

of unemployment among African American youth and youth around the country, the opportunity for them to work with their hands and minds is a positive step.

This legislation will be part of the road map to help expand park service and ensure that our sites are maintained and kept at the level that they should. And I hope to be able to work with the chairman of this committee as I assess the needs of Houston to be able to provide more green space in our community. Along with this bill—tomorrow we will provide real health care for America by the vote I make tomorrow.

I urge support for the legislation.

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

The first gentlelady from California who spoke talked about how important it was to start this program. May I reiterate, once again, we are not starting anything new. We have a program. All we are doing is changing things in that program. The current program has specific dollar amounts going which will be reviewed and specific programmatic responsibility, all of which were stripped out in this particular version.

The gentlelady from Texas, actually, I appreciate everything she said, she was right on. Everything for which she argued that is necessary is what the original program was intended to do. The problem we have is—and we could have easily, easily gone along with the expansion of this program if they had actually allowed us to come up with some kind of limitations, because unfortunately, as I mentioned before, what we have now done with this program, 75 percent of which was to go to make sure that we have healthy forests, where the actual priority was to go to help public lands, is you have taken out all that language and we have simply replicated AmeriCorps.

Once again, go on to the language of the legislation that created that document. On page 22 they list what they can do. It's exactly the same thing that has now opened up this possibility. Page 24, where can they go? Exactly the same thing. All we are doing is making a duplicate of a program that's already there when we have a good program with a specific goal, a specific recommendation, and we have taken out those specifics.

Now I suggested that there is plenty of opportunity for abuse in this particular program if you don't try and limit it to what we want it to accomplish, because we all agree on what we want it to accomplish. The unfortunate thing is the language in this bill doesn't say that. It doesn't specify that. And so indeed we can have instead people going in there to provide not jobs, but to provide internships for people to go in and have them assist professional staff in identifying problems, formulating legal strategies to address those problems, providing legal education and direct response represen-

tation, engaging in policy development.

There is nothing wrong with doing that, but not on the government dime. I don't have a problem with having a tour of this country talking about sustainability of processes and having drinking parties and all. That's fine, but not on the government dime. I don't mind actually having an agency that has a program here in Washington sponsored by the National Park Service, but not if it's going to teach people how to lead protests and sit-ins, not on the government dime. You can do all of these, but not subsidized by government funding. And that's what should be specified, that those type of activities should be beyond the opportunity and beyond the appropriation and beyond the concept of this program. That is what should have been in the bill. And had we done that, we would also all be singing Kumbaya or anything else that you want to with that.

But this bill, as I said before, is somewhat of a metaphor for everything that we have been doing for a large part of this session. It's simply, once again, a bill that there were assurances made in the committee that amendments would be applied to this bill. For whatever reason, they are not. Instead, we are standing up here protesting a bill which should have been and could have been a great piece of legislation to move us forward towards a common goal, but for whatever reason it was not allowed to be written in that form.

We are standing here on a bill that actually presents itself with a visual of why we need systemic change in this body. If the vast majority of Members were here on the floor to hear what these arguments are, I think they would say, yes, this is a logical limitation, it should be there. But as you look around, the vast majority of Members are not on this floor right now. So far too often we do things in a vacuum of understanding, which is why this body needs systemic change in the process that we use to reach conclusions.

Nothing, nothing more than the changes, nothing more than the process we are going through this weekend, reeks of the need for some kind of systemic change. Because if we did that systemic change and the expectation were the people were here to listen to the debate, they were there in the committees to hear the testimony, there were there in the committees to be part of the markup process, I am still convinced that we could have a better product and a bipartisan product.

But the process does not encourage that. The process encourages the exact opposite. We have a process that has evolved in the wrong direction, and if anything else, this weekend should show that we need systemic change in the process.

This bill, this program, is still a decent program. And with some limitations on the amount of spending, some review on a regular period, and some

limitations on what the product will be, what the kids will be working on as they go through these internships, we could have a very, very good positive program. And I hope before this bill actually goes all the way through the system, those kinds of limitations are put back in the bill so we can have something of which we can actually be proud.

I urge defeat of this bill until those changes are made.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I rise to encourage support for H.R. 1612. Part of the discussion today was to say, from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, that it's a bad time to spend money on this program because unemployment is high and the deficit is high. I would respond that it is the perfect time for such investment.

This program is an investment in reducing unemployment among young people and in the long run will save money by preventing these maintenance problems in our public lands from getting worse. I want to talk about what is in the bill. Much of the limitations that were talked about by my good friend are not part of—some of the points that he made are not even part of the legislation. But let's talk for a second what this bill does do.

□ 1115

H.R. 1612 will broaden the scope of the program to include more agencies within the Department of the Interior, NOAA, within the Commerce Department; to expand the purposes of this program to make clear that a central aim is to attract participants from diverse backgrounds who are underrepresented among visitors and managers of our public lands; require establishment of coordinators with each agency eligible to participate in the program so that implementation of the program will be more uniform and efficient; authorize these Federal agencies to enter into cooperative agreements with non-profit youth or Conservation Corps to improve these partnerships; establish criteria and methodology for training programs for all participants; modernize the scope of eligible projects to include new challenges such as climate change and insect infestation; authorize participating agencies to provide housing for participants.

That is what the program does do. It is an appropriate time, it is a necessary time, and it is an investment that will pay huge dividends for our public lands and our young people, and I urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. EDWARDS of Maryland). All time for debate on the bill, as amended, has expired.

—

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourns to meet at 1:00 p.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

# PUBLIC LANDS SERVICE CORPS ACT

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. COLE

Mr. COLE. Madam Speaker, I have an amendment made in order under the rule at the desk.

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 printed in part C of House Report 111-445 offered by Mr. COLE:

Page 20, line 14, after "local" insert "; and tribal".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise today to offer what I believe is a noncontroversial amendment that would amend the Public Lands Service Corps Act to allow the Secretaries to enter into arrangements with tribal governments in order to provide temporary housing for Corps workers. This would be in addition to other Federal agencies, States, local governments, or private organizations. Because tribal governments are not included under the umbrella of any of the bill's other categories, it is necessary to modify the bill's language to include them.

Tribal governments enjoy a unique government-to-government sovereign relationship with the United States. Tribal governments regularly enter into similar agreements with a variety of Federal agencies and have done so for over 200 years, so this change would not disturb precedent.

Throughout this bill, tribal lands are designated as a place for young adults employed in this program to expend their efforts. It makes sense, then, that these tribes would be able to house some of the participants, thereby enhancing the experience of these workers. Not only would this program connect participants to the land, but housing in the tribal areas could enhance their cultural understanding and awareness.

Indian Country is as diverse as America itself, so obviously housing these individuals would not be ideal on some reservations. It is important, though, to include willing tribal governments in this program, as Native Americans are historically some of the best stewards of the environment and because the potential for cultural interchange in this program would certainly have great benefit for both the national lands conservation workers and the tribes.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, this amendment would ensure that the tribes would be among the governments and groups with whom the Secretaries would contract to provide temporary housing for Corps participants.

We support this amendment and appreciate the gentleman's efforts and appreciate the correction of an oversight.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. I thank the gentleman very much, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I urge all Members to vote "yes" on this amendment. Again, this is a simple modification that will allow Native American tribes to enter into agreements to house the employees of the Public Lands Service Corps just like Federal agencies, States, localities, and private organizations.

This designation will give the Departments of Agriculture and the Interior more housing options for these workers and will allow the tribes to be more fully engaged in the program.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, I would also urge support for the amendment and would also note that the Health Care Reform Act we are expecting to take up tomorrow includes the most sweeping changes to Indian health care in decades, long overdue.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 1192, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. BISHOP OF UTAH

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

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

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 2 printed in part C of House Report 111-445 offered by Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

Page 28, strike lines 8 through 13 and insert the following (and redesignate the subsequent paragraphs accordingly):

"(1) in subsection (a), by striking 'for each fiscal year' and inserting 'for each of fiscal years 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, and 2015';"

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

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

This is a very simple amendment, an easily understandable one. It simply has two parts to it.

Number one is you continue the funding authorization that is in the current law; and, number two, you add a 5-year sunset period in there.

As I said earlier when we were talking about the base bill, there is nothing wrong with the things that we should be doing, but there is something wrong when we refuse to periodically exercise our legislative responsibility to review those things that we are currently doing.

We do it all the time. The Endangered Species Act has a sunset, FLPMA has a sunset, The Elementary and Secondary Education Act has a sunset, all of which are designed to have us come back here and reevaluate what we are doing to make sure that our priorities have stayed the same. There is nothing wrong with a sunset. In fact, it should be standard fare in most of our pieces of legislation.

If we are now creating this bill, which replicates AmeriCorps one more time, there is nothing wrong with saying let's review it every 5 years to make sure we are still going on the path we originally determined.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Speaker, under existing law, funding for Public Land Corps is capped at \$12 billion annually. The bill before us, H.R. 1612, would remove this cap. The amendment offered by my colleague, Mr. BISHOP, would not only leave the cap in place, but also force the program to sunset in 5 years.

Madam Speaker, as we all know, when the Republicans controlled this Congress and the White House, they presided over the largest increase in Federal spending in the history of this Nation. Amendments like this one provide important clues as to why that happened. Are we honestly worried about runaway spending on youth job, training, and education programs? Is it imperative that we clamp down on efforts to put young people to work repairing trails and visitor centers used by American families when they visit in parks and public lands? Of course not. This is the definition of being penny wise and pound foolish.

Republicans want to cap and sunset a popular, effective, bipartisan jobs program; but when they controlled the entire Federal budget, they spent like