised in the limited sense that was given to it by the people through the Constitution.

And so while I support all of the comments made by the gentleman from Florida with respect to this rule and find this rule to be relatively non-controversial and to be more of the same, the rule that we are being told of



that we will consider this weekend is not more of the same, is not ordinary, is in fact extraordinary, and I would suggest such an extraordinary stretch that it will be rendered unconstitutional. Why would we follow a procedure that will call into question the very constitutional foundations of the contents of the bill if in fact it is such an important issue? If it in fact is something that needs to be dealt with with such urgency, ought we not to follow the Constitution in each and every aspect and ought we not be guided by the most recent decision of the Supreme Court on a law which we thought was a good law on a bipartisan basis, but which, unfortunately, the Constitution does not allow us to enact.

□ 1000

And I would hope that my colleagues who may not be here on the floor but may have an opportunity to review these remarks will take seriously my concerns. We may very well be preparing to embark on an unconstitutional journey which not only will take the healthy skepticism that our Constitution provides for government—not rejecting government, but we have a healthy skepticism of the power of government that is a part of our constitutional process—but we will turn it from a healthy skepticism to an unfortunately destructive cynicism. And if there is anybody who believes that is good for this country, I would suggest they are wrong.

This is a tough issue that we're going to have to deal with later this weekend. Let us at least do it in a constitutional way, and let us not pass something for the American people that will be called into question in court challenge after court challenge after court challenge and delay the impact or implementation of whatever we believe on a bipartisan basis ought to be the governing law with respect to the health care system.

So with that, I thank the gentleman for his time, and I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. LINCOLN DIAZ-BALART of Florida. I thank my friend again for his courtesy, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Again, I would like to emphasize that the gentleman from California's criticisms are not about this rule or any rule that we have before us. Tomorrow the Rules Committee will be meeting to decide under what rule we will consider health care.

The gentleman has made some remarks with regard to a common practice that is within House resolutions referred by the Rules Committee that involves self-executing language. In 1996, the Republican-controlled House adopted a resolution to consider as adopted the conference report on line-item veto. I would also like read a quote from Thomas Mann who is quoted by USA Today. He is a scholar at the Brookings Institute, who said

that the "deem and pass" move is not very unusual, has been used 36 times in 2005 and 2006 by the Republican Congress, 49 times in 2007 and 2008 by the Democratic Congress.

I think what's important for people to know is that the Rules Committee doesn't have any special ability to do these rules unilaterally. They only exist by the good graces of a majority of the House. If a majority of the House wants to pass the Senate health care bill as part of a rule, they can. There will be a debate and a discussion over that Senate health care bill, and the Senate bill will be presented to the President and signed, if it passes, before the reconciliation bill reaches the Senate floor.

The House, under the Constitution, is given a great ability to do what it wants to do and to conduct its own affairs as it wants to conduct its affairs. Just as today we have a House resolution, 1192, and that House resolution provides for the consideration of two bills, those bills will only be considered by the House if this rule, this House resolution, passes the full House with a majority of the votes. It will be the same with any rule that is referred out of the Rules Committee tomorrow with regard to the consideration of health care. That rule will only have any force, any effect, if a majority of the House passed that rule and whatever is in that rule, just as they would consider any bill under the House of Representatives.

This rule is a very fair rule. These two bills, I believe, have bipartisan support, a strong consensus to help create jobs, prepare kids for our future, educate kids about the environment, and preserve our great natural resources.

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

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

The previous question was ordered.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adopting House Resolution 1192 will be followed by 5-minute votes on two motions that the House suspend the rules previously postponed, on which the yeas and nays are ordered, to wit:

on H.R. 3671 and on H.R. 2788.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 171, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 136]

YEAS—236

Adler (NJ)  
Altmire  
Andrews

Arcuri  
Baca  
Baird

Baldwin  
Barrow  
Bean

Becerra  
Berkley  
Berman  
Berry  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (NY)  
Blumenauer  
Boccheri  
Boren  
Boswell  
Boucher  
Boyd  
Brady (PA)  
Braley (IA)  
Bright  
Brown, Corrine  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cardoza  
Carnahan  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Castor (FL)  
Chandler  
Chu  
Clarke  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly (VA)  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Dahlkemper  
Davis (AL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis (IL)  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delahunt  
DeLauro  
Dicks  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donnelly (IN)  
Doyle  
Driehaus  
Edwards (MD)  
Edwards (TX)  
Ehlers  
Ellison  
Ellsworth  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Etheridge  
Farr  
Fattah  
Filner  
Foster  
Frank (MA)  
Fudge  
Gonzalez  
Gordon (TN)  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Hall (NY)  
Halvorson  
Hare  
Harman  
Hastings (FL)

Heinrich  
Herseth Sandlin  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinchey  
Hinojosa  
Hirono  
Hodes  
Holden  
Holt  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Inslee  
Israel  
Jackson (IL)  
Jackson Lee  
(TX)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kagen  
Kanjorski  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilpatrick (MI)  
Kilroy  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick (AZ)  
Kissell  
Klein (FL)  
Kosmas  
Kratovil  
Kucinich  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lee (CA)  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lowey  
Lujan  
Maffei  
Maloney  
Markey (CO)  
Markey (MA)  
Marshall  
Matheson  
Matsui  
McCarthy (NY)  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McIntyre  
McMahon  
McNerney  
Meek (FL)  
Meeks (NY)  
Melancon  
Michaud  
Miller (NC)  
Miller, George  
Minnick  
Mollohan  
Moore (KS)  
Moore (WI)  
Moran (VA)  
Murphy (CT)  
Murphy (NY)  
Murphy, Patrick  
Nadler (NY)  
Napolitano  
Neal (MA)  
Nye  
Oberstar  
Obey  
Olver

Ortiz  
Owens  
Pallone  
Pascarelli  
Pastor (AZ)  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Perriello  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree (ME)  
Polis (CO)  
Pomeroy  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rahall  
Rangel  
Reyes  
Richardson  
Rodriguez  
Ross  
Rothman (NJ)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salazar  
Sanchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schauer  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Schwartz  
Scott (GA)  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sestak  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sires  
Skelton  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Snyder  
Space  
Speier  
Spratt  
Stupak  
Sutton  
Tanner  
Teague  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tierney  
Titus  
Tonko  
Towns  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters  
Watson  
Watt  
Waxman  
Welch  
Wilson (OH)  
Woolsey  
Wu  
Yarmuth

NAYS—171

Aderholt  
Akin  
Alexander  
Austria  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Cao  
Capito  
Cassidy  
Castle  
Chaffetz  
Childers  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole  
Broun (GA)  
Brown (SC)  
Brown-Waite,  
Ginny  
Buchanan  
Burgess  
Burton (IN)  
Calvert  
Camp  
Campbell  
Cantor  
Cao  
Capito  
Cassidy  
Castle  
Chaffetz  
Childers  
Coble  
Coffman (CO)  
Cole

Conaway  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Davis (KY)  
Dent  
Diaz-Balart, L.  
Diaz-Balart, M.  
Dreier  
Duncan  
Fallin  
Flake  
Fleming  
Forbes  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gallegly  
Garrett (NJ)  
Gerlach  
Giffords

Austria	Bartlett
Barrett (SC)	Barton (TX)