

[Roll No. 138]

## YEAS—410

Aderholt Davis (KY) Kildee  
 Adler (NJ) DeFazio Kilpatrick (MI)  
 Akin DeGette Kilroy  
 Alexander Delahunt Kind  
 Altmire DeLauro King (IA)  
 Andrews Dent King (NY)  
 Arcuri Diaz-Balart, L. Kingston  
 Austria Diaz-Balart, M. Kirk  
 Baca Dicks Kirkpatrick (AZ)  
 Bachmann Dingell Kissell  
 Bachus Doggett Klein (FL)  
 Baird Donnelly (IN) Kline (MN)  
 Baldwin Doyle Kosmas  
 Barrett (SC) Dreier Kratovil  
 Barrow Driehaus Kucinich  
 Bartlett Edwards (MD) Lamborn  
 Barton (TX) Edwards (TX) Lance  
 Bean Ehlers Langevin  
 Becerra Ellison Larsen (WA)  
 Berkley Ellsworth Larson (CT)  
 Berman Engel Latham  
 Berry Eshoo LaTourette  
 Biggert Etheridge Latta  
 Bilbray Fallin Lee (CA)  
 Billakis Farr Levin  
 Bishop (GA) Fattah Lewis (CA)  
 Bishop (NY) Filner Lewis (GA)  
 Bishop (UT) Flake Linder  
 Blackburn Fleming Lipinski  
 Blumenauer Forbes LoBiondo  
 Boccheri Foster Loebsack  
 Boehner Foxx Lowey  
 Bonner Frank (MA) Lucas  
 Bono Mack Franks (AZ) Luetkemeyer  
 Boozman Frelinghuysen Lujan  
 Boren Fudge Lummis  
 Boswell Gallegly Lungren, Daniel  
 Boucher Garrett (NJ) E.  
 Boustany Gerlach Lynch  
 Boyd Giffords Mack  
 Brady (PA) Gingrey (GA) Maffei  
 Brady (TX) Gohmert Maloney  
 Braley (IA) Gonzalez Manzullo  
 Bright Goodlatte Marchant  
 Broun (GA) Gordon (TN) Markey (CO)  
 Brown (SC) Granger Markey (MA)  
 Brown, Corrine Graves Marshall  
 Brown-Waite, Grayson Matheson  
 Ginny Green, Al Matsui  
 Buchanan Green, Gene McCarthy (CA)  
 Burgess Griffith McCarthy (NY)  
 Burton (IN) Grijalva McCaul  
 Butterfield Guthrie McClintock  
 Calvert Hall (NY) McCollum  
 Camp Hall (TX) McCotter  
 Campbell Halvorson McDermott  
 Cantor Hare McGovern  
 Cao Harman McHenry  
 Capito Harper McIntyre  
 Capps Hastings (FL) McKeon  
 Capuano Hastings (WA) McMahon  
 Cardoza Heinrich McMorris  
 Carnahan Heller Rodgers  
 Carney Hensarling McNeerney  
 Carson (IN) Herger Meek (FL)  
 Carter Herseth Sandlin Meeks (NY)  
 Cassidy Higgins Melancon  
 Castle Hill Mica  
 Castor (FL) Himes Michaud  
 Chaffetz Hinchey Miller (FL)  
 Chandler Hinojosa Miller (MI)  
 Childers Hirono Miller (NC)  
 Chu Hodes Miller, Gary  
 Clarke Holden Miller, George  
 Cleaver Holt Minnick  
 Clyburn Honda Mitchell  
 Coble Hoyer Mollohan  
 Coffman (CO) Hunter Moore (KS)  
 Cohen Inglis Moore (WI)  
 Cole Inslee Moran (KS)  
 Conaway Israel Moran (VA)  
 Connolly (VA) Issa Murphy (CT)  
 Conyers Jackson (IL) Murphy (NY)  
 Cooper Jackson Lee Murphy, Patrick  
 Costa (TX) Murphy, Tim  
 Costello Jenkins Myrick  
 Courtney Johnson (GA) Nadler (NY)  
 Crenshaw Johnson (IL) Napolitano  
 Crowley Johnson, E. B. Neal (MA)  
 Cuellar Johnson, Sam Neugebauer  
 Culberson Jones Nunes  
 Cummings Jordan (OH) Nye  
 Dahlkemper Kagen Oberstar  
 Davis (AL) Kanjorski Obey  
 Davis (CA) Kaptur Olson  
 Davis (IL) Kennedy Ortiz

Owens Ruppertsberger Sullivan  
 Pallone Rush Sutton  
 Pascrell Ryan (OH) Tanner  
 Pastor (AZ) Ryan (WI) Taylor  
 Paul Salazar Teague  
 Paulsen Sanchez, Linda Terry  
 Payne T. Thompson (CA)  
 Pence Sanchez, Loretta Thompson (MS)  
 Perlmutter Sarbanes Thompson (PA)  
 Perriello Scalise Thornberry  
 Peters Schakowsky Tiahrt  
 Peterson Schauer Tiberi  
 Petri Schiff Tierney  
 Pingree (ME) Schmidt Titus  
 Pitts Schock Tonko  
 Platts Schrader Towns  
 Poe (TX) Schwartz Tsongas  
 Polis (CO) Scott (GA) Turner  
 Pomeroy Scott (VA) Upton  
 Posey Sensenbrenner Van Hollen  
 Price (GA) Serrano Velázquez  
 Price (NC) Sessions Visclosky  
 Putnam Sestak Waldeen  
 Quigley Shadegg Walz  
 Radanovich Shea-Porter Wamp  
 Rahall Sherman Wasserman  
 Rangel Shimkus Schultz  
 Rehberg Shuler Waters  
 Reichert Shuster Watson  
 Reyes Simpson Watt  
 Richardson Sires Waxman  
 Rodriguez Skelton Weiner  
 Roe (TN) Slaughter Welch  
 Rogers (AL) Smith (NE) Westmoreland  
 Rogers (KY) Smith (NJ) Whitfield  
 Rogers (MI) Smith (TX) Wilson (OH)  
 Rohrabacher Smith (WA) Wilson (SC)  
 Rooney Snyder Wittman  
 Roskam Space Wolf  
 Ross Speier Woolsey  
 Rothman (NJ) Spratt Wu  
 Roybal-Allard Stearns Yarmuth  
 Royce Stupak

## NOT VOTING—20

Ackerman Emerson Olver  
 Blunt Fortenberry Ros-Lehtinen  
 Buyer Garamendi Souder  
 Clay Gutierrez Stark  
 Davis (TN) Hoekstra Young (AK)  
 Deal (GA) Lee (NY) Young (FL)  
 Duncan Lofgren, Zoe

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
 The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). One minute remaining in this vote.

□ 1058

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1100

## OCEAN, COASTAL, AND WATERSHED EDUCATION ACT

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, pursuant to H. Res. 1192, I call up 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, as amended, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland). Pursuant to House Resolution 1192, the bill is considered read.

The amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill is adopted.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 3644

*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 “Ocean, Coastal, and Watershed Education Act”.*

## SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States faces major challenges, such as mitigating and adapting to the impacts of climate change, stewarding critical coastal and marine resources including fish and wildlife habitat while sustaining the commercial and recreational activities that depend on these resources, and improving resilience to natural disasters, that collectively threaten human health, economic development, environmental quality, and national security.

(2) Communities in coastal watersheds are particularly vulnerable to these increasingly urgent, interconnected, and complex challenges and need support for teacher professional development and experiential learning among students of all ages.

(3) These challenges can be met with the help of comprehensive programs specifically targeted to engage coastal watershed communities, schoolchildren, and the general public to develop engaged and environmentally literate citizens who are better able to understand complex environmental issues, assess risk, evaluate proposed plans, and understand how individual decisions affect the environment at local, regional, national, and global scales.

(4) The intrinsic social and conservation values of wildlife-dependent and other outdoor recreation can play an important role in outdoor educational programs that address the myriad of coastal and ocean concerns, as well as instill a sustainable conservation ethic that will enable them to face those challenges to the betterment of both the environment and coastal communities.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to advance environmental literacy, develop public awareness and appreciation of the economic, social, recreational, and environmental benefits of coastal watersheds, and emphasize stewardship of critical coastal and marine resources, including an understanding of how climate change is impacting those resources, through the establishment of—

(1) an Environmental Literacy Grant Program; and

(2) regional programs under the B-WET Program.

## SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) ADMINISTRATOR.—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(2) BAY-WATERSHED EDUCATION.—The term “bay-watershed education” means environmental education focused on watersheds, with an emphasis on stewardship of critical coastal and marine resources, including an understanding of how climate change is impacting those resources.

(3) B-WET PROGRAM.—The term “B-WET Program” means the Bay-Watershed Education and Training Program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, as in effect immediately before the enactment of this Act and modified under this Act or any subsequently enacted Act.

(4) ELIGIBLE ENTITY.—The term “eligible entity” means a State agency, local agency, school district, institution of higher education, or for-profit or non-profit nongovernmental organization, consortium, or other entity that the Administrator finds has demonstrated expertise and experience in the development of the institutional, intellectual, or policy resources to help

environmental education become more effective and widely practiced.

(5) **ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION.**—The term “environmental education” means interdisciplinary formal and informal learning about the relevant interrelationships between dynamic environmental and human systems, and which results in increasing the learner’s capacity for decisionmaking and stewardship regarding natural and community resources.

(6) **ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY.**—The term “environmental literacy” means the capacity to perceive and interpret the relative health of environmental systems and the interrelationships between natural and social systems and technology, and to assess options and take appropriate action to maintain, restore, or improve the health of those systems.

(7) **HIGH-LEVERAGE PROJECTS.**—The term “high-leverage projects” means projects supported by grants authorized under this Act that use Federal, State and nongovernmental financial, technical, and other resources in such a manner that the potential beneficial outcomes are highly magnified or enhanced.

(8) **STATE.**—The term “State” means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, any other territory or possession of the United States, and any Indian tribe.

#### SEC. 4. ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall establish a national competitive grant program, to be known as the “Environmental Literacy Grant Program”, under which the Administrator shall provide, subject to the availability of appropriations, financial assistance to—

(1) expand the adoption of coastal, ocean, Great Lakes, and climate on all time scales education;

(2) build administrative and technical capacity with coastal, ocean, and watershed communities and stakeholder groups to enhance their effectiveness;

(3) encourage water-dependent, wildlife-dependent, and other outdoor recreation, experiential learning, and hands-on involvement with coastal and watershed resources as a method of promoting stewardship of those resources; and

(4) develop and implement new approaches to advance coastal, ocean, Great Lakes, and climate on all time scales education and environmental literacy at national, regional, and local levels.

(b) **PRIORITIES.**—In awarding grants under this section, the Administrator shall give priority consideration to innovative, strategic, high-leverage projects that demonstrate strong potential for being sustained in the future by a grant recipient beyond the time period in which activities are carried out with the grant.

(c) **GUIDELINES.**—No later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and after consultation with appropriate stakeholders, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register guidelines regarding the implementation of this grant program, including publication of criteria for eligible entities, identification of national priorities, establishment of performance measures to evaluate program effectiveness, information regarding sources of non-Federal matching funds or in-kind contributions, and reporting requirements for grant award recipients.

(d) **LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS BY ADMINISTRATOR.**—Of the amounts made available to implement this section—

(1) no less than 80 percent shall be used for competitive grants or cooperative agreements;

(2) no more than 10 percent may be used by the Administrator to implement the grant program; and

(3) no less than 10 percent of the annual funds appropriated for the program authorized under this section shall be used to fund contracts or cooperative agreements to conduct

strategic planning, promote communications among grant recipients and within communities, coordinate grant activities to foster an integrated program, and oversee national evaluation efforts.

#### SEC. 5. B-WET PROGRAM.

(a) **EXISTING PROGRAM.**—The Administrator shall conduct the B-WET Program, including each of the regional programs conducted or under active consideration for creation under such program immediately before the enactment of this Act.

(b) **NEW REGIONAL PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator may create new regional programs under the B-WET Program in accordance with a strategy issued under this subsection.

(2) **STRATEGY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall issue a strategy for establishing such new regional programs.

(B) **CONTENTS.**—The strategy shall include the following:

(i) Evaluation of the need for new regional program in areas that are not served under the B-WET Program on the date of enactment of this Act.

(ii) Identification of potential new regional programs, including a listing of potential principal non-Federal partners.

(iii) A comprehensive budget for future expansion of the B-WET Program over the period for which appropriations are authorized under this Act.

(iv) Such other information as the Administrator considers necessary.

(C) **CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC COMMENT.**—The Administrator shall consult with relevant stakeholders and provide opportunity for public comment in the development of the strategy.

(D) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—The Administrator shall submit the strategy to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate by not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) **PRIORITY CONSIDERATION.**—In creating new regional programs under this subsection, the Administrator shall give priority consideration to the needs of—

(A) United States territories, including Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa;

(B) the Great Lakes States;

(C) Alaska; and

(D) the mid-Atlantic region.

(c) **MODIFICATION OF B-WET PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator may modify or realign regional programs under the B-WET Program, based on—

(A) changes in regional needs;

(B) mutual interest between the Administrator and relevant stakeholders within a region or regions;

(C) changes in resources available to the Administrator to implement the B-WET Program; and

(D) other circumstances as determined necessary by the Administrator.

(2) **CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC COMMENT.**—The Administrator shall—

(A) consult with the persons conducting a regional program and provide opportunity for public comment prior to making a final decision to modify or realign such regional program; and

(B) publish public notice of such a decision no less than 30-days before the effective date of such a modification or realignment.

(d) **REGIONAL PROGRAM MANAGERS.**—

(1) **APPOINTMENT OF REGIONAL PROGRAM MANAGER.**—The Administrator shall be responsible for the selection, appointment, and when necessary replacement of a regional program manager for each regional program under the B-WET Program.

(2) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—To qualify for appointment as a regional program manager, an individual must—

(A) reside in the region for which appointed; and

(B) demonstrate competence and expertise in bay-watershed education and training.

(3) **FUNCTIONS.**—Each regional program manager shall—

(A) be responsible for managing and administering the B-WET Program in the region for which appointed, in accordance with this Act;

(B) determine the most appropriate communities within the region to be served by the B-WET Program;

(C) encourage water-dependent, wildlife-dependent, and other outdoor recreation, experiential learning experiences for students, and hands-on involvement with coastal and watershed resources as a method of promoting stewardship of those resources and complementing core classroom curriculum;

(D) support communication and collaboration among educators, natural resource planners and managers, and governmental and nongovernmental stakeholders;

(E) share and distribute information regarding educational plans, strategies, learning activities, and curricula to all stakeholders within its region;

(F) provide financial and technical assistance pursuant to the guidelines developed by the Administrator under this section; and

(G) perform any additional duties as necessary to carry out the functions of the program.

(e) **PROGRAM GUIDELINES.**—No later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and after consultation with appropriate stakeholders, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register guidelines regarding the implementation of the B-WET Program, as follows:

(1) **CONTRACTS.**—The Administrator shall create guidelines through which each regional program manager may enter into contracts (subject to the availability of appropriations) to support projects to design, demonstrate, evaluate, or disseminate practices, methods, or techniques related to Bay-watershed education and training.

(2) **GRANT MAKING AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall create guidelines through which each regional program manager may provide financial assistance in the form of a grant (subject to the availability of appropriations) or cooperative agreement to support projects that advance the purpose of this Act. The guidelines shall include criteria for eligible entities, identification of national priorities, establishment of performance measures to evaluate program effectiveness, and reporting requirements for grant award recipients.

(B) **PRIORITY.**—In making grants under this paragraph, each regional program manager shall give priority to those projects that will—

(i) promote bay-watershed education throughout the region concerned;

(ii) advance strategic initiatives to incorporate bay-watershed education into formal and informal education systems;

(iii) build capacity within bay-watershed education communities and stakeholder groups for expanding and strengthening their work;

(iv) build bay-watershed education into professional development or training activities for educators; and

(v) broadly replicate existing, proven bay-watershed education programs.

(f) **NON-FEDERAL SHARE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In awarding grants under this section, the regional program managers shall give priority consideration to a project for which the Federal share does not exceed 75 percent of the aggregate cost of such project.

(2) **IN-KIND CONTRIBUTION.**—The non-Federal share of the costs of any project supported by an award of grant funding under this section may be cash or the fair market value of services,

equipment, donations, or any other form of in-kind contribution.

(3) *OTHER PRIORITY.*—The regional program managers shall give priority consideration to a project that will be conducted by or benefit any under-served community, any community that has an inability to draw on other sources of funding because of the small population or low income of the community, or any other person for any other reason the Administrator considers appropriate and consistent with the purpose of this Act.

(g) *REGIONAL PROGRAM COORDINATION.*—Within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Office of Education shall work with regional program managers on the following regional B-WET Program functions:

- (1) Strategic planning efforts.
- (2) Integration and coordination of programs.
- (3) Coordination of national evaluation efforts.
- (4) Promotion of network wide communications.
- (5) Selection of new Regional Program Managers.
- (6) Management, tracking, and oversight of the B-WET Program.
- (h) *LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS BY ADMINISTRATOR.*—Of the amounts made available to implement this section—
  - (1) no less than 80 percent shall be used for implementation of regional program activities, including the award of grants; and
  - (2) no more than 20 percent may be used by the Administrator to implement the regional programs and regional program coordination.

#### SEC. 6. BIENNIAL REPORT.

Not later than December 31, 2011, and biennially thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the grant programs authorized under this Act. Each such report shall include a description of the eligible activities carried out with grants awarded under the Act during the previous two fiscal years, an assessment of the success and impact of such activities, and a description of the type of programs carried out with such grant, disaggregated by State.

#### SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator to carry out this Act such sums as may be necessary for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2015.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. After 1 hour of debate on the bill, as amended, it shall be in order to consider the further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part A of House Report 111-445 if offered by the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) or her designee, which shall be considered read, and shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The amendment to the further amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in part B of House Report 111-445, if offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) or his designee, shall be considered read, and shall be debatable for 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

The gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members that may have 5 legislative days in

which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3644.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I rise today in strong support of my legislation, H.R. 3644, which I introduced on September 24, 2009.

Madam Speaker, in California, we are often inundated with reports of the impacts of climate change, overfishing, wildfires and droughts. Such reports may frighten or dampen a child's innate curiosity and wonder of the natural environment. Fortunately, we have found that connecting children to their environment through hands-on experiences offers an effective way to overcome these challenges.

Over the past 7 years, two NOAA education programs, the Bay-Watershed Education and Training regional program, or as it's known, B-WET, and the Environmental Literacy Grants, or ELG, programs, have been critical tools in advancing a nationwide strategy of experiential education in building ocean, atmospheric and environmental awareness in the United States.

In my district, the MERITO program, which has been funded through the California B-WET program for the past 4 years, has allowed hundreds of children to enjoy the benefits of hands-on, bilingual ocean conservation experiences with trained scientists and professionals in Santa Barbara and Ventura Counties.

Many of these children have taken their first trips to the beach under this MERITO program, even though they may live only a few miles away. According to the testimonials of their parents and their teachers, it has given many of them a new awareness of their local environment and their community and opened the world of new opportunities that they now know they can pursue.

Madam Speaker, my bill, H.R. 3644, seeks to formally authorize these two innovative and important NOAA education programs that were established through the annual appropriations process so we can ensure that they are here for our children now and in the future. It also ensures that certain standards and criteria for positive implementation are met by the agency when they spend these funds. To me, this represents a responsible oversight effort on the part of our committee to exercise our proper duties.

Madam Speaker, these programs have been well received by the ocean and environmental literacy communities, and in fact, since the ELG program was initiated in 2005, the demand for ELG grants has been 10 times greater than the available funding.

Each program has gathered significant momentum and prominence since the Congress passed the America COMPETES Act in 2007, which elevated and enhanced NOAA's educational mission.

A recent report released by the National Academy of Sciences also commends both programs for their positive contributions to increase student interest in science and to improve awareness of the ocean and coastal environment.

H.R. 3644 is fully supported by the administration. The legislation is also strongly supported by the Campaign for Environmental Literacy. This is a coalition of nearly 60 national, regional and local private and non-profit organizations; and they represent science, education, conservation, outdoor recreation and zoological parks, including the National Wildlife Federation, American Fisheries Society, the American Fly Fishing Trade Association, and the Association of Zoos and Aquariums, to name just a few.

At the appropriate time, I will offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute which reflects a bipartisan compromise to address the concerns raised by my colleague and my friend, Congressman CASSIDY of Louisiana, during the markup of this bill by the Committee on Natural Resources.

Madam Speaker, in closing, the B-WET and ELG programs are both effective, wildly popular, and in great demand by educators around the country. These programs represent two critical investments in our efforts to connect children to their natural world and, hopefully as a result, inspire their interest in the sciences and in ensuring the future of their coastal communities. We should recognize their importance today by passing this legislation and codify them as formal programs within NOAA.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, H.R. 3644, the Ocean, Coastal and Watershed Act establishes and authorizes funding for two programs, one of which has been a total creature of appropriations earmarks.

There are two simple and compelling arguments for why I am opposed to this legislation: first, it spends too much money that our government just doesn't have, and it singles out two of the more than one dozen NOAA education programs for special treatment when the entire effort is subject to a top-to-bottom review.

The Capps substitute amendment provides authorized spending levels that provide a 10 percent increase each year for 5 years. The Federal Government and American taxpayers simply cannot afford to increase spending by 10 percent year after year. What American gets a 10 percent pay raise every year? What small business is guaranteed 10 percent more in sales or 10 percent growth? None. And this government program should not be promised such lavish increases.

Now, we are told that they have compromised on these spending levels, that the new amounts are lower than in the bill that was first introduced last year. And it can be acknowledged that they have floated this bloated spending balloon a little lower, but it is still sailing high up in the clouds of out-of-control spending. It needs to come all the way down out of the sky and face the harsh realities of the ground down here. Our Nation is running record Federal budget deficits and the national debt is at historic levels, some \$12-plus trillion.

We are paying over \$600 million a day just in interest on our debt. We need to put a stop to bills like this that just make the problem worse.

It is especially troubling that the Democratic-controlled Rules Committee didn't allow the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee, Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, to offer an amendment that would have frozen spending at the amount being spent this year. Apparently, giving a government program the same amount next year as they got this year is a concept the Democrats believe is so radical and dangerous that they don't even want Members of the House to vote on it, which isn't surprising these days. And this despite what the President has said, that he wants a spending freeze.

Now, it's not just Republicans that are objecting to these high levels of spending on these two programs. In President Obama's own budget proposal that he sent up to Congress in February, he proposed giving zero funding to one of these two programs included in this bill and giving less than half as much to the other one. President Obama has proven time and time again he doesn't have a problem with massive spending increases; and, yet, even he believes Congress is spending too much on these programs.

The second fundamental objection that I expressed with this bill is it is trying to write into law special funding and treatment for just two out of many of NOAA's education programs, when the entire effort is subject to top-to-bottom review.

NOAA itself is looking into how to best conduct its education program. The agency contracted with the National Academy of Sciences to review and critique NOAA's entire education effort. That study was just completed 2 weeks ago after more than 2 years of work. Just 2 weeks ago, this report came out. The American taxpayer spent over \$1 million producing this report, and despite this nearly 200-page document just being delivered into our hands, this House is apparently ready to ignore the work and recommendations by the National Academy of Sciences by moving this bill and voting on it today.

If Congress is going to ignore the National Academy of Sciences report and was going to tell NOAA which education programs it was going to pick and choose to authorize, we could have

saved the National Academy a lot of time, and we could have saved the taxpayers over \$1 million.

This bill needs to be sent back to the drawing board so that spending levels can be cut back and so the National Academy of Sciences report can be taken into consideration. Until the changes are made, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill and the substitute amendment.

I would also like to note, Madam Speaker, that to suggest that the administration fully supports this bill, I think, is a mischaracterization of the facts. In fact, testimony was given that "we also note that NOAA supports education and outreach programs in the Office of Education and throughout NOAA's line offices. The authorization levels of H.R. 3644 could divert funding from these other programs." That should be noted as Members consider this bill.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. I'm pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I thank my good friend from California, and I rise in full support of H.R. 3644, the Ocean, Coastal and Watershed Training Act. I was proud to be an original cosponsor of this bill which creates the Bay Watershed Education and Training program.

Dozens of my constituents have written in support of the Bay Watershed Education and Training program which will strengthen local environmental education in Northern Virginia and in other parts of the Chesapeake Bay watershed.

When John Smith arrived in 1607, the bay estuary, the largest in the country, had an unbelievable profusion of fish, oysters and mussels. Smith's men fished from their boats just by dipping a frying pan in the water, and Smith wrote that the oysters "lay thick as stones" on the bay floor. Not true today.

A central part of restoring America's largest estuary is teaching the next generation about how to be good bay stewards. Northern Virginia educators do an outstanding job teaching students about the environment, including issues ranging from global warming to acid rain, to the health of the bay itself.

Every year, thousands of students will visit Occoquan Bay Wildlife Refuge, Mason Neck State Park and Pohick Bay Regional Park to learn about the Potomac River tidal ecosystems.

Unfortunately, constraints on local resources have prevented most northern Virginia students from participating lately in these programs. The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration will work with local school systems and nonprofits in the Bay Watershed Education and Training program and will provide competitive

grants to help more students participate.

In our area, the National Capital Region, this means more students will be able to participate in bird-banding programs, surveys of benthic macroinvertebrates and exploration of coastal wetlands.

I want to thank Congresswoman CAPPS for her leadership in introducing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to vote in support of this bill.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I would like to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LUNGREN).

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Speaker, once again, we have a bill which has a wonderful name with a wonderful purpose; but it appears that we are forgetting the fact that we're broke. As I understand this bill, this will be a 10 percent increase per year for 5 years for this education program.

I don't know any school district in my district that is going to be able to increase their funding by 10 percent per year for the next 5 years. My State of California, we are broke. I don't know where we're going to get funding. At some point in time, the American people are going to ask us, do you ever connect your responsibilities with fiscal responsibility? And because this is a good idea that we want people to be educated on environmental matters, particularly dealing with the ocean, with the coastline and with watershed, do we just throw out the idea, throw off the table the idea that maybe we ought to be fiscally responsible, or do we ignore it? Similarly, we are probably going to deal with a bill this weekend that throws out the idea that we need to do something to fix some of the problems in our health care system, but apparently we just say, forget the costs.

We also appear to be saying, forget the rules. And we are also apparently saying with respect to that, forget the Constitution. Oh, by the way, the bill that I understand we are going to be presented with later this weekend is entitled this: An act to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time home buyers credit in the case of Members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, and for other purposes.

□ 1115

Now, that doesn't sound like the health care bill, does it? And there is a reason for it. Once again, we have forgotten about transparency and, I would say, responsibility, because the Constitution of the United States says that all revenue-raising measures must start with the House of Representatives.

Now, why would the Founding Fathers say that? It is because they realized the tremendous power of reaching into the pocket of an individual citizen

and taking their money by way of taxes for, presumably, good programs. But because that power is so immense, the Founding Fathers believed that that power should reside initially in the House of Representatives because we are to be more responsive to our constituency, by way of going before them once every 2 years for election or reelection, as opposed to the Senate, which only does one-third of their membership and Members have 6 years before they have to go back to their constituency.

So what does that have to do with the bill that I just mentioned? Well, there was this bill dealing with the first-time homebuyers credit, in the case of the Armed Forces, that started in the Ways and Means Committee, passed out of the House, went over to the Senate. And what they did was they took the title of the bill, and—at least I can find nothing left of the bill that came from here over there—they gutted the bill and replaced it with this 2,000-plus-page health care bill.

Technically, they are complying with the Constitution, but they are violating the spirit of the Constitution, which said that revenue-raising bills—and this is a super-revenue-raising bill—should start here.

Now, to compound that, we used to talk about something in the criminal law called compounding a felony. I will call it compounding a political felony. We now are told that that bill that didn't originate in the House as the constitutional Founders thought it should will now come to the House. But we won't really vote on it. We will vote on some other animal called a rule and thereby deem it to be passed.

So think what we are doing to the spirit of the Constitution. We are not starting this humongous bill in the House of Representatives. We have allowed it to be captured in a shell bill that went over to the Senate, and then, the additional indignity to our constituents is they will not have the opportunity for those of us duly elected to vote on the precise question that the Senate voted on.

Now, I heard a lot of talk about transparency. I heard a lot of talk about regaining the trust of the American people and regaining the confidence of the American people in their institutions, a lot of talk about us reestablishing the confidence of the American people in their institutions of government.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I yield the gentleman from California 2 additional minutes.

Mr. DANIEL E. LUNGREN of California. I would have to ask, if you were to make this a question for a fifth grade government class or a fifth grade U.S. history class as to whether or not that is the way in which you restore the confidence of the American people in their institutions of government. I suspect I know what the answer would be.

But of course we are not fifth graders. We are presumably adults around here. We have sworn an oath to uphold the Constitution. And while we might technically get around that requirement by following the letter of the Constitution, wouldn't it be better if we followed the spirit of the Constitution?

And so once again, Madam Speaker, we are presented in this case with a bill that sounds very good for a worthy cause but gives no consideration whatsoever to the ultimate cost to the American taxpayer because, in many cases, they are 2,000 and 3,000 miles away; they are not here. So out of sight, out of mind.

Oh, yes. And let's forget August. It didn't exist. And the people who were here have been described by some on this floor as un-American and not representative of the American people. I would suggest they are representative of the American people, and I would say that we, at some point in time, have to get away from our business as usual and get back to the people's business.

This would be a good place to start. I hope we will have a strong finish on that this weekend when we come to our senses and recognize that the bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the first-time homebuyers credit in the case of members of the Armed Forces and certain other Federal employees, otherwise known as the takeover of medical care in this country, that we should come to our senses and say enough is enough.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. This is a great bill because it will help American kids to understand what is going on in the oceans, which is they are becoming too acidic to support life as we know it. They are 30 percent more acidic because of carbon pollution. We have got to do something about that. It is nice to let our kids know what is going on.

But I want to respond to this criticism of the health care reform bill, because this Sunday people are going to stand up on this floor and be counted, and they are either going to be with the insurance industry in their ability to stop Americans from getting health insurance because they have diabetes or they will be with us who are going to stop insurance companies from denying coverage to Americans with diabetes and Parkinson's and heart problems.

Now, this criticism of the procedure that is going to be used reminds me of an old show I saw, "To Tell the Truth." And they showed a guy one time, he was a park ranger in Yosemite National Park. He got hit by lightning not once, not twice, but five times, and they asked him what advice he would give to people in a lightning storm. He thought about it for a minute and he said, My advice would be don't stand next to me.

Well, during this debate, don't stand next to the Republicans who are giving you this balderdash poppycock that there is something wrong with this procedure we are going to use, and I will tell you why.

The procedure we are going to use, we are going to vote. Everybody's votes are going to be right up there. It comports with the U.S. Constitution. I will tell you how I know. It is the same procedure the Republicans have used scores of times for the last two decades. Of the times this procedure has been used in the last two decades, 72 percent of the time it was initiated by the Republican Party.

Now, if you tell me there is something wrong with that, there might be a little hypocrisy involved. And when there is hypocrisy involved, maybe you could get struck by lightning.

So let me suggest that during this debate, for the Republicans who are going to say there is something wrong with the constitutional process we have of voting, don't stand next to a Republican. They might get struck by lightning.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I am a freshman here. I didn't create this mess, but I am here to help clean it up. And to suggest this is the direction we should go, I thought the campaign they said was about change. I thought we were going to try to raise the bar in this institution, but evidently not.

At this time, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Utah for yielding.

And it is very interesting that those of us who came here to clean up this process are watching as the liberals that are running this Congress try to ram through a 2,407-page government takeover of health care without even allowing a vote here on the House floor. And maybe they really think that the American people will be fooled, but the American people will not be fooled.

And isn't it interesting that we are here right now debating this bill, H.R. 3644. It is a 15-page bill. We have a debate here on the House floor, and in a little while we are going to have a vote here on the House floor on this 15-page bill; yet Speaker PELOSI and her liberal attendants want to hide a vote on this 2,407-page bill.

They are running around this building; they are running all around town saying how great this bill is. They are talking about all the wonderful things in this bill. Well, if it is so wonderful, why are they actually trying to hide a vote on the bill?

What they are trying to hide, maybe, is all the sweetheart deals that are in this bill and the other subsequent language that they just filed a little while ago that people are still combing through and finding more sweetheart deals.

Maybe another thing they are trying to hide in this bill are all the budget gimmicks, the fact that there is 10 years of taxes in this bill with only 6 years of spending, and yet they want to say that it is going to reduce the deficits.

Anybody who thinks that this bill, this \$1 trillion fiasco is going to reduce the deficit, obviously they didn't follow the Cash for Clunkers program that was supposed to last 6 months and ran out of money after about 2 weeks.

So here we are debating this 15-page bill and we are going to have a vote on this 15-page bill, and American people across the country are wondering right now what they are hiding in this 2,407-page bill that they are trying to avoid a vote on.

Again, maybe it is the \$500 billion in new taxes in this bill that they are trying to hide, most of which would fall of the backs of middle class families and the job creators in this country.

I will tell you one bill that the American people would like us to be debating; not this 2,407-page bill, not this 15-page bill. The American people would like us to be debating a bill to create jobs in this country to actually get our economy back on track. And those of us on the Republican side have put many ideas on the table that would actually create jobs in this country, and they have all been pushed to the side because they want to try to sneak this bill through without a vote on the House floor.

So what other things are in here that they are trying to hide? What about the \$500 billion in cuts to Medicare, including the virtual elimination of the Medicare Advantage program?

And I guess that leads us to something else they are trying to hide is all the broken promises that are in this bill, because the President said on multiple occasions, If you like what you have, you can keep it. The problem is, as the American people are finding out, there are multiple places in this bill that they take away the health care you like, including Medicare Advantage, which hundreds of thousands of seniors in Louisiana and all across the Nation like that plan, and yet it is taken away from them. And many small businesses will tell you the good health care that they provide to their employees, that their employees like, will be taken away.

And, even more importantly, doctors—and ask your family doctor. Many doctors across this country have said they are shutting down their practice if this 2,407-page monstrosity becomes law because they are not going to let a government bureaucrat interfere between the relationship of a doctor and patient.

So what else are they trying to hide? Let's talk about the broken promises again. You know, the President said multiple times all of this is going to be on C-SPAN. Now, if you are watching C-SPAN today, you are watching the debate on this 15-page bill. It is a good

debate we are having on the 15-page bill, but you are not allowed a debate on the 2,407-page bill because it is not on C-SPAN.

In fact, right now while we are here on this House floor, Speaker PELOSI and her liberal attendants have been dispatched all throughout town to continue cutting sweetheart deals. Yes, they are actually still meeting right now cutting sweetheart deals. And what about that C-SPAN promise? Not one of those meetings is on C-SPAN, and yet it is going on right now and we don't see any of that.

And so the American people are watching this, and the American people are sick of this process; yet all I hear on the other side is, Oh, George Bush and those Republicans.

They are running everything now. President Obama is in the White House. They have got a 59-vote majority in the Senate. They have got over 250 votes here on this House floor and they only need 216, and yet they still think that they can get away with saying, Oh, it is those Republicans that are doing all of this. And yet they are trying to sneak through this 2,407-page bill while saying, Okay, it is okay to have a vote on 15 pages and it is okay to have a debate on 15 pages, but they want to hide a debate and hide a vote on 2,407 pages.

The American people are not going to stand for this process, and they are watching.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, may I inquire how much time remains?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 22 minutes remaining and the gentleman from Utah has 13½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES).

Mr. SARBANES. I want to thank my colleague for yielding and for introducing the Ocean, Coastal, and Watershed Education Act, H.R. 3644, and for working to maintain the Bay-Watershed Education and Training programs, watershed approach for environmental education.

In my own State of Maryland, the Chesapeake Bay B-WET was the first B-WET that was established for the country, and it serves as a national model of watershed-based environmental education.

Earlier this fall, I was pleased to join with Congressmen KRATOVIL and WITTMAN to introduce and then see passage in the full House of Representatives legislation that reauthorizes the Chesapeake Bay B-WET program.

The bill before us will codify other existing B-WET programs around the country and provide NOAA the authority to create new B-WETs in various watersheds throughout the country and the territories. So I want to again thank Congresswoman CAPPS for her leadership.

□ 1130

One of the things that this does, this education and training for the next

generation, is that it encourages our kids to become comfortable with science; to look at the world through an empirical lens; to make decisions based on data and facts, not just opinion. And that's a skill that we really need to encourage in the next generation.

It occurs to me as we talk about this health care bill, I wish more people would be bringing a lens of empiricism and fact-based review to the health care bill, because if you look at the health care bill through that lens, if you look at the facts of this health care bill, then it is clear why it responds to all of the grievances that so many Americans have had with the current health care system for decades.

Fact: Not only does it pay for itself, it reduces the deficit. So this suggestion that somehow it's not being paid for is misplaced. Not only does it pay for itself, but over the next 10 years, the independent Congressional Budget Office, the CBO, has projected that there will be savings and a reduction to the deficit of about \$132 billion. And then in the next 10 years they've projected that it will reduce the deficit by \$1.2 trillion. So all those people out there that want to reduce the deficit, this is your bill. The health care bill is a major vehicle for accomplishing that. That's fact number one.

Fact number two: It's going to make Medicare stronger—not weaker—because it's going to crack down on fraud and abuse. It's going to take those savings and—this is another piece of misinformation that's going on, that somehow the savings we're taking from Medicare are going to go off into the ether. We're taking the savings from Medicare, and we're actually putting them right back into the Medicare program by closing the doughnut hole, by making available to our seniors primary care opportunities and preventive care measures that currently they have to pay out of pocket for. But now, because it makes a lot of sense, those things will be covered. So we're taking the savings, we're putting it right back into the Medicare program.

Fact number three: Thirty-two million people who today do not have health insurance coverage, when this bill is passed, will be on their way to getting that coverage. Ninety-five percent of Americans will be covered ultimately when the provisions of this bill take full force. In fact, the last fact I'd just like to point out, which is this, is finally, after decades in which the health insurance industry has pretty much run the show—it's been a health insurance industry takeover of the health care system in America. That's who's taking over the health care system, the private health insurance industry. This bill finally fights back against the health insurance industry and says no longer will you discriminate against people based on pre-existing conditions, no longer will you terminate their coverage right at the moment when they need it most.



Finally, instead of us living in your world, by your rules, you're going to start living in our world by our rules. That's what this health care bill accomplishes. And that's why we're ready to support it.

Again, I want to thank my colleague for her work on the B-WET, and I strongly support that bill as well.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I guess that's the fundamental challenge. I don't want to live in his world. And I don't want the people of the United States to have to live in his world. That's the fundamental difference in the approach that's dealing with this health care bill. We have an opportunity in this country to do the right thing. I think the more the people of the United States of America have gotten to know this health care bill, the less they like it. The more sunshine that's shown on this, the less they like it. Only in the United States of America can you spend a trillion dollars and it's not going to add to the deficit when we're already \$12 trillion into debt. This bill that we're considering here today will add to that debt. Even the President didn't even ask money for this program.

We can't even take care of our seniors in this country or our veterans. We have a Veterans Administration, and I have soldiers in the State of Utah that are trying get care and services, yet we got a notice recently from the Veterans Administration saying, Don't even bother applying because we have such a backlog of people. The American people understand this. They understand how deep our deficit and our debt is. They understand how irresponsible the health care bill is and what a detriment it's going to be to this Nation and this country. And I would challenge Members to try to articulate what this bill is even going to do. There's some 158 programs, and administrations, and departments, and boards. Somebody stand up and try to articulate what's going to happen—not what it's going to do, but how is it going to work? Because I don't think there's anybody in this body that can actually answer, How is it going to work?

Now going back specifically to this bill that we're considering here today. Again, I want to reiterate the point, Madam Speaker, that we spent a million dollars coming up with a study from the National Academy of Sciences and just totally ignored it. Two hundred pages, 2 years of work, and yet because we've got to fill some time here so we can get to health care—they don't even want Members to go home for the weekend—we're going to throw up this bill prematurely. Why are we ignoring this report?

I want to highlight a couple of things that are said in here. This is from that National Academy of Sciences report recommendation 1.2: "In order to adequately address the mismatch between its available resources and its ambitious education agenda, NOAA should

better align and deploy its resources. This may require the termination of certain activities and programs that, based on appropriate evaluation, do not directly and effectively contribute to its education and stewardship goals.

"NOAA's role in education is shaped by the distributed nature of its education efforts across five line offices and the Office of Education. Because of their diverse missions, the line offices . . . and the Office of Education can act independently and sometimes even in competition with each other."

Further, "The differences in management structures, missions, and education mandates are obstacles to creating a cohesive and coordinated education portfolio."

At a time when we are paying over \$600 million a day just in interest, we have a debt that exceeds \$12 trillion, close to a \$1 trillion new health care proposal that's moving forward, some how, some way, the Democrats want to offer a bill that gives an automatic increase year after year. Ten percent. Just keep adding 10 percent to it over the next 5 years. I think that is fundamentally wrong.

Now the ranking member of Natural Resources, DOC HASTINGS, offered an amendment that said, Let's just keep the funding level flat. That is a simple, reasonable proposal. But somehow the Rules Committee couldn't find it in their heart to allow Members to vote on it.

Please, don't come here and lecture to somebody and say, Oh, we're about openness and transparency. We're about change in America. I don't buy it. You're not living up to it. You have the opportunity to do the right thing—and you consistently don't. You consistently offend the American people and offend me. I'm a freshman here. I didn't create this mess. I don't want to hear about how the Republicans messed up, because you know what? They had the House and the Senate and the Presidency and they did blow it. I'll be the first one to stand here and point criticism to them. But if we're going to rise to the level that this body demands, then we need to raise the bar and start acting like adults. Vote on what we're supposed to vote for. Be open and transparent. Allow a rule that will come to this floor and make America proud. Let people without the disguise and the nuances. That is within your power, and yet it's not being done. And it's not being done consistently. There are a lot of people here that are fed up with it. I'm one of them. It's disgusting what you're doing. It is disgusting. And I think you know it.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I'll reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. At this point I'm pleased to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. HOLT).

Mr. HOLT. Madam Speaker, I rise today as cosponsor of H.R. 3644, the Bay-Watershed Education and Training Regional Programs and National Environmental Literacy Grant Program, and with great appreciation for my colleague from California, who combines her interest—our interest—in environmental protection with our interest in the education of youth. And I would like to talk about the bill at hand. She combines here book learning with field environmental education. Environmentalist David Polis once said, "Must we always teach our children with books? Let them look at the mountains and the stars up above. Let them look at the beauty of the waters and the trees and flowers on earth. They will then begin to think, and to think is the beginning of a real education."

If we want to teach our children to be responsible stewards of our environment, we must foster understanding and awareness of the environment as an integral part of our educational curricula. The B-WET and National Environmental Literacy Grant Program operated by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration is an excellent example of a successful environmental program.

Now the opponents of this legislation seem to think that because the National Research Council says there are other good educational programs in NOAA in addition to this, that we somehow should not do this. Through these grant programs, elementary students and high school students across the Nation have learned to appreciate the importance of healthy coastal and ocean resources to the quality of our life and to coastal-based economies.

The legislation before us today would fully authorize and expand access to the B-WET and the Environmental Literacy Program. I'd like to thank my colleague from California for including a provision in this legislation that would allow the Mid-Atlantic region to be a priority area for future B-WET programs. This will allow successful New Jersey educational programs like Rutgers University and the Jacques Cousteau National Estuarine Research Reserve to compete for funds that can enrich environmental education throughout the State and the region. New Jersey is already taking the lead on coastal and marine resources through the K-12 education program developed by the National Estuarine Research Reserve System. It's known as KEEP, the K-12 Estuarine Education Program. The availability of B-WET funds to the Mid-Atlantic region could help to advance KEEP, a field-based estuarine science education initiative that features real-time data and innovative technology. Research has shown that environmental education, particularly field-based education like this, fosters students' readiness to learn. It improves scores on standardized tests. Yes, it helps book learning, too. And it stimulates student interest in math and science.

I urge my colleagues to support this authorization, and I thank the gentlelady from California for her leadership on this.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, we have no additional speakers, but I will continue to reserve the balance of my time, unless you're prepared to close.

Mrs. CAPPS. I'd like now to yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FATTAH).

Mr. FATTAH. Let me thank the gentlelady from California. I want to congratulate my colleague for her extraordinary leadership on this issue of such importance. We know of the real environmental challenges facing the oceans throughout the world. Oceans represent the vast majority—more than two-thirds of the surface of our planet—and this effort to educate our future generations about our responsibilities to be good stewards is so very, very important.

Back home, we have the Lenfest Foundation, in which Gerry and Marguerite Lenfest have put forth tens of millions of dollars into these types of efforts. And here in Washington, my friend, Tom Lindenfeld, with the Blue Guardians. There's so many people, Americans, who have focused the Nation's attention on this challenge.

I want to rise as an appropriator that's on the subcommittee that handles the NOAA appropriations. First of all, these authorizations are important, but they will be held to the PAYGO rules. It's still vitally important that the Congress speak and indicate its preference. I'm a supporter of this bill. I want to thank my colleague for her introduction and hope that all of my colleagues will favorably support it.

□ 1145

Now, I want to say a little bit about the other subject matter that's been raised on the floor, about the health care debate that we're going to have on Sunday. Now, all we have to do as Americans when we really hear these very different points of view is look at the scorecard. When the Republicans had the Presidency, the Congress and the Senate for 6 years, tens of millions of Americans were uninsured, and they did zero. On the question of children's health care, there was just zero and vetoes of the children's health care program. In terms of reining in the insurance companies and their unfair practices, they did zero.

Now, the Democrats in less than 16 months have made sure that the children's health care program could insure over 10 million children. On Sunday—and what an appropriate day for it—we're going to take 32 million of our fellow citizens and make sure that they have health care coverage. Aren't we our brother's keeper? We have a responsibility to be stewards of the Earth, but we also have a responsibility to love our neighbor. And in this Easter season, we know that on Fridays a lot of things can happen. We can

hear a lot of things and witness a lot of things, but if we just hold on and wait until Sunday, good things happen on Sunday.

I believe that this Democratic majority, when we look at the scorecard, when we get held to account for how we were stewards—my colleague from California is showing good stewardship in terms of the oceans and educating future generations, and this Democratic majority is going to show that, indeed, we are our brother's keeper on Sunday. So notwithstanding the zero over their 6 years, we've taken less than 16 months to take the priorities of this country, right them again, and move us in the correct direction.

Now, we've heard this talk about deficits. The last time that we were paying down the deficits and balancing the budget, we had a Democrat in the White House. We're headed in that direction again. That's what PAYGO is about. That's what responsible leadership is about. And that's why the President's set up this fiscal commission. I have introduced a bill to get us to deal with the debts in our country. We hear a lot of nonsense from some of our Republican colleagues. We can stop talking about it and vote on it.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Sunday, Bloody Sunday. Can't wait.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, could I again inquire of the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 10 minutes remaining, and the gentleman from Utah has 8 minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE of Maine. I thank my colleague, the gentlewoman from California, for yielding her time to me and thank you for this great bill. We are veering from the conversation a little bit. But first I want to talk about the Capps bill and just say how important it is to a State like mine, with a tremendous amount of ocean coastline, with an enormous number of young people who grow up on the waterfront, who are fishermen, who work in waterfront communities. This is a great program. I wholeheartedly endorse this particular piece of legislation. I know it's going to be great for our coastal communities, and I commend you for doing it. So thank you very much for what you're doing on the floor today.

I just wanted to take a little bit of time to answer my freshman colleague from Utah, who is also my office neighbor, and just talk about how seriously we disagree on this topic of health care. I, for one, am thrilled that we are here this weekend to finally take up an issue that is of such great importance to my constituents. I mean, frankly, when I go back to my district, I find that the more people hear about this health care bill, the happier they are. They are thrilled to know that as a

small business they're going to start receiving subsidies to help support the cost of health insurance. My seniors are saying, Thank goodness we no longer will have to pay for preventive care under Medicare. Thank goodness we're going to get rid of the doughnut hole that was created by the other side, predominantly when they passed the Medicare prescription D plan.

We hear a lot about process, but I just want to talk a little bit about the process of insurance companies because that's what makes my constituents mad. When they hear about the fact that people are constantly denied coverage because of a preexisting condition—in many States, being a woman, a woman of child-bearing age is a preexisting condition. That will be gone with this bill. Immediately we'll say children are not a preexisting condition. None of them can be denied coverage. And by 2014, no one can be denied under this piece of legislation. We're going to get rid of lifetime caps, people who have a long-term illness who find that their insurance runs out in spite of the fact that they've been paying these high premiums.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I will continue to reserve the balance of my time as we have no further requests for time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, at this time I am pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN).

Mr. MCGOVERN. I want to thank my colleague from California, Congresswoman CAPPS, for yielding the time and for the excellent legislation which will help educate our children about the importance of our environment, our oceans and our watersheds. She has been a leader on environmental legislation, and I am proud to serve with her.

But, Madam Speaker, I want to just take a moment to comment on some of the other debate that's been going on here. I regret very much the tone that my Republican colleagues have taken in this debate. Never, never in all my time being here have I heard such rhetoric, personal attacks, harsh attacks. I regret it because the issue of health insurance reform is an important issue, and we should talk about it with respect for one another and with respect for each other's approaches to health insurance reform.

This is important. This debate we're going to have on Sunday, this vote we're going to have on Sunday is important. My colleagues express outrage over the process. Where's the outrage over the fact that tens of millions of our fellow citizens do not have health care? Where's the outrage over the fact that some of the biggest insurance companies in the United States of America regularly discriminate against individuals who have preexisting conditions, preexisting conditions like acne, believe it or not? And in some States in this country, domestic violence is used as a preexisting condition to deny women health insurance. So a woman who gets beaten by



her husband or her boyfriend has a pre-existing condition. Give me break. Give me a break.

I have heard that we're not going to vote on health care. This is some kind of crazy process. A process, by the way, which has been invoked by them many times when they were in charge. But to the question that always gets raised, is the House approving the Senate bill without actually voting on it? No.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. MCGOVERN. The House is voting to approve the Senate bill when it votes on the rule. When Members take up the rule, they are considering whether to pass the Senate bill at the same time that they pass reconciliation, which will improve the Senate bill.

You want to be outraged, be outraged over the fact that we're the greatest country on this planet, the richest country on this planet, and tens of millions of our citizens do not have health care. We can do better, and we will do better on Sunday.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Let me thank the gentlewoman for her excellent work in the area of the environment, our oceans and our watersheds. But it seems like every conversation here is going to be about health care, so let's take that on.

The fact is, Madam Speaker, this bill that we'll vote on on Sunday cuts the deficit by \$138 billion in the first 10 years. That level of deficit reduction is something the Democrats are known for and Republicans, unfortunately, have not been known for. We know that when the Democrats left office in 2000, we had a surplus, and then we quickly—based on tax cuts for the wealthy and unpaid-for wars and other things—we ran into a massive deficit. Quite frankly, if I was a Republican, I would be embarrassed to talk about deficits. But it seems like they're not.

So the fact is, we have to talk about the facts and straighten out the situation so that the American people will know that the fact is that that bill, this health care bill, cuts the deficit by \$138 billion in the first 10 years, and cuts it by \$1 trillion in the second 10 years. The fact is this bill is good for America. It is fiscally sound. It is paid for. It makes sense. And for any Republican to stand up here and talk about deficits and lecture on deficits, they really do need to review their history because they are the party of deficits. Democrats are the party of deficit reduction. Americans all over this country, some of whom have said that they're scared about the change that is

about to come, their fear should be overcome by the good things that are in this bill.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I do think we should go back and review history. The reality of this bill is the fact that it spends nearly \$1 trillion, and the reason you can try to say that it's deficit-neutral or reduces the deficit is because it raises taxes. Only in America do you try to get away with saying, Hey, we're going to spend nearly \$1 trillion, and by the way, it's not going to hurt the deficit. And let's also go back and review history and understand that during that time you like to tout when President Clinton was in office, the reality is that the debt continued to increase. There was a reduction in the annual deficit, and a Republican Congress was in charge. It is the Congress of the United States of America that originates spending. So let's also make sure that we're fair on that point as well.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, in closing the debate on this topic, I want to spend a couple of minutes responding to some claims from the other side. First with respect to the authorization levels, Congress is already investing in both of these programs under discussion today through the appropriations process. The authorized funding levels contained in my bipartisan compromise amendment were based upon existing appropriations and allow for the continuation and measured growth of both programs, which are in high demand by educators nationwide. They were negotiated with my colleague Mr. CASSIDY, and I do appreciate his efforts.

My bill would authorize the programs that Congress is already spending money on and makes sure that certain standards and criteria for implementation are met by the agency when they do spend these funds. To me, this represents a responsible effort on the part of our committee and our Congress to exercise our oversight function.

Second, with respect to the argument that we should not consider this legislation because we need time to study the recommendations from the NAS evaluation of NOAA's education program, it is true that the National Academy of Science report on NOAA's education program was released last week. Nothing in the report, however, was specifically critical of either the B-WET or ELG programs. And because of this, this report should have no bearing on my legislation to codify both programs.

Indeed, the NAS' National Research Council panel found that over the relatively short lives of both programs, they have made positive contributions to fulfill NOAA's educational mission and that they reflect well the agency's diverse capabilities in science, resource stewardship, and education.

In short, these are both very good programs with broad support from more than 60 science education, out-

door recreation, and conservation organizations. By authorizing them, we ensure money already being spent is spent well and responsibly. I urge all Members to support the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MCGOVERN). All time for debate on the bill, as amended, has expired.

AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE  
OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk 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 printed in part A of House Report 111-445 offered by Mrs. CAPPS:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Ocean, Coastal, and Watershed Education Act".

#### SEC. 2. FINDINGS AND PURPOSE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The Congress finds the following:

(1) The United States faces major challenges, such as mitigating and adapting to the impacts of climate change, stewarding critical coastal and marine resources including fish and wildlife habitat while sustaining the commercial and recreational activities that depend on these resources, and improving resilience to natural disasters, that collectively threaten human health, sustainable economic development, environmental quality, and national security.

(2) Communities in coastal watersheds are particularly vulnerable to these increasingly urgent, interconnected, and complex challenges and need support for teacher professional development and experiential learning among students of all ages.

(3) These challenges can be met with the help of comprehensive programs specifically targeted to engage coastal watershed communities, schoolchildren, and the general public to develop engaged and environmentally literate citizens who are better able to understand complex environmental issues, assess risk, evaluate proposed plans, and understand how individual decisions affect the environment at local, regional, national, and global scales.

(4) The intrinsic social and conservation values of wildlife-dependent and other outdoor recreation can play an important role in outdoor educational programs that address the myriad of coastal and ocean concerns, as well as instill a sustainable conservation ethic that will enable them to face those challenges to the betterment of both the environment and coastal communities.

(5) The economic importance of coastal areas and resources to the overall economy of the United States is significant. According to the U.S. Commission on Ocean Policy, coastal and ocean-related activities support millions of American jobs and generate more than \$1 trillion, or one tenth of the Nation's annual gross domestic product. Sustainable use of the Nation's natural resources can provide additional economic opportunities to the United States economy.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this Act is to advance environmental literacy, develop public awareness and appreciation of the economic, social, recreational, and environmental benefits of coastal watersheds, and emphasize stewardship and sustainable economic development of critical coastal and marine resources, including an understanding of how climate change is impacting

those resources, through the establishment of—

(1) an Environmental Literacy Grant Program; and

(2) regional programs under the B-WET Program.

### SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **ADMINISTRATOR.**—The term “Administrator” means the Administrator of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration.

(2) **BAY-WATERSHED EDUCATION.**—The term “bay-watershed education” means environmental education focused on watersheds, with an emphasis on stewardship and sustainable economic development of critical coastal and marine resources, including an understanding of how climate change is impacting those resources.

(3) **B-WET PROGRAM.**—The term “B-WET Program” means the Bay-Watershed Education and Training Program of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, as in effect immediately before the enactment of this Act and modified under this Act or any subsequently enacted Act.

(4) **ELIGIBLE ENTITY.**—The term “eligible entity” means a State agency, local agency, school district, institution of higher education, or for-profit or non-profit nongovernmental organization, consortium, or other entity that the Administrator finds has demonstrated expertise and experience in the development of the institutional, intellectual, or policy resources to help environmental education become more effective and widely practiced.

(5) **ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION.**—The term “environmental education” means interdisciplinary formal and informal learning about the relevant interrelationships between dynamic environmental and human systems, including economic systems that depend on coastal, watershed and marine resources for job creation and economic growth, that results in increasing the learner’s capacity for decisionmaking, stewardship, and sustainable economic development of natural and community resources.

(6) **ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY.**—The term “environmental literacy” means the capacity to perceive and interpret the relative health of environmental systems and the interrelationships between natural, economic, and social systems and technology, and to assess options and take appropriate action to maintain, restore, or improve the health of those systems and promote sustainable economic development.

(7) **HIGH-LEVERAGE PROJECTS.**—The term “high-leverage projects” means projects supported by grants authorized under this Act that use Federal, State and nongovernmental financial, technical, and other resources in such a manner that the potential beneficial outcomes are highly magnified or enhanced.

(8) **STATE.**—The term “State” means each of the several States of the United States, the District of Columbia, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Guam, American Samoa, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, any other territory or possession of the United States, and any Indian tribe.

### SEC. 4. ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY GRANT PROGRAM.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall establish a national competitive grant program, to be known as the “Environmental Literacy Grant Program”, under which the Administrator shall provide, subject to the availability of appropriations, financial assistance to—

(1) expand the adoption of coastal, ocean, Great Lakes, and climate on all time scales education;

(2) build administrative and technical capacity with coastal, ocean, and watershed communities and stakeholder groups to enhance their effectiveness;

(3) encourage water-dependent, wildlife-dependent, and other outdoor recreation, experiential learning, and hands-on involvement with coastal and watershed resources as a method of promoting stewardship and sustainable economic development of those resources;

(4) develop and implement new approaches to advance coastal, ocean, Great Lakes, and climate on all time scales education and environmental literacy at national, regional, and local levels; and

(5) encourage formal and informal environmental education about the systemic interrelationships between healthy coastal, watershed, and marine resources and sustainable economic systems that depend on such resources for job creation and economic development.

(b) **PRIORITIES.**—In awarding grants under this section, the Administrator shall give priority consideration to innovative, strategic, high-leverage projects that demonstrate strong potential for being sustained in the future by a grant recipient beyond the time period in which activities are carried out with the grant.

(c) **GUIDELINES.**—No later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and after consultation with appropriate stakeholders, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register guidelines regarding the implementation of this grant program, including publication of criteria for eligible entities, identification of national priorities, establishment of performance measures to evaluate program effectiveness, information regarding sources of non-Federal matching funds or in-kind contributions, and reporting requirements for grant award recipients.

(d) **LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS BY ADMINISTRATOR.**—Of the amounts made available to implement this section—

(1) no less than 80 percent shall be used for competitive grants or cooperative agreements;

(2) no more than 10 percent may be used by the Administrator to implement the grant program; and

(3) no less than 10 percent of the annual funds appropriated for the program authorized under this section shall be used to fund contracts or cooperative agreements to conduct strategic planning, promote communications among grant recipients and within communities, coordinate grant activities to foster an integrated program, and oversee national evaluation efforts.

### SEC. 5. B-WET PROGRAM.

(a) **EXISTING PROGRAM.**—The Administrator shall conduct the B-WET Program, including each of the regional programs conducted or under active consideration for creation under such program immediately before the enactment of this Act.

(b) **NEW REGIONAL PROGRAMS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator may create new regional programs under the B-WET Program in accordance with a strategy issued under this subsection.

(2) **STRATEGY.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall issue a strategy for establishing such new regional programs

(B) **CONTENTS.**—The strategy shall include the following:

(i) Evaluation of the need for new regional program in areas that are not served under the B-WET Program on the date of enactment of this Act.

(ii) Identification of potential new regional programs, including a listing of potential principal non-Federal partners.

(iii) A comprehensive budget for future expansion of the B-WET Program over the period for which appropriations are authorized under this Act.

(iv) Such other information as the Administrator considers necessary.

(C) **CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC COMMENT.**—The Administrator shall consult with relevant stakeholders and provide opportunity for public comment in the development of the strategy.

(D) **SUBMISSION TO CONGRESS.**—The Administrator shall submit the strategy to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation of the Senate by not later than 270 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

(3) **PRIORITY CONSIDERATION.**—In creating new regional programs under this subsection, the Administrator shall give priority consideration to the needs of—

(A) United States territories, including Guam, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa;

(B) the Great Lakes States;

(C) Alaska; and

(D) the mid-Atlantic region.

(c) **MODIFICATION OF B-WET PROGRAM.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator may modify or realign regional programs under the B-WET Program, based on—

(A) changes in regional needs;

(B) mutual interest between the Administrator and relevant stakeholders within a region or regions;

(C) changes in resources available to the Administrator to implement the B-WET Program; and

(D) other circumstances as determined necessary by the Administrator.

(2) **CONSULTATION AND PUBLIC COMMENT.**—The Administrator shall—

(A) consult with the persons conducting a regional program and provide opportunity for public comment prior to making a final decision to modify or realign such regional program; and

(B) publish public notice of such a decision no less than 30-days before the effective date of such a modification or realignment.

(d) **REGIONAL PROGRAM MANAGERS.**—

(1) **APPOINTMENT OF REGIONAL PROGRAM MANAGER.**—The Administrator shall be responsible for the selection, appointment, and when necessary replacement of a regional program manager for each regional program under the B-WET Program.

(2) **QUALIFICATIONS.**—To qualify for appointment as a regional program manager, an individual must—

(A) reside in the region for which appointed; and

(B) demonstrate competence and expertise in bay-watershed education and training.

(3) **FUNCTIONS.**—Each regional program manager shall—

(A) be responsible for managing and administering the B-WET Program in the region for which appointed, in accordance with this Act;

(B) determine the most appropriate communities within the region to be served by the B-WET Program;

(C) encourage water-dependent, wildlife-dependent, and other outdoor recreation, experiential learning experiences for students, and hands-on involvement with coastal and watershed resources as a method of promoting stewardship and sustainable economic development of those resources and complementing core classroom curriculum;

(D) support communication and collaboration among educators, natural resource planners and managers, and governmental and nongovernmental stakeholders;

(E) share and distribute information regarding educational plans, strategies, learning activities, and curricula to all stakeholders within its region;

(F) provide financial and technical assistance pursuant to the guidelines developed by the Administrator under this section; and

(G) perform any additional duties as necessary to carry out the functions of the program.

(e) **PROGRAM GUIDELINES.**—No later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act and after consultation with appropriate stakeholders, the Administrator shall publish in the Federal Register guidelines regarding the implementation of the B-WET Program, as follows:

(1) **CONTRACTS.**—The Administrator shall create guidelines through which each regional program manager may enter into contracts (subject to the availability of appropriations) to support projects to design, demonstrate, evaluate, or disseminate practices, methods, or techniques related to Bay-watershed education and training.

(2) **GRANT MAKING AND COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Administrator shall create guidelines through which each regional program manager may provide financial assistance in the form of a grant (subject to the availability of appropriations) or cooperative agreement to support projects that advance the purpose of this Act. The guidelines shall include criteria for eligible entities, identification of national priorities, establishment of performance measures to evaluate program effectiveness, and reporting requirements for grant award recipients.

(B) **PRIORITY.**—In making grants under this paragraph, each regional program manager shall give priority to those projects that will—

(i) promote bay-watershed education throughout the region concerned;

(ii) advance strategic initiatives to incorporate bay-watershed education into formal and informal education systems;

(iii) build capacity within bay-watershed education communities and stakeholder groups for expanding and strengthening their work;

(iv) build bay-watershed education into professional development or training activities for educators; and

(v) broadly replicate existing, proven bay-watershed education programs.

(f) **NON-FEDERAL SHARE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—In awarding grants under this section, the regional program managers shall give priority consideration to a project for which the Federal share does not exceed 75 percent of the aggregate cost of such project.

(2) **IN-KIND CONTRIBUTION.**—The non-Federal share of the costs of any project supported by an award of grant funding under this section may be cash or the fair market value of services, equipment, donations, or any other form of in-kind contribution.

(3) **OTHER PRIORITY.**—The regional program managers shall give priority consideration to a project that will be conducted by or benefit any under-served community, any community that has an inability to draw on other sources of funding because of the small population or low income of the community, or any other person for any other reason the Administrator considers appropriate and consistent with the purpose of this Act.

(g) **REGIONAL PROGRAM COORDINATION.**—Within the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, the Office of Education shall work with regional program managers on the following regional B-WET Program functions:

(1) Strategic planning efforts.

(2) Integration and coordination of programs.

(3) Coordination of national evaluation efforts.

(4) Promotion of network wide communications.

(5) Selection of new Regional Program Managers.

(6) Management, tracking, and oversight of the B-WET Program.

(h) **LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS BY ADMINISTRATOR.**—Of the amounts made available to implement this section—

(1) no less than 80 percent shall be used for implementation of regional program activities, including the award of grants; and

(2) no more than 20 percent may be used by the Administrator to implement the regional programs and regional program coordination.

#### **SEC. 6. BIENNIAL REPORT.**

Not later than December 31, 2011, and biennially thereafter, the Administrator shall submit to Congress a report on the grant programs authorized under this Act. Each such report shall include a description of the eligible activities carried out with grants awarded under the Act during the previous two fiscal years, an assessment of the success and impact of such activities, and a description of the type of programs carried out with such grant, disaggregated by State.

#### **SEC. 7. AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.**

There are authorized to be appropriated to the Administrator—

(1) to carry out the Environmental Literacy Grant Program authorized by section 4 (including administrative expenses for preparing the report under section 6)—

(A) for fiscal year 2011, \$13,200,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2012, \$14,500,000;

(C) for fiscal year 2013, \$16,000,000;

(D) for fiscal year 2014, \$17,600,000; and

(E) for fiscal year 2015, \$19,300,000; and

(2) to carry out the B-WET Program authorized by section 5 (including administrative expenses for preparing the report under section 6)—

(A) for fiscal year 2011, \$10,700,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2012, \$11,700,000;

(C) for fiscal year 2013, \$12,900,000;

(D) for fiscal year 2014, \$14,200,000; and

(E) for fiscal year 2015, \$15,600,000.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1192, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and a Member opposed each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, my amendment in the nature of a substitute reflects changes to the bill, as ordered reported by the Committee on Natural Resources, that, as I mentioned, were negotiated between myself and Congressman CASSIDY of Louisiana. I wish to thank Mr. CASSIDY and his staff for their cooperation and thoughtful suggestions to improve this bill, and I think that the final bipartisan compromise does just that.

In particular, the amendment makes several changes to reflect the significant economic importance of coastal areas and resources to the overall economy of the United States.

As a Representative of a coastal district, I could not agree more that the economic health and viability of our coastal communities is intrinsically connected to the health of the natural resources of the watersheds in which

we live. You cannot have one without the other. In addition, my amendment will authorize a gradual increase in authorized appropriations for fiscal years 2011 through 2015. This modest annual increase of 10 percent will allow for the responsible expansion of both programs to incorporate new regions that are not currently served, particularly by the regional B-WET programs.

I applaud the gentleman from Louisiana for his leadership on this front. Both of our districts enjoy the benefits of the regional B-WET programs, and we would like to see those benefits extended to other watersheds around the country where, I can assure you, there is an overwhelming demand. Mr. Speaker, the changes reflected in this amendment serve to strengthen the overall purposes of this bill. I would like once more to thank Congressman CASSIDY and his staff for their work on these revisions, and I do encourage support of my colleague's amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1200

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there are several concerns with this. In fact, in the bill there are several good programs and things of quality that I would applaud, but there are some basic fundamental flaws that put me in a position, and others in a position, where we are unable to support this amendment and the overall bill.

First of all, it addresses simply two programs within a list of 16 that are found within NOAA's education programs and supporting offices. Further, you see, and actually JARED POLIS, a colleague of ours, had a Dear Colleague letter talking about Environmental Protection Agency educational programs. I don't think it has been addressed how cohesive or incohesive it might be between the overlap and what might be happening or not happening. I don't think that has been properly ferreted out.

Now through some foresight in previous Congresses here, the National Academy of Sciences was tasked with a 2-year study to go out and look at what is going on over at NOAA and what their recommendations are. We have spent, as American taxpayers, over a million dollars to get this report, and yet it seems to be totally ignored. Why does this Congress continue to spend money on worthless reports if the Members are going to simply ignore them and say, Oh, well, these are my two pet projects; and, by the way, let's go ahead and give them 10 percent increases year after year after year?

Is there no recognition that this country is over \$12 trillion in debt?

We are paying over \$600 million a day in interest on the debt, and yet we continue to fund these programs at record

levels, and giving them amazingly high increases without recognition of the fact that this body has got to make difficult decisions.

We can't be all things to all people. We are going to have to make some difficult decisions in this body. And to what is this body actually going to say "no"? Where do we actually turn around and say, No. You know what; we are this far in debt and, I'm sorry, we just can't increase the funding for another educational program?

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to my colleague, the gentleman from California (Mr. FARR) who is the pioneer in the area of coastal education.

Mr. FARR. Mr. Speaker, I rise on B-WET. I want to talk about B-WET rather than all wet.

I rise in support of this legislation, and I think it is interesting that people are talking about health care because, if you don't have a healthy planet and healthy ocean, all of this discussion about how you care for human beings on the planet is for naught. So let's, for a moment, just focus on a healthy Earth that we may understand, and this bill does that by this program called B-WET.

I am a strong advocate for California's B-WET program, and I come to the floor today to share a few of the stories that I have heard over the years from students and teachers who have benefited from the support.

I would like to tell you about a student who went through California State University of Monterey Bay's Recruitment in Science Education program, a program called RISE, which we all support, to try to get young people interested in the sciences. This young fellow started the RISE program when he was in the sixth grade. He was never very engaged in activities. He was very shy, and he got average grades. He probably would have quit if it hadn't been for his mom and the RISE staff pushing him to stay active. His experiences during a water testing program on the Salinas River while he was a sophomore in high school motivated him to get better grades and to get into college. RISE, the program that he went through grammar school and high school with, is happy to announce that he is now studying microbiology at the University of California, Davis. This program motivated him to go into higher education.

The other story I would like to share with you is about a teacher from Moss Landing Marine Laboratory. That teacher participated in the marine lab program for 3 years. Unfortunately, this year that teacher was given a pink slip and does not have a job, but he told me that his participation in the Moss Landing Marine Lab program was the only thing that kept him going.

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

Mrs. CAPPS. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. FARR. I thank the gentlewoman.

This interaction and relationship that he built with the teachers in the program have kept him motivated and excited about bringing meaningful watershed educational experiences to the classroom with something that he knew was making a big difference to his students.

These are stories about students and teachers that wouldn't exist without this program.

Mr. Speaker, we in Congress are constantly trying to think of new ways to get students engaged in science. I can attest that this program works and is money well spent. I urge its adoption.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE).

Mr. FLAKE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I would like to echo some of the comments that have already been made here. There seems to be no recognition at all that we have a \$12 trillion debt. We are paying \$600 million a day to service the debt that we have, and yet we are going to be adding, this bill authorizes \$23.9 million just in FY 2011. That is more than the President has recommended for all of the education programs at NOAA. He has recommended that we zero some out, but we have doubled down and said let's increase, by a factor of 100 percent, everything we are doing over there in terms of education.

The gentleman from Utah pointed out that we commission these reports, and then they come back to us and we simply don't follow their recommendations. It has been pointed out that they weren't criticizing the programs that we are actually plussing up funding for; but mark my words, when the President's recommendations come to Congress to zero out some of these programs, we will ignore them and say we can't zero out those programs just because a report says they are not working.

I remember one that we dealt with a while ago. I think it was the DARE program. We commissioned a report, and it came back and said this program is not working at all. It is not delivering the benefits that you say should be delivered. What did we do? I think we doubled funding for it that year instead of saying, all right, recognizing maybe we are not spending money wisely, let's not spend it. Let's pay down the deficit a little or pay down the debt. Let's not increase the deficit. And yet we get these reports, we throw them on a shelf, and we never see them again. That is not the proper oversight we should be doing.

Congress, as we have been going through this earmark debate, we hear Congress say that we are jealously guarding our congressional prerogative. We have the power of the purse; we have the power to earmark. We do have the power of the purse. We have the power to appropriate; and what bothers me more than anything is we

spend so much time on the 1 percent we earmark and ignore the other 99 percent that is spent by the Federal agencies. Instead of offering true oversight, and when we get reports saying programs don't work, then following those reports and say, We are not going to fund these programs any more, instead, we plus up year after year after year until our deficits are exploding and our debt is exploding. We cannot continue to do this. We cannot continue to go on this path.

I will be offering an amendment in a couple of minutes that will simply say that none of the programs that are authorized in this bill should be earmarked. That is a start, because often we will establish these competitive grant programs and, within a couple of years, they are all filled up with congressional earmarks and no one can even compete. I assume that amendment will be adopted. That is a good first start.

Still, we have to look at the overall impact of what we are doing here. We are spending \$23.9 million, and the total over 10 years is \$150 billion or so that we are authorizing in new spending, every dime of which we spend we are borrowing. We have a deficit of over a trillion dollars. We have deficits as far as the eye can see. We are scheduled to triple the debt just in a few years, and yet we are authorizing new programs, more spending, to add to this deficit that we already have. Mr. Speaker, we cannot continue to do this.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased now to yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentlelady from California for yielding me the time and for the underlying bill.

I come from the State of Maryland, and we have the largest estuary, the Chesapeake Bay, in and around the State of Maryland, and this notion of educating young people, investing them in science and also educating them about the deep impacts that we have through all of our communities onto this estuary is so important.

But I would like to take a moment and talk about an issue which has consumed us and over which we will hear a lot of discussion and misinformation over the ensuing days and hours. Let's talk about health care, Mr. Speaker.

I am so pleased that on Sunday we will have an opportunity in this country, finally, to bring health care to the American people. All of us as Members of Congress will have an opportunity to say that we either stand on the side of the American people or we stand on the side of insurance companies; insurance companies that continue to raise their rates for premiums; insurance companies that deny care and coverage; insurance companies that determine that it is maybe better to pay a CEO \$23 million a year than it is to deliver quality, affordable, and accessible health care to the American people.

So at long last, the Democrats in Congress and our Democratic President are going to bring health care to the American people. We are going to ensure that at a cost of \$940 billion over a decade, saving and cutting the deficit by \$138 billion in just the first 10 years and by \$1.2 trillion in the second 10 years. This is deficit reduction like we haven't seen since the last time we had a Democrat in the White House. And yet, that is exactly what this health care reform package will do.

And what do we get for \$940 billion? Well, I am going to tell you what the American people get. Our small businesses will receive tax credits so they can provide the kind of health care coverage that they want to their employees. Our seniors will see their Medicare coverage strengthened and those programs strengthened. Thirty-two million people across this country who don't have health care coverage now will finally be able to relieve themselves and their families of the worry of disease or illness that they can't take care of.

And, of course, all of us who have health care will see the stopping of the escalation of our premium costs because we will be taking a look at what insurance companies do. This and more is what we will get for \$940 billion, saving \$138 billion in the first 10 years, \$1.2 trillion over the next 10 years.

This is a real bargain for the American people. It is an opportunity for the American people. We have long waited for that.

It will eliminate exclusions for preexisting conditions. Can you believe, Mr. Speaker, that, over on the other side of the aisle, we would let the practice continue where a preexisting condition is identified as domestic violence? Those of us in this Chamber and across the country know that domestic violence is a crime; it is not a preexisting condition for excluding medical conditions.

We know that there are exclusions for preexisting conditions like acne or even for childbirth. This is unconscionable in this country that we have allowed insurance companies to determine health care, and we are going to put a stop to that. We are going to say, You know what; we need everybody out there covered. We want to make sure that people are covered and they get quality care and they get accessible care. And we are going to do it at a cost to the American people that is not going to continue to break the bank in the way it has over the decades.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, we are going to end rescissions. We are going to stop insurance companies from telling you, You know, you've reached your cap. You can't get covered any more, even though you have paid into this system. We have to end discrimination against our children because they have a preexisting condition. These practices are unacceptable.

Every American, whether you have insurance or you don't have insurance,

you know that it is unacceptable and unsustainable. And we are going to make sure that it is affordable for the American people. That is what they deserve. This is what will happen. You can listen to all of the mythology, Mr. Speaker. You can listen to the mythology and points that are put out there that don't describe this bill at all. But I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, as one Member of Congress who, in fact, has read the House and Senate bill and stayed up late into the night looking at the reconciliation, I am confident about what we are going to do for the American people to bring quality, affordable, and accessible health care.

□ 1215

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

America gets it, what is happening with this health care bill. America gets it. They understand. The Peoria-based Caterpillar just announcing that in the first year alone they believe their costs will increase \$100 million in their first year. I would like to read a quote from Caterpillar, Mr. Gregory Folley, the vice president and chief human resources officer at Caterpillar. Quote, "We can ill afford cost increases that place us at a disadvantage versus our global competitors. We are disappointed that efforts at reform have not addressed the cost concerns that we have raised throughout the year."

Wasn't it the President of the United States that traveled to Peoria to go visit Caterpillar to tout all these great programs he was going to do? And yet Caterpillar, one of our most important manufacturers in this country, is saying they alone will have \$100 million in additional costs to their company. I fear for the small businessman and the small businesswoman, while it is touted on the other side, we're going to put root beer in every drinking fountain and it's just going to be glorious, and somehow this \$900-plus billion isn't going to add to the deficit. Come on. Come on. Who believes that?

This government can't get anything right when it comes to cost. That is why we are \$12 trillion in debt. That is why we are paying over \$660 million a day just in interest. At some point we have to become responsible. We can no longer take money out of the American people's pockets only to redistribute it to where the Congress thinks it should go. That is wrong. It is wrong. It is not the proper role of government to mandate this.

These solutions to health care will best come at the States. They will not come from this body, they will not come from Washington, D.C. And we have to have across this country for people to let their Members of Congress know they are not going to stand up for it anymore. Caterpillar is standing up and saying \$100 million. Who do you think that is going to affect? It is going to affect the rank and file, the members there in Illinois who may not have a job anymore.

The number one thing we can do to actually help people with their health care is get this economy, get jobs going again, because I guarantee if you have a job, you have much more of a propensity to be able to go out and get the health care that you want and you deserve.

Yet today we are looking at a bill and the other side is saying, we need to spend money on this education program and we're going to increase its spending, its costs, 10 percent year after year after year.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, as I close my discussion of this amendment, let me remark that over the past 7 years these two programs, the environmental and coastal programs have cumulatively introduced millions of students to unique hands-on learning experiences. The National Academy of Sciences report that was requested by NOAA, not by Congress, reaffirms that each program has increased student interest in science, increased teacher capabilities to instruct science, and increased awareness and appreciation of the environment.

So I urge Members to support the amendment and the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Speaker, one of the things we are going to have to be careful with this health care debate is trading votes for jobs. Let's keep an eye on Mr. GORDON, where it was reported that he was promised the job of NASA administrator in exchange for his vote. Maybe we ought to pay attention to Mr. TANNER, who it was reported that he wants an appointment as U.S. Ambassador to NATO in exchange for his vote.

I hope we pay very close attention to these types of backroom deals that unfortunately might be happening in this very body.

With that, Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. FLAKE TO THE AMENDMENT IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

Mr. FLAKE. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland). The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment printed in part B of House Report 111-445 offered by Mr. FLAKE:

At the beginning of section 7, insert "(a) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—" before "There are authorized".

At the end of section 7, insert the following:

(b) PROHIBITION ON EARMARKS.—None of the funds appropriated pursuant to subsection (a) may be used for a congressional earmark as defined in clause 9(e) of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1192, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair. I just have to say something about the discussion that just went on. I guess only in this body can it be said that we are going to spend nearly a trillion dollars and pay down the deficit somehow, or pay down the debt over 10 years. When the CBO was figuring the savings or costs of this document, the health care bill, they have to assume what Congress says it will do, Congress will actually do. In this bill I think we are saying that we are going to be cutting \$500 billion out of Medicare. Now, who among us really believes that will happen? I can tell you nobody out there does. Nobody really believes that will happen. It wouldn't happen if we managed the bill on our side and said we were going to do it or on the other side of the aisle. But CBO has to score it as if we are going to follow through on our promises.

That is the problem you get into in believing some kind of CBO score that says we are going to pay down the debt over 10 years by spending a trillion dollars more. Now, you can say we are going to increase taxes, but you don't really want to say that. But there is a lot of that in here as well. So I would just encourage anybody who is watching this debate to actually look at the argument here. It is being said that we are going to pay down the debt by nearly a trillion dollars over the next 10 years, or over a trillion dollars, by spending another trillion dollars. That may make sense to us here, but it shouldn't make sense to anybody else.

On the substance of this amendment, this amendment should be non-controversial. This similar amendment has been adopted on a bipartisan basis on other programs that we have authorized. This bill before us, H.R. 3644, is to establish education and watershed programs that advance environmental literacy. This bill creates a competitive grant program titled the National Environmental Literacy Grant Program. This amendment would simply ensure that the new grant program is not earmarked by Members of Congress in the future.

Unfortunately, we talk a lot about getting control over earmarks. There are proposals before the Congress this year, gratefully, on the Republican side to have an overall moratorium, and on the Democratic side to at least restrict earmarks somewhat. I hope we follow through on these. But it is good to adopt these kind of amendments to these kind of bills to ensure that grant programs that are established, if we are going to fund them, they should go for their intended purpose.

The problem is too often in the past when grant programs like this have been established, then they are simply earmarked by Members of Congress, and those hoping to apply for those grants in the future simply have no money in the account to draw on.

Let me give a couple examples. FEMA's National Pre-Disaster Mitigation Program is a competitive grant

program that was designed to, quote, "save lives and reduce property damage by providing funds for hazard mitigation planning, acquisition, and relocation of structures out of the floodplain." The fiscal year 2010 Homeland Security appropriations bill appropriated \$100 million for the program. Almost \$25 million of that was earmarked for projects in Members' districts. That meant that only three-quarters of the money was available. Believe me, go a couple years in the future and all of that money will likely be gone because Members of Congress have earmarked it.

In some cases, these projects are earmarked when the applicant has applied for the grant and didn't get it. The grant wasn't deemed worthy, and so the Member of Congress steps in and simply earmarks it. There may have been a good reason why it wasn't deemed worthy.

But the thing is if we are going to establish these programs as competitive grant programs, then we better either trust the agencies that they are going to do it right or we provide the proper oversight to ensure that they do, instead of running a parallel track program where we Members of Congress say, they don't do it right over there in the agency so we're going to do that ourselves. That is not proper oversight. That is just handing out Federal largesse. And we shouldn't be doing that. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mrs. CAPPS. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I thank the gentleman from Arizona for offering his amendment to ensure that funds appropriated to support the implementation of the B-WET and the ELG programs are not earmarked. One of the primary purposes of this legislation is to finally codify these programs as permanent educational programs within NOAA's larger educational initiative so that they can be incorporated into NOAA's base budget. In addition, this legislation will establish the purposes and policies of both programs, which should improve the ability of Congress to conduct its oversight to ensure that they remain effective and accountable.

As it now stands, funds appropriated for these programs are not earmarked to benefit any one institution, but rather funds are distributed through regional programs or NOAA's education office through merit-based competitive processes. While this amendment will prohibit the earmarking of funds appropriated to implement both programs, it should have little direct effect on how B-WET or ELG grants are awarded in the future because, as the history of the programs dem-

onstrates, funds have always been awarded competitively.

Consequently, we can accept this amendment even though it is unnecessary, and thank the gentleman from Arizona for his interest in maintaining merit-based and competitive grant making for both programs.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FLAKE. Can I inquire as to the time remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. FLAKE. I thank the Chair, and I thank the gentlelady for agreeing to support the amendment. It is important that we ensure if we are going to establish these programs—I don't think we ought to establish them, frankly. I think we are overspent, we are overtaxed. We shouldn't put this additional burden. But if we are going to do it, certainly we ought to ensure that it goes to its intended purpose. That is what this amendment is for. I thank all for supporting the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, could I inquire what time there is remaining on this side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAPPS. At this point I am very pleased to yield 1½ minutes to my colleague from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Let me thank the gentlelady from California. And I want to thank her for her thoughtfulness in being a leader on H.R. 3644, which focuses on the opportunity to promote ocean, atmospheric and environmental education awareness opportunities for young people. And to acknowledge that these are competitive grants again emphasizes that this caucus, that Democrats are concerned about the budget, but also concerned about important issues dealing with coastal growth and coastal learning.

I am from the coastal area, and it brings me to some of the comments that have been made on this health care bill. It is interesting that when we look at our friends on the other side of the aisle, who spent billions of wasteful dollars on giving tax cuts to the richest of Americans, that they can give a short shrift, if you will, to the fact that this health care bill will not only insure millions of Americans, almost 95 percent of Americans, including those who are employer-based insured, which we say to them, as in my own congressional district, where 41 percent are employer-based, yes, you can keep your insurance.

But at the same time, we are prepared to reduce the deficit \$130 billion over the next 10 years and \$1.2 trillion more over the following decade, reining in waste, fraud, and abuse, but at the same time providing millions of uninsured Americans, women, children, families with the opportunity for insurance.

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



Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I am pleased to yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Tennessee, the chairman of the Science Committee, Mr. GORDON.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is recognized for 2 minutes.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I thank my friend from California.

I recognize that the health care discussion is personal and felt by a lot of folks that we're getting into an emotional point here and that there is a lot of passion. But we also need to stick with the facts.

I was a little shocked earlier to hear that there was an insinuation by a colleague of mine from Utah that I have worked together with on legislation to keep radioactive waste from other countries out of Utah. I just want to set the record straight. There was an insinuation that I had, he used the word, traded my vote for the directorship of NASA.

□ 1230

Let me make it very clear. We have an outstanding director of NASA right now in Charlie Bolden. If he were to leave, though, if it was offered to me, I would not accept. So please understand that. My wife has said 26 years of public service is enough.

I yield to my friend from Utah.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I have nothing to say.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Then I would ask my friend from Utah, where would he get that type of misinformation?

I would yield back to my friend from Utah to explain why he said what he did and where he got that misinformation.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I think it's important that we pay attention to those types of things. This is no doubt an emotional, deep debate.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Once again, I yield to my friend to explain where he got that misinformation.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. As I said, it's something that we should be aware of. It's something that we should pay attention to. I think that's fair. We'll pay attention to it.

I appreciate your comments and the direction that you're going. You've had a great and distinguished career. We applaud you for that. I appreciate your service in this Congress, the work that we've done together. But I think it's fair that we pay attention to what might or might not be happening.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Let me say this to my friend from Utah. If I say to you person to person right here on this floor that that offer was never made and that I would not accept it, would you accept that as true?

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

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. I ask unanimous consent to allow the gentleman from Utah to have whatever time as he might to respond to that very fair question.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. I have no reason to doubt your word.

Mr. GORDON of Tennessee. Thank you.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members will please suspend.

All time has expired.

The question is on the amendment by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FLAKE) to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS).

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam 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 time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 376, nays 37, answered “present” 1, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 139]  
YEAS—376

Aderholt	Carson (IN)	Garamendi
Adler (NJ)	Carter	Garrett (NJ)
Akin	Cassidy	Gerlach
Alexander	Castle	Giffords
Altmire	Castor (FL)	Gingrey (GA)
Andrews	Chaffetz	Gohmert
Arcuri	Chandler	Gonzalez
Austria	Childers	Goodlatte
Baca	Chu	Gordon (TN)
Bachmann	Clay	Granger
Bachus	Cleaver	Graves
Baird	Coble	Grayson
Baldwin	Coffman (CO)	Green, Al
Baldwin	Cohen	Green, Gene
Barrett (SC)	Cole	Griffith
Barrow	Conaway	Guthrie
Bartlett	Cooper	Hall (NY)
Barton (TX)	Costello	Hall (TX)
Bean	Courtney	Halvorson
Becerra	Crenshaw	Hare
Berkley	Cuellar	Harman
Berman	Culberson	Harper
Biggart	Dahlkemper	Hastings (FL)
Bilbray	Davis (AL)	Hastings (WA)
Bilirakis	Davis (CA)	Heinrich
Bishop (NY)	Davis (KY)	Heller
Bishop (UT)	DeFazio	Hensarling
Blackburn	DeGette	Herger
Blumenauer	Boccieri	Herseth Sandlin
Boccieri	Boehner	Higgins
Boehner	Bonner	Hill
Bonner	Bono Mack	Himes
Bono Mack	Boozman	Hinojosa
Boozman	Boren	Hirono
Boren	Boswell	Hodes
Boswell	Boucher	Holden
Boucher	Boustany	Holt
Boustany	Boyd	Hoyer
Boyd	Brady (PA)	Hunter
Brady (PA)	Brady (TX)	Inglis
Brady (TX)	Braley (IA)	Inslee
Braley (IA)	Bright	Israel
Bright	Broun (GA)	Issa
Broun (GA)	Brown (SC)	Jackson Lee
Brown (SC)	Brown-Waite,	(TX)
Brown-Waite,	Ginny	Jenkins
Ginny	Buchanan	Johnson (GA)
Buchanan	Burgess	Johnson (IL)
Burgess	Burton (IN)	Johnson, Sam
Burton (IN)	Calvert	Jones
Calvert	Camp	Jordan (OH)
Camp	Campbell	Kagen
Campbell	Cantor	Kanjorski
Cantor	Cao	Kaptur
Cao	Capito	Kilroy
Capito	Capps	Kind
Capps	Capuano	King (IA)
Capuano	Cardoza	King (NY)
Cardoza	Carnahan	Kingston
Carnahan	Carney	Kirk
Carney		

Kirkpatrick (AZ)	Moran (KS)	Schock
Kissell	Moran (VA)	Schrader
Klein (FL)	Murphy (CT)	Schwartz
Kline (MN)	Murphy (NY)	Scott (GA)
Kosmas	Murphy, Patrick	Scott (VA)
Kratovil	Murphy, Tim	Sensenbrenner
Lamborn	Myrick	Serrano
Lance	Napolitano	Sessions
Langevin	Neal (MA)	Sestak
Larsen (WA)	Neugebauer	Shadegg
Larson (CT)	Nye	Shea-Porter
Latham	Oberstar	Shimkus
LaTourette	Obey	Shuler
Latta	Olson	Shuster
Lee (NY)	Olver	Simpson
Levin	Ortiz	Sires
Lewis (CA)	Owens	Skelton
Lewis (GA)	Pallone	Slaughter
Linder	Pastor (AZ)	Smith (NE)
Lipinski	Paulsen	Smith (NJ)
LoBiondo	Pence	Smith (TX)
Loeback	Perlmutter	Smith (WA)
Lowe	Perriello	Snyder
Lucas	Peters	Souder
Luetkemeyer	Peterson	Space
Lujan	Petri	Speier
Lummis	Pingree (ME)	Spratt
Lungren, Daniel	Pitts	Stearns
E.	Platts	Stupak
Lynch	Poe (TX)	Sullivan
Mack	Polis (CO)	Sutton
Maffei	Pomeroy	Tanner
Maloney	Posey	Taylor
Manzullo	Price (GA)	Teague
Marchant	Price (NC)	Terry
Markey (CO)	Putnam	Thompson (CA)
Markey (MA)	Quigley	Thornberry
Marshall	Radanovich	Tiahrt
Matheson	Rangel	Tiberi
Matsui	Rehberg	Tierney
McCarthy (CA)	Reichert	Titus
McCarthy (NY)	Reyes	Tonko
McCaul	Richardson	Tsongas
McClintock	Rodriguez	Turner
McCollum	Roe (TN)	Upton
McCotter	Rogers (AL)	Van Hollen
McGovern	Rogers (KY)	Velázquez
McHenry	Rogers (MI)	Visclosky
McIntyre	Rohrabacher	Walden
McKeon	Rooney	Walz
McMahon	Roskam	Wamp
McMorris	Ross	Wasserman
Rodgers	Rothman (NJ)	Schultz
McNerney	Royce	Waxman
Meek (FL)	Ruppersberger	Weiner
Meeks (NY)	Rush	Welch
Melancon	Ryan (OH)	Westmoreland
Mica	Ryan (WI)	Whitfield
Michaud	Salazar	Wilson (OH)
Miller (FL)	Sánchez, Linda	Wilson (SC)
Miller (MI)	T.	Wittman
Miller (NC)	Sanchez, Loretta	Wolf
Miller, Gary	Sarbanes	Wu
Miller, George	Scalise	Yarmuth
Minnick	Schakowsky	Young (AK)
Mitchell	Schauer	Young (FL)
Mollohan	Schiff	
Moore (KS)	Schmidt	

NAYS—37

Berry	Grijalva	Paul
Bishop (GA)	Hinchey	Payne
Brown, Corrine	Jackson (IL)	Rahall
Butterfield	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Clarke	Kennedy	Sherman
Clyburn	Kildee	Thompson (MS)
Conyers	Kilpatrick (MI)	Towns
Cummings	Kucinich	Waters
Davis (IL)	Lee (CA)	Watson
Edwards (MD)	McDermott	Watt
Farr	Moore (WI)	Woolsey
Filner	Nadler (NY)	
Fudge	Pascrell	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Thompson (PA)

NOT VOTING—16

Ackerman	Davis (TN)	Lofgren, Zoe
Blunt	Deal (GA)	Nunes
Buyer	Fortenberry	Ros-Lehtinen
Connolly (VA)	Gutierrez	Stark
Costa	Hoekstra	
Crowley	Honda	

□ 1302

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. WOOLSEY, Messrs. FARR

of California, JACKSON of Illinois, CLYBURN, THOMPSON of Mississippi, PASCRELL, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. NADLER of New York, Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin, Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland, Messrs. WATT, PAYNE, BUTTERFIELD, Ms. WATSON, and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. CRENSHAW changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the amendment to the amendment in the nature of a substitute was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute by the gentleman from California (Mrs. CAPPS), as amended.

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

#### RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. CAPPS. Madam Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 178, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 140]

AYES—233

Adler (NJ)	DeLauro	Kilpatrick (MI)
Andrews	Dicks	Kilroy
Baca	Dingell	Kind
Baird	Doggett	Kirk
Baldwin	Donnelly (IN)	Kirkpatrick (AZ)
Barrow	Doyle	Kissell
Bean	Driehaus	Klein (FL)
Becerra	Edwards (MD)	Kosmas
Berkley	Edwards (TX)	Kratovil
Berman	Ehlers	Kucinich
Berry	Eshoo	Langevin
Bishop (GA)	Etheridge	Larsen (WA)
Bishop (NY)	Farr	Larson (CT)
Blumenauer	Fattah	Lee (CA)
Bocieri	Filner	Levin
Boren	Frank (MA)	Lewis (GA)
Boswell	Fudge	Lipinski
Boucher	Garamendi	Loeb sack
Boyd	Gonzalez	Lowey
Brady (PA)	Gordon (TN)	Lujan
Braley (IA)	Grayson	Lynch
Brown, Corrine	Green, Al	Maffei
Butterfield	Green, Gene	Maloney
Cao	Grijalva	Markey (CO)
Capps	Hall (NY)	Markey (MA)
Capuano	Halvorson	Matheson
Cardoza	Hare	Matsui
Carnahan	Harman	McCarthy (NY)
Carson (IN)	Hastings (FL)	McCollum
Cassidy	Heinrich	McDermott
Castor (FL)	Herseth Sandlin	McGovern
Chandler	Higgins	McIntyre
Childers	Hill	McMahon
Chu	Himes	McNerney
Clarke	Hinchey	Meek (FL)
Clay	Hinojosa	Meeks (NY)
Cleaver	Hirono	Melancon
Clyburn	Hodes	Michaud
Cohen	Holden	Miller (NC)
Conyers	Holt	Miller, George
Cooper	Hoyer	Minnick
Costa	Inslee	Mollohan
Costello	Israel	Moore (KS)
Courtney	Jackson (IL)	Moore (WI)
Cuellar	Jackson Lee	Moran (VA)
Cummings	(TX)	Murphy (CT)
Dahlkemper	Johnson (GA)	Murphy, Patrick
Davis (AL)	Johnson, E. B.	Nadler (NY)
Davis (CA)	Kagen	Napolitano
Davis (IL)	Kanjorski	Neal (MA)
DeFazio	Kaptur	Nye
DeGette	Kennedy	Oberstar
Delahunt	Kildee	Oliver

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

NOES—178

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

NOT VOTING—19

Ackerman	Ellison	Marshall
Blunt	Engel	Obey
Buyer	Portenberry	Ros-Lehtinen
Connolly (VA)	Gutierrez	Stark
Crowley	Hoekstra	Wamp
Davis (TN)	Honda	
Deal (GA)	Lofgren, Zoe	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SERRANO) (during the vote). One minute is remaining on this vote.

□ 1310

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. REICHERT. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 140, I inadvertently voted “no.” I wanted to be a “yea.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1192, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Yes, in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Chaffetz moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3644 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

In section 4(a)(4), strike “and” after the semicolon.

In section 4(a)(5), strike the period at the end and insert “; and”.

At the end of section 4(a), add the following new paragraph:

(6) examine the impacts of natural gas and oil seeps on oceans, beaches, air quality, and the coastal environment and the possibility of mitigation of those impacts through resource and energy development.

In section 7, in paragraph (1), strike “under section 6)—” and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and insert “under section 6) \$12,000,000 for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2015; and”.

In section 7, in paragraph (2), strike “under section 6)—” and all that follows through the end of the paragraph and insert “under section 6) \$9,700,000 for each of fiscal years 2011 through 2015.”.

Add at the end the following new section:

#### SEC. 8. LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.

An eligible entity that is a party to a pending lawsuit against the Administrator shall not be eligible to receive funds authorized or otherwise made available under this Act.

Mr. CHAFFETZ (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the motion be considered as read.

Mrs. CAPPS. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk continued to read.

□ 1315

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this Congress has to get control of spending. We're \$12 trillion in debt. We're spending more than \$600 million a day just in interest on our debt. At some point, some way, we're going to have to curb spending in this body. This bill authorizes a 10 percent increase every year for the 5 years covered in this bill. This is just too much. This motion to recommit does three very simple things.

First, it freezes funding in the bill to fiscal year 2010 appropriated amounts for the next 5 years—a very reasonable approach. This means that what these programs are getting this year is what they will get next year. No 10 percent increases. Just flat funding. In fact, I would remind this body that it was President Obama that asked for a spending freeze. I concur with the President on this issue in this matter. This Federal Government has to learn to live within its means.

Second, this motion to recommit would prohibit any entity from receiving a grant under this bill if it is currently suing the Federal Government. This bill allows both nonprofit and for-profit organizations to qualify for grants. The amendment simply disqualifies any of those that have a lawsuit against NOAA. Groups can't expect the American taxpayer to allow them to accept free money with one hand while taking the government to court on the other hand. The grant program in this bill shouldn't be allowed to become an avenue for subsidizing or enabling lawsuits that tie up the courts and waste the taxpayers' money.

Third, it expands the list of areas for which environmental literacy grants may be given. This legislation authorizes two educational programs aimed at teaching young people about the coastal and marine environment, and the amendment in the nature of a substitute adds language that will include lessons about jobs that are created by using the natural resources and the benefits of our coastal economies. However, the legislation does not include one more issue that affects some areas of our coastal environment—natural seepage.

In many areas of our Nation's coastline, natural seeps of oil and natural gas occur. This is common in the Gulf of Mexico, but probably nowhere more prevalent than in the areas off the coast of Santa Barbara, California. The educational programs authorized in this legislation are perfect vehicles to teach our young people about these naturally-occurring petroleum seeps—that they do exist, and they can have an effect on our beaches and our coastal air quality. The program proposed here will offer an opportunity to educate our communities and children about the cause of these seeps and the ability of resources and energy development to lessen the volume and impact of these natural seeps into our environment.

Again, this motion to recommit simply will freeze funding at the current year appropriated levels; block groups that have a lawsuit against NOAA from receiving grant money; and expand the range of grants to include the impacts of oil seeps on our beaches and marine environment. I would urge all my colleagues to vote in favor of this motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to claim time in opposition to this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker and my colleagues, may I go back to the underlying legislation, which is H.R. 3644, the Ocean, Coastal, and Watershed Educational Act. This is an educational program for children. They are not qualified to do natural resource surveys or to assess the impacts of oil seep. NOAA, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, does not have jurisdiction over air quality and the mitigation of impacts. That would fall under jurisdiction of the Environmental Protection Agency.

The proposal to level fund the program was rejected in the Natural Resources Committee and by the Rules Committee. The modest increases in this bill were negotiated with my colleague, Mr. CASSIDY, in the Natural Resources Committee, in a very bipartisan discussion with negotiations that we made between the two sides, and I urge Members to oppose this motion and support the underlying bill.

I remind my colleagues that these programs have a track record of being grant-making programs under NOAA for several years, and in all the places where they are currently being enacted, they are very popular. At a time when our public schools are being inundated with funding decreases and cuts and at a time when we're so concerned about the availability of our young people to learn the basics in science and math, this is a hands-on experience that they can have. It is an educational program that helps them appreciate their environment and take good care of it. We have 10 more applicants for every grant that's been available. So we made this modest agreement in a bipartisan way to increase over time by a very small amount the amount of money that can be available under this program through NOAA. I would hope that we would all get back to the basics of the legislation, oppose the motion to recommit, and support this underlying bill.

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 noes appeared to have it.

## RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 3644, if ordered; and the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 4003.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 200, noes 215, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 141]

AYES—200

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

NOES—215

Andrews	Berry	Brady (PA)
Baca	Bishop (GA)	Braley (IA)
Baird	Bishop (NY)	Brown, Corrine
Baldwin	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Bean	Boren	Capps
Becerra	Boswell	Capuano
Berkley	Boucher	Carnahan
Berman	Boyd	Carson (IN)

Castor (FL) Jackson Lee (TX)  
 Chandler Johnson (GA)  
 Chu Johnson, E. B.  
 Clarke Kanjorski  
 Clay Kaptur  
 Cleaver Kennedy  
 Clyburn Kildee  
 Cohen Kilpatrick (MI)  
 Conyers Kilroy  
 Cooper Kind  
 Costa Kissell  
 Costello Klein (FL)  
 Courtney Kosmas  
 Crowley Kratochvil  
 Cuellar Kucinich  
 Cummings Langevin  
 Davis (AL) Larsen (WA)  
 Davis (CA) Larson (CT)  
 Davis (IL) Lee (CA)  
 DeFazio Levin  
 DeGette Lewis (GA)  
 Delahunt Lipinski  
 DeLauro Loebach  
 Dicks Lowey  
 Dingell Lujan  
 Doggett Lynch  
 Doyle Maffei  
 Driehaus Malone  
 Edwards (MD) Markey (MA)  
 Edwards (TX) Marshall  
 Ellison Matheson  
 Engel Matsui  
 Eshoo McCarthy (NY)  
 Etheridge McCollum  
 Farr McDermott  
 Fattah McGovern  
 Filner McIntyre  
 Frank (MA) McNeerney  
 Fudge Meek (FL)  
 Garamendi Meeks (NY)  
 Gonzalez Moore (TN)  
 Gordon (TN) Miller (NC)  
 Grayson Miller, George  
 Green, Al Mollohan  
 Green, Gene Moore (KS)  
 Grijalva Moore (WI)  
 Hall (NY) Moran (VA)  
 Halvorson Murphy (CT)  
 Hare Murphy (NY)  
 Harman Hastings (FL)  
 Heinrich Nadler (NY)  
 Herseth Sandlin Napolitano  
 Higgins Neal (MA)  
 Hinchey Oberstar  
 Hinojosa Obey  
 Hirono Olver  
 Holden Ortiz  
 Holt Owens  
 Honda Pallone  
 Hoyer Pascarella  
 Inslee Pastor (AZ)  
 Israel Payne  
 Jackson (IL) Perlmutter

## NOT VOTING—15

Ackerman Deal (GA)  
 Blunt Fortenberry  
 Buyer Gutierrez  
 Connolly (VA) Hoekstra  
 Davis (TN) Lofgren, Zoe

□ 1339

Messrs. PAYNE and WEINER changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”  
 Messrs. CARDOZA and SCHAUER changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”  
 So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

## RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
 The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 244, noes 170, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 142]

## AYES—244

Adler (NJ)  
 Altmire  
 Andrews  
 Ruppberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Salazar  
 Sánchez, Linda T.  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schrader  
 Schwartz  
 Scott (GA)  
 Scott (VA)  
 Serrano  
 Sestak  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Sires  
 Skelton  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Snyder  
 Speier  
 Spratt  
 Stupak  
 Sutton  
 Tanner  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tierney  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Towns  
 Tsongas  
 Van Hollen  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters  
 Watson  
 Watt  
 Waxman  
 Weiner  
 Welch  
 Wilson (OH)  
 Woolsey  
 Wu  
 Yarmuth

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  
 Kaptur  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilpatrick (MI)  
 Kilroy  
 Kind  
 Kirk  
 Kissell  
 Klein (FL)  
 Kosmas  
 Kratochvil  
 Kucinich  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 LaTourette  
 Lee (CA)  
 Levin  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lipinski  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Lowey  
 Lujan  
 Lynch  
 Maffei  
 Maloney  
 Markey (CO)  
 Markey (MA)  
 Marshall  
 Matheson  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy (NY)  
 McCollum  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McIntyre  
 McMahon  
 McNeerney  
 Meek (FL)  
 Meeks (NY)  
 Melancon  
 Michaud  
 Miller (NC)  
 Miller, George  
 Minnick  
 Mollohan  
 Moore (KS)  
 Moore (WI)  
 Moran (VA)  
 Murphy (CT)  
 Nadler (NY)  
 Napolitano  
 Neal (MA)

## NOES—170

Aderholt  
 Akin  
 Alexander  
 Austria  
 Bachmann  
 Bachus  
 Barrett (SC)  
 Bartlett  
 Barton (TX)

Bean  
 Bilbray  
 Billirakis  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Blackburn  
 Boehner  
 Bonner  
 Bono Mack  
 Boozman  
 Boustany  
 Brady (TX)  
 Bright  
 Broun (GA)  
 Brown (SC)  
 Brown-Waite,  
 Ginny  
 Burgess  
 Burton (IN)  
 Calvert  
 Camp  
 Campbell  
 Cantor  
 Capito  
 Carter  
 Chaffetz  
 Coble  
 Coffman (CO)  
 Cole  
 Conaway  
 Crenshaw  
 Culberson  
 Davis (KY)  
 Dent  
 Diaz-Balart, L.  
 Diaz-Balart, M.  
 Dreier  
 Duncan  
 Emerson  
 Fallon  
 Flake  
 Fleming  
 Forbes  
 Foss  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Gallegly  
 Garrett (NJ)  
 Gerlach  
 Giffords  
 Gingrey (GA)  
 Gohmert  
 Goodlatte  
 Granger  
 Graves  
 Griffith

Guthrie  
 Hall (TX)  
 Harper  
 Hastings (WA)  
 Heller  
 Hensarling  
 Herger  
 Hunter  
 Inglis  
 Issa  
 Jenkins  
 Johnson (IL)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones  
 Jordan (OH)  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kingston  
 Kirkpatrick (AZ)  
 Kline (MN)  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Latham  
 Latta  
 Lee (NY)  
 Lewis (CA)  
 Linder  
 LoBiondo  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lummis  
 Lungren, Daniel E.  
 Mack  
 Manzullo  
 Marchant  
 McCarthy (CA)  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McCotter  
 McHenry  
 McKeon  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Miller, Gary  
 Mitchell  
 Moran (KS)  
 Murphy (NY)  
 Murphy, Patrick  
 Murphy, Tim  
 Myrick  
 Neugebauer

## NOT VOTING—16

Ackerman  
 Blunt  
 Buchanan  
 Buyer  
 Connolly (VA)  
 Davis (TN)  
 Deal (GA)  
 Fortenberry  
 Gutierrez  
 Hoekstra  
 Lofgren, Zoe  
 Nunes  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Schrader  
 Stark  
 Wamp

□ 1348

So the bill was passed.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

## HUDSON RIVER VALLEY SPECIAL RESOURCE STUDY ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4003, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Guam (Ms. BORDALLO) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 4003, as amended.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 293, nays 115, not voting 22, as follows: