and believe environmental education is an important component. Resulting from the No Child Left Behind Act, which I coauthored, all 50 States have implemented accountability measures in response to increasing concerns about the quality of our Nation's students' elementary and secondary education. I believe this amendment follows this trend by ensuring that environmental education, too, is of a high standard in this country.

While I believe the underlying legislation will help strengthen environmental education in our country, I also believe it is necessary for Congress to move forward with a broader reauthorization of the National Environmental Education Act.

I look forward to working with my colleagues on this vital piece of legislation as we head into next year.

I would just point out with all the discussion we've had on the floor in the last 2 or 3 months about energy and the environment, that education such as this could be very helpful in terms of future Congresses as well.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3036.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, I do want to thank Ranking Member MCKEON and Congressman CASTLE for their support here today for the bill, as well as in committee, and thank Representative CASTLE for his very helpful amendment during the markup.

Ms. WOOLSEY just a moment before mentioned just how this brings children alive, and I want to make one point before I yield to Representative ANDREWS. That is, we had testimony in our hearings for all those who are concerned about this, you know, whether introducing in a meaningful way back into our curriculum things like environmental education and other subjects are somehow going to detract from this important focus on math and reading proficiency, for example.

The testimony that we had from one teacher was that her fourth graders are writing grant applications to local foundations for funding that can help support local projects that they're involved in with their local watershed right there in their own backyard, backyard streams and so forth. And nothing is enhancing their reading and verbal proficiency more than engaging in that exercise. But it's all motivated by their love of the environment.

It is my pleasure now to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS).

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

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this very well-thought-out piece of legislation. School districts across our country are struggling economically to pay their bills for their basics, to do the basic things that we've established schools to do. And sometimes some things that they would like to do that are somewhat extra fall by the wayside. Very often they do.

This program builds a competitive grant program where school districts around the country can compete for the most innovative and effective environmental education programs.

This is the field trip that the students might not otherwise have; this is the summer course for the teacher that he or she might not otherwise have; this is investment in the learning materials for the technology that the students might not otherwise have; this is the science fair competition that is centered upon environmental issues that the students might not otherwise have. The beneficiaries of this well-thought-out bill are not simply the students and the teachers and the schools who will benefit from the program, it's the U.S. economy and all of us who depend on it.

The jobs of the future will be jobs that generate new ideas, particularly in the area of alternative energy production. So much of that is intricately tied to environmental education. And it's today's students, today's young people, for whom these ideas will be enlightened and from whom new products will come.

So this is not simply an assistance to America's schools today. I believe it's also an investment in the jobs of the future that the country so badly needs.

I congratulate Mr. SARBANES for his excellent work on this bill. I would hope both Democrats and Republicans support it, and I would urge a ''yes'' vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Ms. CLARKE) assumed the Chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Ms. Wanda Evans, one of his secretaries.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

NO CHILD LEFT INSIDE ACT OF 2008

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to at this time yield to the gentlelady from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) such time as she may consume.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from California for yielding me time.

He made a couple of comments earlier, I won't try to repeat everything that he said, but he asked a question; he doesn't know why we're here dealing with this bill that normally would be under suspension and certainly wouldn't be a rule bill, but I agree that we know why we're here: it's to fill time because the majority has so little of consequence for us to deal with when we should be dealing with consequential things such as the American Energy Act.

However, I want to also point out the fact that this bill is not going to solve all of the problems of the world. It's not going to create the alternative energies that we need. I read the Constitution. I read it fairly frequently. Yesterday we celebrated Constitution Day. And I have searched in vain for the word ''education'' there. Nowhere did our Founding Fathers just think that the Congress of the United States should be involved in education. That was an issue that they thought best left to the States, and I think it is best left to the States and is not something that we should be dealing with here in the Congress.

Almost every day someone from the majority party comes to the floor and decries the deficit that we're facing. Well, one of the reasons that we're facing a terrible deficit is because the majority party is involved in everything and many things it should not be involved in, especially in education. That is something we should leave to the States. If we did that and left the hard-working people's money at the State level, we would be able to do a lot more than we're currently doing.

But I want to point out the fact that we should be dealing with the American Energy Act. We had a chance this week to do that, and we refused. Bipartisan passage of the American Energy Act would demonstrate to the world that America will no longer keep its rich energy resources under lock and key as the Democrats want to do. Not only will it help bring down the price of gasoline now, but it will make needed investments in the alternative fuels that will power our lives and our economy in the future.

Now as my colleague also mentioned earlier, there's been a very fine survey done. Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit the entire survey for the RECORD today. I want to just point out some of the things that came out in the survey that my colleague had not pointed out.

This survey was launched in July by the Republicans on the Education Committee. It was provided via the Caucus Web site and was sent to education stakeholders all across the country. We asked those people to give us their reactions and the impact on the high cost of energy to the schools. Ninety percent of the people who responded indicated that high gas prices are having an impact on schools in their community. Ninety-six percent of these respondents demanded that Congress do more to address the energy crisis.

''Nearly half of the respondents reported that high fuel costs have forced schools in their community to cut field trips and after-school activities; one-third of respondents reported that high costs forced schools to limit bus routes, and nearly a quarter of respondents reported that rising energy costs have led to higher school lunch prices.''

We don't need to create more programs to encourage students to go on field trips. They're not going to be able to go on field trips because there's no

money to buy gas for the buses to take them on field trips.

This is just one of the most ridiculous things that we've been talking about in this session of Congress.

''Since Democrats took control of Congress''—and I'm quoting again from the survey—''in January 2007''—they took control of Congress, and I think it's very important the American people know who's in charge—''the energy crunch has been swift and severe. Gas prices have risen from an average of $2.33 per gallon in the first days of the Democrat majority to more than $3.75 per gallon today while diesel prices—particularly important for school transportation purposes—have risen from $2.44 a gallon to more than $4 per gallon today.''

Even the liberal New York Times has talked about the problem that the schools are facing. We don't usually find ourselves agreeing with the New York Times on issues, but they talked about the pain that schools are feeling. ''As the cost of diesel fuel has soared well past what many districts budgeted for last spring, school officials are rethinking their transportation needs, making big-ticket spending cuts and a host of surgical trims.''

They go on to quote, ''In a national survey of superintendents released in July by the American Association of School Administrators, 99 percent said that rising fuel costs had forced across-the-board cuts.'' This was the New York Times, September 5, 2008.

Here we are setting up programs, new programs, that cost a lot of money in bureaucracy and administration to try to do something we could do very, very easily by passing the American Energy Act.

□ 1530

That's all within our power here to do, and here are some individual comments in their own words from Americans who demand energy reform.

This is from Robert in Hamilton, Ohio: ''Yes, drill, build new refineries, solar, nuclear and anything else to break the dependence on foreign oil.''

That is exactly the position of Republican Members of this House. We want to break our dependency on foreign oil and we can do this. We are pro-American energy. Our colleagues, the Democrats, are anti-American energy. They will not do things that help us increase the supply in this country.

Here's another comment from Lori from Middletown, Ohio: ''I work at (a local) Head Start program. Our families are struggling to get their children to preschool. They must choose between gas in the car or food in many cases.''

I listened to these platitudes by our colleagues across the aisle, and frankly, they sound pretty hollow to me when we hear comments like this. The American people are suffering. They are doing nothing.

Another comment from Reeves in Gastonia, North Carolina: ''The rising cost of energy is impacting our school district in many ways: pupil transportation, employee travel, staff development, cost of goods/services, et cetera. It is getting increasingly difficult to reduce costs and not have an impact on the instructional day.''

Again, the American people are hurting and the Democrats are turning a deaf ear.

From Thomas from Joelton, Tennessee: ''We have to increase the supply of domestic oil. When my family grew in size, I did not reduce the amount of food provided to each member, I increased the supply. Gasoline is the same way.''

The American people are very, very smart and the Democrats are selling them short. They understand the issue. They understand that the issue is supply and demand, and this report concludes:

''Education stakeholders overwhelmingly report they are being hurt by the energy squeeze and demand that Congress do more. But instead of doing more, rank-and-file Democrats voted overwhelmingly with their leadership to kill a Republican measure that would have given schools relief and continue to block a comprehensive plan to bring down fuel prices. The House Republicans' 'back-to-school' energy survey confirms a New York Times report from earlier this month: 'School officials are rethinking their transportation needs, making big-ticket spending cuts and a host of surgical trims.' How much longer will the Democrat-led Congress wait to give them—and families, seniors, and small businesses—the relief they are demanding from today's high energy costs?''

It is time that the Democrats listened to the will of the American people and provide an opportunity for us to provide more supply for the American people and give relief to them.

I say to them again, you're either pro-American energy or you're anti-American energy. So far, the position you've taken is anti-American energy, and I don't believe that's where the American people want you to be.

STRAPPED: STUDENTS AND SCHOOLS PAY THE PRICE FOR DEMOCRATS FAILED ENERGY POLICIES

SUMMARY AND KEY FINDINGS

A survey launched in late July by House Republicans has yielded some eye-opening results as the Democratic leadership of the 110th Congress has refused to allow a vote on the House Republicans' American Energy Act (H.R. 6566), which aims to lower gas prices by increasing production of American energy, encouraging more conservation and efficiency, and promoting the use of more alternative and renewable fuels.

The survey—provided via the Education & Labor Committee Republican caucus' website—was made available to education stakeholders across the country, from parents and students to teachers and administrators and sought their input on the impact of today's high gas prices on schools, colleges, and universities as the 2008–09 academic year begins. Key findings of the survey follow:

90 percent of the survey's nearly 1,000 respondents indicated that high gas prices are having an impact on schools in their community.

96 percent of respondents demand that Congress do more to address the energy crisis.

Nearly half of respondents reported that high fuel costs have forced schools in their community to cut field trips and after-school activities; one-third of respondents reported that high costs forced schools to limit bus routes, and nearly a quarter of respondents reported that rising energy costs have led to higher school lunch prices.

In spite of these stark findings, the Democratic leadership of the House has refused to schedule the American Energy Act for a vote and defeated Republican proposals on June 4, June 26, and September 16, 2008 to assist schools feeling the greatest impact from high energy costs. In fact, the Democrat-led Education & Labor Committee has not even held a single hearing on this issue.

SCHOOLS FEEL THE PAIN OF HIGH ENERGY COSTS

American families, seniors, and small businesses are hurting amid high gas prices and heating costs that are poised to rise this fall and winter. But they are not alone. As schools across the country settle into the 2008–09 academic year, they too are feeling the pain of today's energy crunch. Indeed, from elementary and secondary schools to community colleges and universities, schools at every level are grappling with this crisis and making all-too-often painful adjustments just to get themselves through the year.

Since Democrats took control of Congress in January 2007, the energy crunch has been swift and severe. Gas prices have risen from an average of $2.33 per gallon in the first days of the Democratic Majority to more than $3.75 per gallon today, while diesel prices—particularly important for school transportation purposes—have risen from $2.44 per gallon to more than $4.00 per gallon today.

Simply put, the surge in energy costs has been dramatic, and the Majority has yet to offer the ''commonsense plan'' to lower gas prices then-Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi (D–CA) promised during the 2006 campaign season. Instead, the Speaker and her colleagues in the Democratic leadership have offered one ''no energy'' bill after another—proving themselves more interested in votes to provide political cover for vulnerable Democrats than they are in giving the American people an ''all of the above'' energy strategy to lower fuel costs. And all the while, families, seniors, small businesses, and—yes—schools are left to pay the price . . . literally.

Earlier this month, the New York Times put the pain schools are feeling into perspective:

''As the cost of diesel fuel has soared well past what many districts budgeted for last spring, school officials are rethinking their transportation needs, making big-ticket spending cuts and a host of surgical trims.

''Some districts are eliminating field trips and after-school buses. Many are consolidating routes, causing some students to walk farther to their stops and others to lose their buses altogether. They are holding off on new teachers, counselors and textbooks, and teaming with neighboring districts for pre-kindergarten, special education and private school transportation . . .

''In a national survey of superintendents released in July by the American Association of School Administrators, 99 percent said that rising fuel costs had forced across-the-board cuts.'' (New York Times, ''Fuel Prices Squeeze School Districts,'' September 5, 2008)

HOUSE REPUBLICANS LAUNCH INNOVATIVE ''BACK-TO-SCHOOL ENERGY SURVEY''

To help understand the scope of this problem, House Republicans launched a web-based initiative in late July focused on how high energy prices are impacting schools all across the nation. Housed at the Education & Labor Committee's Republican website, this survey gathered input from school officials, teachers, and families over a period of six weeks to determine the extent of the energy crisis for schools at all levels—input that Republicans hope will provide both parties even more of an incentive to come together in these final days of the 110th Congress and pass an ''all of the above'' plan to increase American energy production, encourage more efficiency and conservation, and promote the use of alternative and renewable fuels. The survey follows:

1. Are high gas prices having an impact on back-to-school preparations in your community?
Yes, a very significant impact.
Yes, somewhat of an impact.
No, not much of an impact.
No, not at all.
2. If you answered ''yes'' above, how are your local schools coping with high energy prices?
Limiting bus routes.
Cutting field trips/after-school activities.
Increasing school lunch prices.
Moving to a four (or fewer) day week.
Expanding online course offerings.
Other (please describe below).
3. Should Congress be doing more to lower gas prices and promote long-term American energy independence?
Yes.
No.
No comment.
4. Additional comments:
5. Name:
6. E-mail (optional):
7. City, State:
8. May we share your story with others?

OVERSTRETCHED SCHOOLS WANT ACTION FROM DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS

The above-referenced New York Times article depicts the types of problems being experienced nationwide. In fact, according to the ''back-to-school'' energy survey, 90 percent of all respondents indicated that high gas prices are having an impact on schools in their community (72 percent responding that gas prices are having ''a very significant impact,'' with 18 percent responding that they are having ''somewhat of an impact''). The most common ramifications of high fuel costs are cutting field trips and after-school activities (provided by 48 percent of respondents), limiting bus routes (33 percent), and increasing school lunch prices (23 percent).

As a result, nearly every respondent to the survey (96 percent) indicated that Congress should be doing more to lower gas prices and promote long-term American energy independence. Congress, however, has not answered the call, in spite of the fact that House Republicans unveiled the comprehensive American Energy Act to lower fuel prices nearly two months ago. Democrats also turned back a House Republican effort to provide more funding to assist schools dealing with high energy costs.

HOUSE REPUBLICAN PROPOSALS FOR REFORM DEFEATED BY DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY

As the recently-completed survey suggests, schools across the country are feeling the pain from rising energy costs. Even before the survey was launched, however, House Republicans attempted to provide more assistance to those schools feeling the greatest pain from today's energy crunch.

On June 4, 2008, the Democratic leadership scheduled for House consideration the 21st Century Green High-Performing Public School Facilities Act (H.R. 3021), a bill that takes $20 billion in taxpayer dollars away from low-income students and students with disabilities and creates a massive, unproven school construction program run by bureaucrats in Washington. During consideration of the legislation, Rep. Cathy McMorris Rodgers (R–WA) offered a motion to recommit proposal to allow schools that have seen their energy costs rise by more than 50 percent since January 4, 2007—Rep. Pelosi's first day as Speaker—to use funds under the bill to help cover their energy expenditures. Unfortunately, Democrats killed the proposal, leaving the schools to fend for themselves. (Rollcall Vote 378, with 225 Democrats voting against the proposal.)

On June 26, 2008, during consideration of the Saving Energy Through Public Transportation Act (H.R. 6052), Democrats blocked a Republican proposal to assist rural schools and students. The measure—offered by Rep. Greg Walden (R–OR)—would have required that in any area where school bus services are being cut back because of high fuel prices, the funds under the Democratic bill must be used to help restore those services. Walden's proposal gave preference to rural and suburban areas where school buses have to travel greater distances to transport students. (Rollcall Vote 466, with 217 Democrats voting against the proposal.)

On September 16, 2008, Democrats turned back a bipartisan plan—co-sponsored by 38 Democrats, 24 of whom inexplicably voted against it—that would have aided schools suffering from the effects of the energy crisis as well. During consideration of the Democrats' so-called Comprehensive American Energy Security and Consumer Protection Act (H.R. 6899), Rep. John Peterson (R–PA) offered a bipartisan plan he originally authored with Rep. Neil Abercrombie (D–HI) to begin taking steps toward lower gas prices and energy independence. The plan, in part, would have enabled states to enter into revenue-sharing agreements with the federal government as part of increased energy production far off of their coasts. Under the bipartisan plan, states would be permitted to use revenues to increase funding to schools feeling the impact of the energy crunch. But once again, the Democratic Majority blocked the plan, depriving schools of critical funding to help them cope with rising energy costs. (Rollcall Vote 598, with 216 Democrats voting against the proposal.)

IN THEIR OWN WORDS: AMERICANS DEMAND ENERGY REFORM

Following is a sampling of remarks left by respondents to the ''back-to-school'' energy survey detailing exactly what parents, teachers, and students are facing while the Democratic Congress refuses to act on meaningful legislation to bring down gas prices and other energy costs:

''Yes, drill, build new refineries, solar, nuclear and anything else to break the dependence on foreign oil.''—Robert from Hamilton, OH.

''I work at [a local] Head Start program. Our families are struggling to get their children to pre-school. They must choose between gas in the car or food in many cases.''—Lori from Middletown, OH.

''The rising cost of energy is impacting our school district in many ways: pupil transportation, employee travel, staff development, cost of goods/services, etc. It is getting increasingly difficult to reduce costs and not have an impact on the instructional day.''—Reeves from Gastonia, NC.

''What are schools to do? The price of diesel, which most school buses use, is even higher than the price of gasoline. The option of passing or even sharing the cost of the fuel increase with the consumers (parents) is not an option. Levies are increasingly more difficult to pass. Field trips and busing for athletics are either eliminated or the parents are charged a fee to help offset the transportation cost. Lengthening the school day and providing a 4-day week is vehemently opposed by many parents who do not want to pay for child care for that 5th weekday the child would not be in school. Freezing wages and cutting back on insurance benefits for teachers and support personnel deters people from teaching at a time when the country desperately needs to be focusing on Math, Science and Technology so its students are better prepared for employment in our global economy . . . I repeat—what are schools to do?''—Shari from Medway, OH.

''We cannot believe Congress went on vacation. We must have a complete policy. Drill for oil, build new refineries, build nuclear plants, and anything else that will work. Everything is being affected, cost of groceries and all other goods. Please help. Keep up the fight for us. We need an energy policy.''—Ruth from Vacaville, CA.

''We have to increase the supply of domestic oil. When my family grew in size, I did not reduce the amount food provided to each member, I increased the supply. Gasoline is the same way.''—Thomas from Joelton, TN.

''As an educator I am very concerned on the impact of budget cuts for all students and staff operating in our school system.''—Tessa from Waleska, GA.

''Being a rural community where most of the students come to school on buses, high fuel prices cause a big problem.''—Edward from Wapato, WA.

''The high price of fuel and energy costs [has] significantly reduced the amount of funding we have for educating our children to be competitive in a world class economy.''—Pam from Medical Lake, WA.

''Every school child that I know has had their bus route increased. My 6 year old is now on the bus for more than 2 hours a day.''—Claudia from Stevenson Ranch, CA.

''This year we may not be able to go on any field trips because the school bus rates have gotten so expensive. Families are having a tough time as it is. It is sad because the kids are missing out on those experiences.''—Tar from DeLand, FL.

CONCLUSION

Education stakeholders overwhelmingly report they are being hurt by the energy squeeze and demand that Congress do more. But instead of doing more, rank-and-file Democrats voted overwhelmingly with their leadership to kill a Republican measure that would have given schools relief and continue to block a comprehensive plan to bring down fuel prices. The House Republicans' ''back-to-school'' energy survey confirms a New York Times report from earlier this month: ''School officials are rethinking their transportation needs, making big-ticket spending cuts and a host of surgical trims.'' How much longer will the Democrat-led Congress wait to give them—and families, seniors, and small businesses—the relief they are demanding from today's high energy costs?

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with the gentlewoman that I am and I know my party is pro-American energy. In fact, the more I listen to testimony on the other side, the more convinced I am that this legislation that we're debating right now is exactly what we need to make sure that the advances with respect to energy technology are there.

With respect to education stakeholders and their view of No Child Left

Inside, this is a list of over 700 organizations nationally representing 40 million members. Many of these organizations are education organizations who understand how important it is for our young people to get this sort of opportunity.

We can all agree, Democrats and Republicans, in this debate that we've been having over energy for the last few weeks and months that it's important for us to develop alternative sources of energy, renewable sources of energy. To do that, of course, we're going to need the scientists and the entrepreneurs who can make it happen, and they are not going to land on a spaceship from outer space. We are going to have to develop them right here, and the next generation is where we are going to find those scientists and those entrepreneurs that are going to make those sort of advances. But they are not going to be able to do it if we don't put the resources behind the kind of environmental education that this will provide.

And then just the last point I wanted to make is, yes, there are field trips that will be funded by this, but a lot of what this has to do is getting kids outside, and you don't have to take a bus from inside of the classroom to outside of a classroom. You can walk. And a lot of these young students are doing things right there in their own backyard, right there around their school, right there in a stream that's a quarter mile away, and they can use the walk. The idea is to get them outside and experiencing the environment.

It is my pleasure now to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE), a member of the Education and Labor Committee and someone who brought a very important amendment regarding environmental justice to this bill in the committee.

Ms. CLARKE. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in support of H.R. 3036, the No Child Left Inside Act of 2008. The effects of global warming and climate change, as evidenced by wildfires, tornadoes, hurricanes, and floodings has been experienced by hundreds of thousands of Americans. These things, coupled with the energy crisis, are calling out for investment in renewable energy.

We must be ever cognizant that future generations will inherit a myriad of complicated environmental challenges. By encouraging schools to incorporate environmental education into their curriculum, H.R. 3036 will give future generations a solid understanding of environmental issues and a knowledge base that will equip and empower them with the tools needed to overcome the environmental problems that plague our civil society and our environs.

I am pleased to have language from my bill, H.R. 5902, the GREEN Act, incorporated into this bill. My bill's language would give schools the option of integrating an environmental justice curriculum into their own educational program.

Located in my congressional district, the Brooklyn Academy of Science and the Environment provides an innovative example of how environmental justice concepts can be used as an integrating context for learning. Created through a partnership with the Brooklyn Botanic Gardens, Prospect Park Alliance, and the New York City Department of Education, this is one of New York City's first public environmental education high schools.

In closing, I want to thank Congressman SARBANES for being a champion for America's scholars and for his consistent leadership on environmental education and for including my bill, H.R. 5902, as part of the No Child Left Inside Act of 2008, a bill that I believe will greatly transform our Nation in the years to come.

Mr. MCKEON. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield at this time 3 minutes to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS).

Mr. SHAYS. I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

I am rising in support of H.R. 3036, the No Child Left Inside Act, which would authorize a grant program to provide States the resources to include environmental literacy education programs in their K–12 curriculum.

Protecting the environment is one of the most important jobs I have as a Member of Congress. We simply will not have a world to live in if we continue our neglectful ways.

It is imperative we instill the need for environmental responsibility upon the next generation, and I can't think of a better place to foster a sense of environmental stewardship than in the classroom.

Just this week, Congress finally debated a bill to begin reducing our dependence on foreign oil and encouraging alternative energy solutions. The repercussions of the debate we had this week will not be dealt with by us, but rather, by our children. By ignoring our environmental and energy crisis for so long, we have passed significant challenges on to the next generation to find solutions. The time to invigorate our youth to tackle these challenges is now.

I have heard from teachers and school administrators throughout Connecticut's Fourth Congressional District, and from across the country, who have felt a narrowing of school curricula in the wake of No Child Left Behind's (NCLB) high stakes testing requirements. It seems to me this bill should have been considered in the context of a larger No Child Left Behind reauthorization. Unfortunately, the majority has yet to bring comprehensive reform to the floor for consideration, and I am hopeful these types of curricular enrichments remain a priority as we work towards reauthorizing this critical bill.

In the absence of reauthorization efforts this Congress, I am pleased we are providing the resources school districts need to enrich their curricula and cultivate an awareness of environmental issues in our public schools.

I support No Child Left Behind because it is forcing us to improve and deal with gaps in our public education, but I realize there are several improvements that need to be made in the reauthorization process. I look forward to a reauthorization of this bill that reevaluates priority curricula to ensure our students are not only achieving in the areas of math, reading, and science, but are well-prepared to engage in a 21st century, global society.

Mr. SARBANES. May I inquire as to whether the other side has any more speakers?

Mr. MCKEON. I will be concluding for our side, if we could inquire how much time we have left.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has 5½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Maryland has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve my time to allow the gentleman to close.

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

One week before the 110th Congress is scheduled to adjourn, we are devoting precious legislative hours to debating a noncontroversial bill to extend a minuscule environmental education program for 1 year. I think we all agree that environmental education is important now and for future generations, and I want to commend the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) for the work that he's done on this bill. I think, as he has eloquently stated, environmental education is very important. But how we spend our time in this Chamber is a reflection of our priorities, and today, our priorities are all wrong.

Chairman MILLER and I work well together on the Education and Labor Committee, and we often reach agreements before bills are brought to the floor. On this bill, we worked together to resolve our differences, and we agreed that while important, this bill was straightforward and noncontroversial—most of our Members will vote for it—enough that it should be considered on the suspension calendar. I believe that two-thirds of this body would easily have supported the legislation, making these hours of debate unnecessary.

For whatever reason, whether to mask their continued failure to offer comprehensive energy solutions or simply to avoid a debate on the issue altogether, the majority has opted to bring this bill to the floor today under a rule. So let me just take a moment to reflect on H.R. 3036.

The Federal Government has a role to play in education. That role is to provide support and assistance to ensure that all children are provided a quality education. It is to support the academic achievement of disadvantaged children, children with disabilities, and other at-risk students who might otherwise be left behind. In pursuing these goals, we must be careful

not to create too much bureaucracy nor too many Federal programs that could undermine local control.

That's why I appreciate the efforts that were made to limit the scope of this bill, extending an existing program at the EPA and supplementing it with similar activities through the Department of Education rather than establishing a massive new environmental education bureaucracy as some had originally proposed.

□ 1545

This is a reasonable bill, and at the end of the day, I will support it. But, Mr. Chairman, if I had my choice, we would not be here debating this legislation today. Although environmental education is important, this Congress has a limited amount of time to challenge our mammoth problems facing this Nation.

As of a few minutes ago, when we found we won't be in session tomorrow, if we work all of next week, we will have 5 days left to finish the work of this Congress. Instead of tinkering around the edges of an existing environmental education program, we ought to be debating comprehensive, all-of-the-above approaches to reform our Nation's energy policy and put America on the path to energy independence.

Here we are, going into the last week of this Congress. We've been here 2 years, we only have now 13 days of work scheduled for the last 5 months of this year—and that, after our Democrat leadership, during the last election, said that we would be a harder working Congress, we would be a more open Congress, we would be one that would follow regular order, we would be open to the way this House was meant to function.

At this point, we have not passed one spending bill. The spending bills that were passed last year run out on September 30, the new year starts October 1, and not one spending bill to continue to fund the Government through the next year has yet been passed. We did pass one on this floor, but not one has been passed through the whole process—the House, the Senate, and been sent to the President's desk, not one spending bill.

I guess the people throughout the country will be watching and seeing what happens on October 1. Will the Government be shut down? I don't know. I don't know how they plan to solve this problem. I just know that at this point they have not brought one spending bill to completion for the President to sign.

We have not finished our work on this committee on No Child Left Behind. That was a very, very important piece of legislation. We worked on it last year. We haven't talked about it for over a year now. And I guess that's just going to be let go into next year, when a new Congress will be here.

I am greatly disappointed, Mr. Chairman, with the work product of this Congress. We had the ability. We had new leadership that came in with lots of promises, lots of enthusiasm, lots of things that were going to be done to make things better for the American public. The most important issue facing us today is the energy issue. Every one of us in America sees that every day when we fill our tanks or at least drive by the gas stations and see how the price has gone up—or maybe down a couple cents, depending, but it's a couple dollars more than it was when the Republicans were in charge here a couple years ago.

We had the opportunity this year, even this week, to address an all-of-the-above energy solution: More conservation, more alternative fuels, more biomass, more wind, more solar—yes, and more oil, more coal, more shale.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, the desire to move forward with the reauthorization of No Child Left Behind is one that certainly we shared on this side of the aisle, and we are prepared to do that this year. The problem is that the administration, for the last 2 years, sent budgets which suggested there wasn't going to be the resources behind that effort that needed to be there, and so we're where we are. But that doesn't mean that we can't, as we're going to do with this bill, begin to set the table for what can be a very comprehensive and meaningful reauthorization of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act next year. And what I'm so excited about is, if we put our stamp on this bill today, we're going to be sending a very powerful message that environmental education should be part and parcel of that reauthorization next year.

I would like to thank, again, the members of the No Child Left Inside Coalition, as I noted, over 700 organizations across the country representing upwards of 40 million people. These are folks who just want to see this happen. They understand how important it is to get our children outdoors and into nature. I want to thank them for all the work that they did to make this possible, to get this to the floor. It would not be here without the work that they have done.

I want to close by noting some of the benefits of this. I've talked about the contents of the bill, but I want to talk more generally about the benefits that it offers.

Many of the witnesses that we heard from, many of the advocates who are behind this bill are public health advocates. They're pointing to epidemic levels, for example, of childhood obesity that we see now across the country. Kids just aren't active. One of the benefits of getting children outdoors, getting them engaged in environmental activities is they start to become more active, and that is going to be good for their health and the health of our Nation.

We've talked about the economic development benefits; that environmental education spurs interests, it leads to children wanting to go into science, into technology, and so forth. And so we are going to be unleashing a tremendous economic potential if we put resources into the No Child Left Inside Act.

It is a great way for kids to learn. There is all the evidence that shows that when kids are outdoors, it activates all their senses, it fully engages them, and their performance increases across the board because of that experience. And of course it raises awareness in the next generation of the environment and the need to preserve our environment. The fact of the matter is that the only way we're going to save our environment, the only way we're going to preserve treasures like the Chesapeake Bay in the State of Maryland is if millions of people develop good habits in dealing with the environment. That's what we can impart to our young people, to the next generation.

Let me just finish with two articles, or anecdotes. The first is from the Rochester, Minnesota Post-Bulletin. It's an article titled, ''Program urges kids to ditch couches for canoes.'' It talks about a program that a woman named Sara Grover founded, Project Get Outdoors, where she brings kids outside. She talks about a fifth grader on his first camping trip. She said he was practically crying and he said, ''This is the best day of my entire life.'' There are a lot of good days ahead for a lot of great kids if we get this legislation in place.

Just to put a punctuation mark on this notion of kids going into science as a result of their experiences outdoors, I just got this e-mail on my BlackBerry notifying me that a young man from my district was named a finalist in the science competition for middle school students. His project was, ''The Effectiveness of Limestone Aggregates to Mitigate Acid-Mine Drainage.'' He came up with the idea for this project while rafting and kayaking on the Cheat River in West Virginia.

This is what I'm talking about. This is what's going to happen if we provide our children, our young people, the next generation with the environmental education that they deserve and integrate it fully into the instructional program in their schools.

That's why I'm supporting this bill. That's why I introduced it. That's why the coalition of advocates that supports it is so excited about it. I urge this House to pass H.R. 3036, the No Child Left Inside Act.

Mrs. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 6604, the Commodity Markets Transparent Accountability Act.

Before I outline my opposition to this legislation, I want to be clear that I am seriously concerned about the cost of oil and the cost Americans are paying at the pump. To this end, I have been proud to support a series of other bills that this House has considered to

help bring down the cost Americans are paying at the pump as well as efforts to create new alternative and renewable sources of energy. I have been a long-term supporter of reforming the royalties the oil and gas industry pays for the natural resources they extract from public lands. Last year I was proud to stand with my colleagues as we, for the first time in a generation, increased the fuel efficiency standards on cars sold here in the United States. Just yesterday, I was pleased to vote in favor of H.R. 6899, the Comprehensive American Energy Security and Consumer Protection Act. The legislation is a bold step forward, helping end our dependence on foreign oil and increase our national security. It launches a clean renewable energy future that creates new American jobs, expands domestic energy supply—including new offshore drilling—and invents and builds more efficient vehicles, buildings, homes, and infrastructure. It will lower costs to consumers and protect the interests of taxpayers. It is a comprehensive strategy and the product of bipartisan compromise.

I want to be clear that I am completely opposed to energy manipulation, which is a crime, but what we are talking about here is the role of legitimate investors in the commodities market. To that end, my main concern with this legislation is that it would crack down on legitimate trading practices, resulting in the loss of American jobs.

Additionally, I am concerned that this legislation will significantly reduce liquidity in the U.S. futures and derivatives markets and drive trading overseas at a very precarious time for U.S. financial markets. This legislation also could create legal uncertainty and could also increase market disruption in the over-the-counter, OTC, markets. Moving this trading overseas and creating legal uncertainties could result in lost jobs here in the United States, especially for our constituents who work in these markets. At a time we are fighting to keep New York City and the United States as the financial capital of the world, any measure that could cost our economy quality jobs without providing any benefit in return is not a measure I can support.

Joining me in my skepticism that speculators have been able to manipulate the oil market is what many may consider an unlikely source, Paul Krugman of the New York Times.

In a May 12, 2008 column, titled ''The Oil Nonbubble'', Krugman writes:

''The only way speculation can have a persistent effect on oil prices, then, is if it leads to physical hoarding—an increase in private inventories of black gunk. This actually happened in the late 1970s, when the effects of disrupted Iranian supply were amplified by widespread panic stockpiling.

But it hasn't happened this time: all through the period of the alleged bubble, inventories have remained at more or less normal levels. This tells us that the rise in oil prices isn't the result of runaway speculation; it's the result of fundamental factors, mainly the growing difficulty of finding oil and the rapid growth of emerging economies like China. The rise in oil prices these past few years had to happen to keep demand growth from exceeding supply growth.''

To be clear, I stand ready to support legislation that will reduce the cost Americans are paying at the pump, and I am fully in support of efforts to create new, affordable and renewable energy options that will move us towards energy independence. However, this legislation, while certainly well intentioned, could potentially create more harm than good and lead to the loss of American jobs.

Mrs. BACHMANN. Mr. Chairman, today, the House will consider H.R. 3036, the No Child Left Inside Act. I rise in strong opposition to this legislation.

First of all, H.R. 3036 continues our Nation down the ill-fated road of shifting control of school curricula away from the parents and teachers and local school boards who best know what their children need into the hands of Federal Government and its one-size-fits-all approach. To best serve our children's educational needs, local school boards need flexibility to target resources where they are needed most—from school construction and class size reduction efforts to higher teacher salaries and technology in the classroom. The needs of individual school districts are dynamic and complex. They are not homogenous and are most certainly not best understood by bureaucrats in Washington.

I fervently believe that parents and teachers and local school boards know best how to educate our children, and it is time for Congress to stop removing them further and further from the equation. Congress must move back down the path to control, accountability, and authority at a local level for education. H.R. 3036 leads us away from this crucial goal.

Furthermore, while I agree it is important to promote conservation and environmental literacy, especially as America faces a crippling energy crisis, I do not agree that public school is the place to do it. H.R. 3036 would simply add another layer of bureaucracy and Federal mandates to our Nation's already overburdened schools, displacing important educational building blocks with questionable environmental education programs. At a time when American test scores continue to lag behind our global counterparts, can we honestly say that we need less time for the fundamentals of reading, writing, arithmetic? Church groups, scouting, extracurricular organizations, and the family promote conservation, love of and respect for the outdoors, and environmental messages daily. Let the teachers teach; let parents instill values.

Finally, let us not forget that Congress has already allotted funds for environmental literacy through an Environmental Protection Agency, EPA, grant program. Since 1992, that program has allocated over $40 million, or roughly $2.5 million per year. H.R. 3036 would spend an additional $14 million to create an additional grant program administered by a whole new executive branch agency, the Department of Education. Can there be any question that this represents an expansion of the Federal bureaucracy, a duplication of efforts, and a wholly irresponsible distribution of taxpayer dollars?

The No Child Left Inside Act represents a step in the wrong direction, adding the weight of increased Federal bureaucracy to an already sinking educational outlook. Forcing local school districts to direct scarce resources away from core curricula to serve a political agenda will only further suppress the academic performance of America's next generation. I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. HONDA. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the ''No Child Left Inside Act,'' H.R. 3036.

The 21st century global economy increasingly requires scientific and environmental literacy. Unfortunately, due to the narrowing of curriculum under ''No Child Left Behind,'' schools are struggling to offer a comprehensive curriculum inclusive of environmental education.

I applaud Representative SARBANES for championing H.R. 3036, to help ensure our students are prepared to make informed decisions that impact our future, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of this important bill.

I share the gentleman from Maryland's passion for environmental literacy and environmental education, which are also priorities in a bill I introduced, H.R. 1728, the ''Global Warming Education Act.''

I believe that education is essential to ensuring that the public understands both the short- and long-term environmental consequences of dangers such as global warming.

In my bill, I sought to establish a grant program to create educational materials, develop climate change curricula, and improve the dissemination of scientific developments in the area of global warming, along with providing practical learning opportunities for people of all ages and from diverse backgrounds.

The ''No Child Left Inside Act'' will also establish grants to help environmental education become more effective and widely practiced, and it will provide professional development and training for teachers to incorporate environmental education activities as part of school curricula.

It is critical that America fosters an environmentally aware citizenry equipped to make informed decisions that will ensure a secure environment for our future generations.

This is why I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to recognize the importance of environmental education by supporting H.R. 3036.

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support the No Child Left Inside Act. I thank my colleague from Maryland, JOHN SARBANES, for his efforts on this important initiative.

Mr. Chairman, our Nation faces great environmental challenges. We need to combat global warming, curb pollution, and expand conservation and energy efficiency. And to confront these challenges, we need to ensure that students graduate from our schools with an understanding of the environment. We need hands-on outdoor learning opportunities to inspire students to enter science fields and develop innovative solutions.

Today's bill extends the authorization for the National Environmental Education Act and enhances the Environmental Education and Training Program with teacher training and the opportunity for partnerships between teachers and working professionals in environmental fields. It also establishes the National Capacity Environmental Education Grant Program to assist States and local education agencies as they work to develop environmental literacy plans and student academic achievement standards. It encourages partnerships between states, schools, and institutes of higher education and creates and disseminates best practices for environmental education programs.

No Child Left Inside will give our students the opportunity to interact with and understand their environment. It will encourage their interest in science and prepare them to solve 21st century environmental challenges. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this bill.

Mr. BRALEY of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3036, the No Child Left Inside Act. This legislation is vitally important to better prepare our students for the environmental, energy and natural resource challenges facing our country, and also for the career opportunities these challenges open up.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to represent Iowa's First Congressional District. Our district is noted for its rolling farmlands of corn, soybeans and other crops, our border on the Mississippi River, the largest river in North America, and for the businesses that have come to the Quad Cities, Dubuque, and the Cedar Valley. Our citizens have a deep appreciation and respect for our natural resources and recognize the important opportunities that are opening up in the fields of bio-energy and other agriculture-based, renewable energy resources. That's why I introduced the National Endowment for Workforce Education in Renewables and Agriculture Act to help our community colleges support the education and training of technicians in these areas. I was happy to see this bill included in the 2008 Farm Bill which was signed into Public Law.

I also recently toured the University of Dubuque's Environmental Science Education center, a great example of college level environmental education. This center provides college students with State, regional, and national benefit through educating undergraduate- and graduate-level students in the environmental sciences, and helping to create the next generation of science professionals. The Environmental Science Center allows the University to expand on its proven record of educating national scientific leaders. The Center specializes in hands-on, applied learning for current science teachers, environmental agency personnel, undergraduate environmental science majors, and education majors to teach the next generation of American scientists.

I'm proud to represent a University that has taken a leading role in educating the next generation of scientists and environmentalists, and I'm pleased to support this bill because schools like the University of Dubuque will benefit from the competitive grant program authorized in this legislation. These grants would be awarded to higher education institutions and would be used directly for the study of environmental education. The University of Dubuque could use this grant program to better improve their already succeeding Environmental Education Center.

In addition to higher education, we also need to ensure that our next-generation of leaders have a basic understanding of the environment and our natural resources, before they graduate from high school. These are the students currently in our elementary and secondary schools and the students who will be coming to our community colleges and universities in the coming years. This legislation will also provide learning opportunities for these students.

This bill authorizes much-needed resources to educate students at the K–12 levels about the environment, energy and natural resources and to help teachers, schools and school districts provide the best experiences and instruction for their students. It would begin to implement the recommendations of several reports by the National Science Foundation, the National Environmental Education Advisory Council, and the National Council for Science and the Environment to enhance environmental education in our schools. And it would help improve student achievement and enthusiasm for learning as several studies have demonstrated.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this legislation that will improve environmental education for both K–12 students, and students in our Nation's colleges and universities. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3036, the No Child Left Inside Act. This legislation, introduced by Representative JOHN SARBANES, would provide sorely needed assistance to States, elementary and secondary schools and others to help teach our children about the environment and instill within them an appreciation and sense of stewardship for our planet.

The case for extending and enhancing environmental education is quite clear. Several recent studies indicate that students perform better in science, reading, math and social studies, when environmental education is integrated into the core curricula. Indeed, Hollywood Elementary School, located in Maryland's 5th Congressional District, was part of an intensive study by the State Education and Environment Roundtable published in 1998 that documented how 40 schools in 12 States achieved remarkable results by implementing an environmental education program. The study also found that environmental education increased students' enthusiasm for learning and enhanced their creative thinking skills.

Getting kids outdoors to exercise, play and experience their natural world is also an important tool to prevent childhood obesity, reduce attention deficit disorder, and address other related health problems. Research shows that kids today are spending more than 6 hours a day inside plugged in to electronics—but only minutes a day outdoors. That could have serious consequences for our children's physical and mental development.

Just as important, environmental education prepares children to be responsible stewards and citizens. We face enormous environmental challenges including global warming and pollution in the Chesapeake Bay. To take on those challenges, the next generation needs a solid understanding of environmental Science.

But even though environmental education is desperately needed, for all of those reasons, our Nation has seen it go into decline. In recent years, the overall level of federal support for environmental education in both policy and funding has unfortunately been woefully inadequate.

The No Child Left Inside Act seeks to remedy this situation by providing new support and funding for environmental education in the Nation's public schools in three areas: teacher training, enhanced programs, and the development and implementation of State environmental literacy plans.

Specifically, this legislation reauthorizes the National Environmental Education Act of 1990 and authorizes funding for the Environmental Protection Agency's Environmental Education and Training Program. It also creates a new National Capacity Environmental Education Grant Program to be administered by the Department of Education, awarding matched grant funds to local and State educational agencies, colleges and universities, and nonprofit groups to develop curricula, disseminate information about model programs, and increase the number of environmental educators.

Our looming environmental problems demand a strong generation of scientists, researchers, public servants, and citizens. By passing this bill, we can help to build that generation and improve our children's health and quality of life at the same time.

I commend Representative SARBANES for introducing this measure and I urge my colleagues to join with me in voting for the No Child Left Inside Act.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my strong support of H.R. 3036, the No Child Left Inside Act, and the opportunities it provides students for a strong environmental education. I have been a strong supporter of the No Child Left Inside Act. As a member of Education and Labor and Chairman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, this act represents an important confluence of my interests, and I am happy to support this legislation. I attended the field hearing for this legislation, and have taken a personal interest in its passage through the many steps it has taken to the floor. Though I am unable to participate in the vote on final passage today, I wish to make it clear that I remain a steadfast proponent of the No Child Left Inside Act, and am pleased with its consideration by the House today.

This act will promote environmental literacy and hands-on educational experiences, while at the same time promoting core learning of critical skills. These programs have also been linked to meaningful improvements in student cooperation, conflict resolution, motivation to learn and positive behavior. Additionally, these programs add to the encouragement of a healthy and active lifestyle of outdoor recreation.

No Child Left Inside promotes environmental literacy where it is most effective—in nature. This, in turn, promotes children's health, increases their knowledge of the natural world, and encourages students' interests in the lesson. NCLI provides educators with the necessary skills to teach environmental education, and provides grants for State and local agencies to acquire the needed capacity for effective environmental education.

The benefits of this program have a measureable impact on students' core curriculum—improving performance in science, math, reading and social studies. The No Child Left Inside Act is important for our environment, as it educates the next generation, who will inherit a planet whose fragile habitats will increasingly need our help and protection.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 3036, the No Child Left Inside Act, introduced by my good friend and freshman colleague, Representative JOHN SARBANES of Maryland.

Mr. Chairman, global warming is one of the greatest environmental challenges facing our Nation today. But, as the impact of global warming becomes more and more visible, our children are increasingly disconnected from nature and the world around them.

Kids today spend less time playing outdoors than any previous generation. The Kaiser Family Foundation found kids ages 8 to 18 spend an average of 6½ hours a day glued to the TV, playing video games, surfing the Internet, and talking on cell phones, leading to what has been called a ''nature deficit disorder''.

The No Child Left Inside Act addresses critical environmental challenges by strengthening and expanding environmental education in the classroom. This bipartisan bill provides schools with more resources and teacher training for environmental education.

Using environmental education in the classroom, we can transform playgrounds and parks into learning laboratories and recapture the interest and enthusiasm of students in the world around them.

Not only has environmental education raised test scores in math and reading, but it has also inspired school age children to become future stewards of the Earth.

Mr. Chairman, H.R. 3036 is an important step toward combating childhood obesity, promoting an environmentally-conscious society and improving the health of our planet.

I am proud to be a cosponsor of this bill, and I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for the No Child Left Inside Act.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3036, the No Child Left Inside Act, which would amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to promote the expansion and development of environmental education in our classrooms from kindergarten to grade 12.

Environmental education is so important for our students, especially with the growing crisis facing our climate. Yet across the country, these types of programs are facing cuts due to school budget woes. H.R. 3036 helps alleviate this problem by extending the National Environmental Education Act through 2009 and strengthening the Environmental Education Training program under current law. This legislation also establishes the National Capacity Environmental Education Grant Program, which would authorize the Secretary of Education to award 1–3 year competitive grants to nonprofit organizations, state educational agencies, local education agencies, or institutions of higher education.

The No Child Left Inside Act will help our students see the real world beyond the classroom and better prepare them for the 21st century. I am proud that my home State of Rhode Island already stands out in this area because of its steadfast commitment to protecting its resources—the Narragansett Bay, beaches, parks and forests, lakes and rivers, and other beloved spaces. Rhode Island has been ahead of the curve in promoting renewable energy sources and conducting climate change research. Now we must work to make sure this legacy is passed on to future generations. Just as we have worked in our cities and towns to preserve the environment, we must ensure that our national policies build on these actions. With so many teachers and students already involved, the No Child Left Inside Act will only boost our work in Rhode Island.

I would like to thank my colleague, Congressman SARBANES, for introducing this bill, as well as my colleague and fellow Rhode Islander, Senator JACK REED, for introducing the companion bill.

Mr. Chairman, this bill has bipartisan support and both environmental groups and schools are ready to implement these programs. I encourage my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3036, the No Child Left Inside Act of 2008. This bipartisan legislation extends the National Environmental Education Act through 2009 and strengthens the Environment Education Training Program. It also establishes a capacity building grant program to help States and school districts expand environmental education.

Today's students are our future workforce and they must be quipped to face the myriad of challenges that threaten our Nation. Our country faces an energy crisis, air quality concerns, climate change, and diminishing natural resources. It is vitally important that environmental education become an integrated part of the curriculum, and that our students be trained in the tools necessary for future careers in green technology.

In my home State of Oregon, Portland State University has a renowned sustainability program that has just been boosted by a $25 million foundation challenge grant. PSU already partners with schools throughout the community to teach children about environmental sustainability. Because of today's legislation, schools across the country will have similar opportunities as those students in Oregon to learn the value of our resources and gain the skills necessary to be key players in America's future green economy.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in full support of passage of H.R. 3036, the No Child Left Inside Act.

I worked with Chairman MILLER and Mr. SARBANES, the sponsor of the bill and a member of my subcommittee which has jurisdiction over environmental education.

It is a pleasure to support the professional development of environmental educators and expand the capacity of these teachers and the States in which they work to bring environmental education to our Nation's young people through this bill.

The No Child Left Inside Act seeks to improve the professional development opportunities of our Nation's environmental educators. We know that teachers make the difference in the educational experience of young people and their educational outcomes. By creating professional development opportunities that are meaningful and relevant for our teachers, they in turn will make environmental education meaningful and relevant for their students. These students evolve into the voting citizens who will craft our Nation's future. The bill contributes to ensuring a scientifically literate society through ensuring a more scientifically literate teaching force.

The National Academies of Science recently released a report titled ''Public Participation in Environmental Assessment and Decision Making.'' The first conclusion states that ''When done well, public participation improves the quality and legitimacy of a decision and builds the capacity of all involved to engage in the policy process. It can lead to better results in terms of environmental quality and other social objectives. It also can enhance trust and understanding among parties. Achieving these results depends on using practices that address difficulties that specific aspects of the context can present.''

This is a description of democracy at work.

It is important to ensure that our society is scientifically literate and therefore capable of not only understanding, but critically assessing, scientific data and weighing the societal consequences of these decisions. Science education is critical for the future of our Nation. So many of the skills taught and utilized in science are used and necessary for success in the global knowledge economy. We know that students learn so much and may even be more inspired when presented with opportunities outside the classroom and programs like these are often what sparks a student's interest in science. H.R. 3036 has a role here.

Beyond professional development, the bill contains a grant program to make environmental education more effective and more widely practiced. These grants will have local, regional, and national impact, and will increase the number of young people who understand the importance of the environment and our interaction with it. To keep American competitive and number one, we must have a scientifically literate society, and H.R. 3036 works to ensure this. I ask my colleagues to join me in a yes vote on this bill.

Mr. HOLT. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 3036, the No Child Left Inside Act of 2008.

Today our Nation faces a number of pressing environmental issues, including clean water, clean air, open space preservation, and the looming threat of global warming. Addressing these problems will become one of the dominant issues and challenges in the 21st century and our workforce needs the knowledge and skills to understand and address these complex environmental issues.

I would like to commend my colleague from Maryland, Representative JOHN SARBANES, for his hard work on H.R. 3036, to expand and enhance environmental education. This Federal investment in environmental education will help prepare our Nation's youth as responsible citizens who will value and protect America's resources and landscapes. Environmental education is about more than just science; these programs can be designed to have a positive effect in reading, math, and social studies.

Environmental education is best understood by those who have had the opportunity to touch it, breathe it, and live it. Where better to learn about the importance of our national resources than in our Nation's most special and protected places? Imagine seeing the effects of climate change firsthand at Glacier National Park rather than learning about it in the abstract in a classroom, or learning about the ecosystems in Great Swamps National Wilderness Refuge in my home State of New Jersey, or learning about the human genome project in Yellowstone where crucial breakthroughs about DNA were made.

As a member of the Committee on Education and Labor, I had the privilege of working on this legislation when it passed through our committee. My colleague from Indiana, Representative MARK SOUDER, and I successfully offered an amendment to H.R. 3036 which would allow schools and local education agencies to partner with Federal agencies, including national parks, when developing and administering their environmental programs.

I would like to share a letter of support from one of my constituents. John from Pennington,

New Jersey, wrote "As parents of a 7-year-old, we see how positive is the time he spends out back building his tree fort, or playing in Curliss woods, or attending summer camp at the Watershed . . . and how often his time before the TV seems deadening by contrast."

I firmly support H.R. 3036, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN (Ms. DEGETTE). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the amendment in the nature of a substitute printed in the bill shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read.

The text of the committee amendment is as follows:

H.R. 3036

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 ''No Child Left Inside Act of 2008''.

SEC. 2. NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION ACT AMENDMENTS.

(a) DEFINITIONS.—Section 3 of the National Environmental Education Act (20 U.S.C. 5502) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (12), by striking ''and'' at the end;

(2) in paragraph (13), by striking the period at the end and inserting a semicolon; and

(3) by adding at the end the following:

''(14) 'principles of scientific research' means principles of research that—

''(A) apply rigorous, systematic, and objective methodology to obtain reliable and valid knowledge relevant to education activities and programs;

''(B) present findings and make claims that are appropriate to, and supported by, the methods that have been employed; and

''(C) include, appropriate to the research being conducted—

''(i) use of systematic, empirical methods that draw on observation or experiment;

''(ii) use of data analyses that are adequate to support the general findings;

''(iii) reliance on measurements or observational methods that provide reliable and generalizable findings;

''(iv) strong claims of causal relationships, only with research designs that eliminate plausible completing explanations for observed results, such as, but not limited to, random-assignment experiments;

''(v) presentation of studies and methods in sufficient detail and clarity to allow for replication or, at a minimum, to offer the opportunity to build systematically on the findings of the research;

''(vi) acceptance by a peer-reviewed journal or critique by a panel of independent experts through a comparably rigorous, objective, and scientific review; and

''(vii) consistency of findings across multiple studies or sites to support the generality of results and conclusions;

''(15) 'scientifically valid research' includes applied research, basic research, and field-initiated research in which the rationale, design, and interpretation are soundly developed in accordance with principles of scientific research;

''(16) 'State' has the meaning given such term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965; and

''(17) 'State educational agency' has the meaning given such term in section 9101 of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965.''.

(b) ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION AND TRAINING PROGRAM.—Section 5 of the National Environmental Education Act (20 U.S.C. 5504) is amended—

(1) in subsection (b)—

(A) in paragraph (1)—

(i) by inserting ''creating opportunities for enhanced and ongoing professional development and'' before ''classroom''; and

(ii) by inserting ''(including integrating scientifically valid research teaching methods and technology-based teaching methods into the curriculum)'' after ''practices'';

(B) in paragraph (3)—

(i) by striking ''curriculum, including'' and inserting ''curriculum (including'';

(ii) by striking ''groups;'' and inserting ''groups) which—''; and

(iii) by adding at the end the following:

''(A) are aligned with challenging State and local academic content standards to the extent such standards exist; and

''(B) advance the teaching of interdisciplinary courses that integrate the study of natural, social, and economic systems and that include strong field components;'';

(C) in paragraph (7), by striking ''and forums;'' and inserting ''forums, and bringing teachers into contact with working professionals in environmental fields to expand such teachers' subject matter knowledge of, and research in, environmental issues;'';

(D) in paragraph (8), by striking ''; and'' and inserting '', including environmental education distance learning programs for teachers using curricula that are innovative, content-based, and based on scientifically valid research that is current as of the date of the program involved;'';

(E) by redesignating paragraph (9) as paragraph (13);

(F) by redesignating paragraphs (4) through (8) as paragraphs (5) through (9), respectively;

(G) by inserting after paragraph (3) the following:

''(4) encouraging individuals traditionally under-represented in environmental careers to pursue postsecondary degrees in majors leading to such careers;''; and

(H) by inserting after paragraph (9) (as so redesignated) the following:

''(10) establishment of programs to prepare teachers at a school to provide environmental education professional development to other teachers at the school and programs to promote outdoor environmental education activities as part of the regular school curriculum and schedule in order to further the knowledge and development of teachers and students;

''(11) summer workshops or institutes, including follow-up training, for elementary and secondary school environmental education teachers;

''(12) encouraging mid-career environmental professionals to pursue careers in environmental education; and''; and

(2) in subsection (c)(1), by inserting '', in consultation with the Secretary,'' after ''Administrator''.

(c) AUTHORIZATION.—Section 11(a) of the National Environmental Education Act (20 U.S.C. 5510(a)) is amended by striking ''Act'' and all that follows through the period at the end and inserting ''Act, except for section 11, $14,000,000 for fiscal year 2009.''.

(d) NATIONAL CAPACITY ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION GRANT PROGRAM; ACCOUNTABILITY.—The National Environmental Education Act (20 U.S.C. 5501 et seq.) is amended—

(1) by redesignating section 11 as section 13; and

(2) by inserting after section 10 the following:

''SEC. 11. NATIONAL CAPACITY ENVIRONMENTAL EDUCATION GRANT PROGRAM.

''(a) GRANTS AUTHORIZED.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary is authorized to award grants, on a competitive basis, to non-profit organizations, State educational agencies, local educational agencies, or institutions of higher education that have demonstrated expertise and experience in the development of the institutional, financial, intellectual, or policy resources needed to help the field of environmental education become more effective and widely practiced. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a State educational agency, a local educational agency, an institution of higher education, or a not-for-profit organization may use funds provided under this section to coordinate with any program or unit operated by a Federal Natural Resource Management Agency to carry out environmental education programs based on the full range of the resources and mission of the Agency.

''(2) DURATION.—The Secretary shall award each grant under this section for a period of not less than 1 year and not more than 3 years.

''(b) USE OF FUNDS.—Grant funds made available under this section shall be used for 1 or more of the following:

''(1) Developing and implementing challenging State academic content standards, student academic achievement standards, and State curriculum frameworks in environmental education, including the need to balance conservation of the environment with the development of the Nation's energy resources.

''(2) Replicating or disseminating information about proven and tested model environmental education programs that—

''(A) use the environment as an integrating theme or content throughout the curriculum;

''(B) provide integrated, interdisciplinary instruction about natural, social, and economic systems along with field experience that provides students with opportunities to directly experience nature in ways designed to improve overall academic performance, self-esteem, personal responsibility, community involvement, personal health (including addressing child obesity issues), or their understanding of nature;

''(C) provide integrated instruction on waste reduction, reuse, recycling, and composting programs and, when possible, promote such activities within the school; or

''(D) address issues of environmental justice, including policies and methods for eliminating disparate enforcement of environmental laws and regulations with respect to minority and low-income communities, with particular attention to the development of environmental justice curriculum at the middle and high school level.

''(3) Developing and implementing new policy approaches to advancing environmental education at the State and national level.

''(4) Conducting studies of national significance that—

''(A) evaluate the effectiveness of teaching environmental education as a separate subject, and as an integrating concept or theme;

''(B) evaluate the effectiveness of using environmental education in helping students improve their assessment scores in mathematics, reading or language arts, science, and the other core academic subjects; or

''(C) evaluate ways to coordinate activities under this Act with existing Federal science teacher in-service training or professional development programs.

''(5) Executing projects that advance widespread State and local educational agency adoption and use of environmental education content standards, including adoption and use of such standards in textbook selection criteria.

''(6) Developing a State environmental literacy plan that includes the following:

''(A) A description of how the State educational agency will measure the environmental literacy of students, including—

''(i) relevant State academic content standards and content areas regarding environmental education, and courses or subjects where environmental education instruction will take place; and

''(ii) a description of the relationship of the plan to the secondary school graduation requirements of the State.

''(B) A description of programs for professional development for teachers to improve the teachers'—

''(i) environmental content knowledge;

''(ii) skill in teaching about environmental issues; and

''(iii) field-based pedagogical skills.

''(C) A description of how the State educational agency will implement the plan, including securing funding and other necessary support.

''(7) Developing evidence-based approaches to build capacity to increase the number of elementary and secondary environmental educators.

''(c) APPLICATIONS.—Each nonprofit organization, State educational agency, local educational agency, or institution of higher education desiring a grant under this section shall submit to the Secretary an application that contains a plan to initiate, expand, or improve environmental education programs in order to make progress toward meeting State standards for environmental learning (to the extent such standards exist) and environmental literacy and contains an evaluation and accountability plan for activities assisted under this section that includes rigorous objectives that measure the impact of activities funded under this section.

''(d) REQUIREMENTS.—

''(1) ANNUAL REPORT.—In order to continue receiving grant funds under this section after the first year of a multi-year grant under this section, the grantee shall submit to the Secretary an annual report that—

''(A) describes the activities assisted under this section that were conducted during the preceding year;

''(B) describes the results of the grantee's evaluation and accountability plan; and

''(C) demonstrates that the grantee has undertaken activities to accomplish at least one of the following:

''(i) Responsibly preparing children to understand and address major challenges facing the United States, such as increasing the supply of clean energy, climate change, environmental health risks, and environmental disaster and emergency preparedness.

''(ii) Supporting systemic education reform by strengthening environmental education as an integral part of the elementary school and secondary school curriculum.

''(iii) Helping ensure that all students meet challenging State academic content and student academic achievement standards in environmental learning.

''(iv) Supporting efforts to enable students to engage in environmental education.

''(v) Leveraging and expanding private and public support for environmental education partnerships at national, State, and local levels.

''(vi) Awarding grants to initiate, expand, or improve environmental education programs for elementary and secondary students.

''(vii) Restoring and increasing field experiences as part of the regular school curriculum and schedule in order to improve students' overall academic performance, self-esteem, personal responsibility, community involvement, personal health (including addressing child obesity issues), and understanding of nature.

''(2) ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—Not more than 5 percent of the grant funds made available to a nonprofit organization, State educational agency, local educational agency, or institution of higher education under this section for any fiscal year may be used for administrative expenses.

''(3) STATE ENVIRONMENTAL LITERACY PLANS.—

''(A) IN GENERAL.—A State educational agency receiving a grant under this section shall—

''(i) have a State environmental literacy plan that is consistent with the requirements of subsection (b)(6) and that is peer reviewed within the State by a panel composed of experts in environmental education and representatives from other related State agencies; or

''(ii) develop a State environmental literacy plan described in subsection (b)(6) with funds made available under this section prior to using the grant funds for any other purpose.

''(B) PEER REVIEW.—If an environmental literacy plan described in subparagraph (A)(i) has not been peer reviewed within the State, the State educational agency, notwithstanding subsection (b), shall use funds made available under this section to complete such review, as described in such subparagraph, prior to using the grant funds for any other purpose.

''(C) OTHER GRANTEES.—An applicant for a grant under this section that is not a State educational agency and applies for funding to be used for the purpose described in subsection (b)(6) shall demonstrate in the application that the applicant has consulted with the State educational agency about such use of funds.

''(e) ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.—

''(1) FEDERAL SHARE.—The Federal share under this section shall not exceed—

''(A) 90 percent of the total cost of a program assisted under this section for the first year for which the program receives assistance under this section;

''(B) 75 percent of such cost for the second; and

''(C) 50 percent of such cost for each subsequent such year.

''(2) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than one year after enactment of this bill, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Education and Labor of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions of the Senate a report that—

''(A) describes the programs assisted under this section;

''(B) documents the success of such programs in improving national and State environmental education capacity; and

''(C) makes such recommendations as the Secretary determines appropriate for the continuation and improvement of the programs assisted under this section.

''(3) AVAILABILITY OF FUNDS.—Amounts made available to the Secretary to carry out this section shall remain available until expended.

''(f) SUPPLEMENT, NOT SUPPLANT.—Funds made available under this section shall be used to supplement, and not supplant, any other Federal, State, or local funds available for environmental education activities.

''(g) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this section such sums as may be necessary for fiscal year 2009.

''SEC. 12. ACCOUNTABILITY.

''(a) QUALITY INDICATORS.—The Administrator, the Secretary, and the Foundation each shall establish indicators of program quality for the programs and activities funded under this Act (other than fellowship awards funded under section 7) that such official or entity administers.

''(b) MINIMUM INDICATORS.—Such indicators of program quality, at a minimum, shall—

''(1) enhance understanding of the natural and built environment;

''(2) foster a better appreciation of the interdisciplinary nature of environmental issues and conditions;

''(3) increase achievement in related areas of national interest, such as mathematics and science;

''(4) increase understanding of the benefits of exposure to the natural environment;

''(5) improve understanding of how human and natural systems interact together;

''(6) broaden awareness of environmental issues; and

''(7) include such other indicators as the Administrator, Secretary, or Foundation may develop.

''(c) REPORT.—Each recipient receiving funds under this Act, other than fellowship recipients under section 7, shall report annually to the Administrator, the Secretary, or the Foundation regarding progress made in meeting the minimum indicators of program quality established under subsection (b). The Administrator, the Secretary, and the Foundation shall disseminate such information widely to the public through electronic and other means.''.

(e) RESTRICTIONS ON FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—The National Environmental Education Act (20 U.S.C. 5501 et seq.), as amended by subsection (d), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 14. RESTRICTIONS ON FEDERAL GOVERNMENT AND USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.

''(a) GENERAL PROHIBITION.—Nothing in this Act shall be construed to authorize an officer or employee of the Federal Government to mandate, direct, or control a State, local educational agency, or school's curriculum, program of instruction, specific instructional content, academic achievement standards, assessments, or allocation of State or local resources, or mandate a State or any subdivision thereof to spend any funds or incur any costs not paid for under this Act.

''(b) PROHIBITION ON ENDORSEMENT OF CURRICULUM.—No funds provided to the Administrator or Secretary under this Act may be used by the Agency or Department of Education to endorse, approve, or sanction any curriculum designed to be used in an elementary school or secondary school.

''(c) PROHIBITION ON REQUIRING FEDERAL APPROVAL OR CERTIFICATION OF STANDARDS.—No State shall be required to have academic content or student academic achievement standards approved or certified by the Federal Government, in order to receive assistance under this Act.

''(d) RESTRICTIONS ON PARTISAN POLITICAL INFLUENCE.—

''(1) IN GENERAL.—In carrying out the activities described in this Act, the Administrator and Secretary shall ensure that such activities—

''(A) conform to high standards of quality, integrity, and accuracy;

''(B) are objective, neutral, and nonideological and are free of partisan political influence; and

''(C) do not advocate a particular political viewpoint.

''(2) ACTIONS TO IMPLEMENT AND ENFORCE.—The Administrator and Secretary shall take such actions as are necessary to ensure that the provisions of this section are vigorously implemented and enforced.''.

(f) CONFORMING AMENDMENT.—The table of contents in section 1(b) of the National Environmental Education Act (20 U.S.C. 5501 note) is amended by striking the item relating to section 11 and inserting the following:

''Sec. 11. National capacity environmental education grant program.
''Sec. 12. Accountability.
''Sec. 13. Authorization.
''Sec. 14. Restrictions on Federal Government and use of Federal funds.''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. No amendment to the committee amendment is in order except those printed in House Report 110–854. Each amendment shall be considered only in the order printed in the report; by a Member designated in the report; shall be considered read; shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent of the amendment; shall not be subject to amendment; and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SARBANES

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 110–854.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Is the gentleman from Maryland the designee of the gentleman from California (Mr. MILLER)?

Mr. SARBANES. Yes, Madam Chairman.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 1 offered by Mr. SARBANES:

Page 10, strike lines 1 through 8 and insert the following:

''(D) address issues of environmental justice, including policies and methods for eliminating disparate enforcement of environmental laws and regulations, including with respect to low-income communities.

Page 10, strike lines 9 through 11 and insert the following:

''(3) Developing and implementing new policy approaches to environmental education, which shall include a discussion of—

''(A) the benefits and costs to the environment and to consumers regarding increasing the supply of energy produced in the United States from—

''(i) oil and gas drilling;

''(ii) nuclear power;

''(iii) new coal technologies; and

''(iv) clean renewable and alternative sources of energy, including wind, solar, geothermal, hydropower, and advanced biofuels; and

''(B) the best strategies for reducing energy consumption through an enhanced emphasis on efficiency and conservation.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1441, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chairman, this amendment would seek to strengthen and improve the legislation in a number of ways.

First, it clarifies that funds that are issued under the National Capacity Environmental Education Grant Program, which is the new program that's being created here under the U.S. Department of Education, that those funds can be used to address environmental justice issues that may arise in low-income communities.

We heard earlier from Representative CLARKE of New York, who has made this issue a passion of hers and introduced the underlying amendment in the mark-up at the committee level. This is an important additional element for the bill.

Secondly, the amendment clarifies that funds used to develop and implement new policy approaches to environmental education will include a discussion of the benefits and the costs to the environment and to consumers with respect to increasing the supply of energy produced in the United States from a variety of sources.

This is, again, an important amendment. It signals, I think, that good quality environmental education—almost by definition—is going to focus the next generation on dealing with these very challenging issues and what the proper balance needs to be between developing our energy sources and conservation and other environmental issues, which is, frankly, at the heart of much of the debate that we're having these days. So this is also, I think, an important addition to the bill.

And thirdly, the amendment that we are proposing here provides that the policy approaches developed under this bill must also include a discussion of the best strategies for reducing energy consumption. Again, any meaningful environmental education should include looking at all of these various policy approaches.

With that, Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I will not oppose it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to thank Chairman MILLER for offering this amendment, and Mr. SARBANES for filling in.

This amendment clarifies that the Federal Government will not impose an environmental justice curriculum on our Nation's schools. This issue was debated during the committee consideration of the bill and it was an issue on which there was disagreement between the majority and the minority. I believe that the bill approved by our committee went too far in this regard because it could have required State and local officials to develop specific environmental justice curricula.

We have long believed that specific curricula—which is taught in individual classrooms—is best determined at the local level. And while this bill contains a broad prohibition on Federal curriculum development, I believe it was necessary to clarify the environmental justice language as well so that there would be no confusion as to what the Federal Government is or is not demanding of our schools. Chairman MILLER worked closely with me to refine this language, and I want to thank him for his willingness to do so.

This amendment also contains some interesting language that was added earlier this week, presumably in response to efforts on our side of the aisle to ensure this bill does not ignore critical energy issues.

Republicans proposed amendments to advance the understanding of the environmental and economic benefits of clean coal and oil shale production, energy production in the ANWR, and energy production on the Outer Continental Shelf. We proposed amendments to advance the understanding of the environmental and economic benefits of nuclear power, and of American-made energy, and of the all-of-the-above energy strategy, which would increase production, promote conservation, and expand innovation. We think that each of these issues deserves a full and open debate because an all-of-the-above energy strategy does not ignore any aspect of energy reform.

□ 1600

Although our amendments were not made in order, I was pleased to see that the Miller amendment now includes language to ensure that environmental education programs include a discussion of the costs and benefits of oil and gas drilling, of nuclear power, of new coal technologies, and of renewable energy sources. While this language is not as strong and comprehensive as what the Republicans had offered, I appreciate its inclusion nonetheless.

The truth is we need to be talking about energy more, not less. We passed an energy bill earlier this week that won't increase energy production. We passed an energy bill that puts American resources under lock and key instead of opening them up to environmentally safe production that will create jobs and that will bring down energy prices. This sham of a bill that we passed raises taxes and stands to drive consumer prices up, not down.

So I'm glad we're going to be talking to our children about the benefits of American energy production. It's a conversation we should be having here in Congress as well.

Once again, I want to thank Chairman MILLER for working with me to clarify the environmental justice aspect of this legislation, and I look forward to supporting this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SARBANES. Does the gentleman have any additional speakers? I'm prepared to yield back, and I would reserve the right to close.

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

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chairman, again, I would urge the passage of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. SARBANES. Madam Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that amendments No. 2 and 3 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF VERMONT

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 110–854.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk made in order under the rule.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Amendment No. 4 offered by Mr. WELCH of Vermont:

Page 8, line 7, insert ''municipalities,'' after ''agencies,''.

Page 8, line 15, insert ''a municipality,'' after ''education,''.

Page 12, line 8, insert ''municipality,'' after ''Each''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1441, the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. My amendment is quite simple.

It would add municipalities to the list of entities eligible for the National Capacity Environmental Education Grant Program. Keep in mind, anyone who is going to be successful has to go through a competitive grant process.

The reason for that is the municipalities are the ones that at the grassroots level oftentimes provide these services. Obviously, we all live in towns or in cities, and this environmental education initiative outlined in the legislation is being offered, in many cases, by small towns in rural America and in large towns elsewhere. In fact, in smaller towns, it's the local Parks and Recreation Department. That's a subset, obviously, of the municipality and who is the ultimate intended beneficiary of this opportunity. It's the Parks and Rec Department that takes the lead in providing environmental education to our kids. This amendment would allow those agencies to participate.

According to the National Park and Recreation Association, an entity that has endorsed this amendment, municipal park systems are the best and most logical partners for schools and for other educational agencies across the country to develop effective environmental education programs.

In my own State of Vermont, environmental education programs are offered by almost every town during their summer programming. The programs are great for the kids in helping them appreciate the environment and the value of protecting it. The town of Colchester, for instance, boasts four summer environmental education offerings. Killington, Vermont did a survey, and it revealed that the majority of citizens thinks their town should offer through parks and recreation such an education program.

Such programs are committed to providing diverse, accessible and effective environmental education at the grassroots. This amendment will bolster these efforts by assuring properly trained staff and the best materials. Tested instruction strategies are available for and are integrated into environmental programming.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

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

The bill before us is about environmental education. Specifically, it is about teaching elementary and secondary students about the world in which they live, about the natural resources of our great Nation and about the stewardship of our environment and of our resources for the future.

This legislation provides grants to State and local education agencies, to institutions of higher education or to nonprofit organizations. The resources are targeted to ensure they will directly benefit students. This amendment, as I understand it, would make ''municipalities eligible for these grants as well.'' Unfortunately, that term is not defined, leaving open to interpretation just exactly how far we would be expanding this program.

Without a clear and narrow definition, this amendment could open up the funding to any number of entities, including cities, townships, districts or county governments, to name just a few. In other words, this amendment opens the limited resources under the bill to organizations that may or may not provide the direct services to students that we're seeking.

I support local control and local partnerships. That's why I support the Courtney amendment, which allows partnerships with State and local park departments. Through that model, we provide grants directly to educational organizations, which can then partner with the local organizations we're talking about now that can enrich the environmental education experience.

I understand what the gentleman is trying to accomplish with this amendment, and I'd like to work with him to see if we can get there, but at this time, I'm opposed to this amendment because it's not clear enough about prioritizing funds for educational entities that provide direct services to students. I know that the majority is working with us to clarify the definition of ''municipality.''

As this bill moves forward, I look forward to working with them to ensure we do not dilute the limited resources of this program away from the students they're intended for.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I appreciate the concerns expressed by the gentleman from California, but I think I can assure him that the definition won't dilute the program, and there are two reasons.

One, the term ''municipality'' does have a legal definition. It's a city, basically, or an entity as defined in the code of the applicable State. In Vermont—and I think this is pretty much true around the country—you have subdivisions. You have the Parks and Rec Department. The point here is that it is the Parks and Rec Department that is oftentimes doing this kind of work.

So what this amendment would do, I think, is it would achieve that goal of local control and delivery at the most elemental and local of levels, which I think is an objective that the gentleman from California and I share.

The other thing that gives me some reassurance—and it may not quite reach the level of assurance that the gentleman from California looks to—is that the grants will be competitive, so there will be a process that applicants have to go through, whether they're a municipality or whether they're any other entity making an application. It will be reviewed by an impartial authority. Let's certainly hope that's the case. Then the merit-based decision will be that this application looks like it's going to help a lot of kids and be effective, and it will be granted on that basis, not on the name of the applicant or on that of the particular entity.

So I really do appreciate the concerns that were offered. I have more comfort with the constraints of the definition of ''municipality,'' apparently, than does my friend from California, but ultimately, the backstop here is that independent review that is going to be the final arbiter of who gets these competitive opportunities.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. I appreciate the gentleman. As I said, I appreciate his amendment, and I appreciate his effort in this regard.

This points out, once again, to me that we have a large country with 435 congressional districts. Just within my congressional district, we have cities; we have counties; we have towns; we have towns that really don't have a government responsibility, but they're kind of granted that, and that's just in my district. I haven't had the opportunity to visit your district. I'm sure that in each of the 435 districts we would find different ways that this would be treated, and that is my concern is how we define that.

I think the gentleman's bill is directed towards students to help students get the education of environmental studies that he would like to see and that I support. The concern that I have again is that, if we direct it as your amendment would, it may be directed away from students. I think that this could be worked out. As we know, we are not going to finish this up in this Congress anyway, so it will be something that will carry over next year. Should we all happen by some circumstance to win our elections, we'll be back here in a few months, working on this again, but at this point, I would still have to oppose the amendment, hoping that we could work this out in the future.

I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California has the right to close.

Mr. WELCH of Vermont. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. I think I've said everything I needed to say.

I would yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY

The Acting CHAIRMAN. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 110–854.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 12, line 19, after ''section.'' insert the following: ''Such application may describe how the applicant has partnered, or intends to partner, with a State and local park and recreation department.''.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to House Resolution 1441, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Madam Chairman, this is the ultimate friendly amendment to this very solid bill, on which I commend the gentleman from Maryland for his leadership. Based on Mr. MCKEON's positive comments earlier, I should probably make this very short and sweet.

In a nutshell, what this amendment does is it encourages organizations that apply for this environmental education grant program to describe on their application for Federal grants how they have partnered or how they intend to partner with a State or with a local park and recreation department.

As was mentioned in the earlier colloquy, Park and Recreation Departments all over the country already are very involved in environmental education programs, and that certainly holds true also for State park systems.

In Connecticut, we actually have a program, by coincidence, called the No Child Left Inside Program, which was instituted in 2006 by the Republican Governor of Connecticut, Jodi Rell, and by her outstanding commissioner of the Department of Environmental Protection, which again is following exactly the same mission that Mr. SARBANES' bill is following, to encourage children to get outside, to experience nature, to learn about nature, and to hopefully stimulate an interest in environmental science, which again, as has been said many times here during the earlier debate, is an important way to make sure that we get children engaged and involved in science, technology, engineering, and math, which the education committee has spent many hours wrestling with because we clearly have an educational system which is not producing enough scientists and engineers to meet the workforce challenges of our country.

The Connecticut program utilizes State park systems which, again, are perfectly established right now to provide trained personnel, transportation equipment and programs funding to again provide a very solid and an enriching experience in nature. They work together with school systems in a variety of programs.

The Appalachian Connection program, which again uses the Appalachian Trail which goes through Connecticut, works collaboratively with school systems to bring children out to the Appalachian Trail. It's just an extraordinary part of Connecticut's environment.

In Bolton, Connecticut, they have the geography in October program. In Preston, Connecticut, there is a recycling program, which again is operated through the No Child Left Inside Program.

There are many examples of where working in collaboration between the State's park system and local school boards has really, again, provided a perfect model and an example of what this legislation seeks to achieve.

The National Recreation and Park Association and local parks departments all over the country have endorsed this amendment. It's a ''may'' not ''shall'' amendment, so it is purely voluntary in terms of encouraging local school districts to participate.

□ 1615

In conclusion, I just wanted to comment on some of the prior discussion regarding the energy needs of this country and how come we are taking up a bill like this.

In my State, where we have an active nuclear power plant that provides 40 percent of the power of the State, we build nuclear submarines in my district, if you talk to people in the industry, an industry which in America has not built a nuclear reactor since 1973, in fact the biggest challenge is not financing or national energy policy, because we have over 20 new applications for new nuclear reactors before the NRC today. If you talk to the people in the industry, their biggest challenge is human capital, that the average age of a nuclear engineer in this country is over age 55.

Because of that gap, which has existed because for a million different reasons, if we are really serious about promoting nuclear power as an avenue in the future, and with the cap and trade debate that is looming on the horizon in the future I believe it is going to be part our energy portfolio, the fact of the matter is we have to get serious about getting kids engaged and involved in science and engineering. And Mr. SARBANES' legislation is all about that. It is exactly focused on the real energy needs that we have in this country, which is to create the scientists and engineers that are going to provide the solutions in all of the above avenues.

Madam Chairman, with that, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment, although I will not oppose it.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKEON. Madam Chairman, as I stated earlier, I support the gentleman's amendment and commend him on it.

Madam Chairman, over the last several years, the National Park Service has increasingly relied on partnerships with outside entities to fulfill its mission and foster a shared sense of stewardship for our environment and natural resources. In fact, a number of National Park Service programs operate almost exclusively through partnerships.

One way the National Park Service is supporting environmental education is through professional development opportunities for teachers. These include helping teachers utilize park resources in the classroom or preparing classes for a park visit. Most of these workshops are accredited and can be taken for college credit, and are structured to meet the needs of today's teacher—teaching to academic content standards while making the material engaging and relevant.

Because of the existing commitment on the part of the National Park Service to provide educational enrichment, the bill allows grantees to enter into National Park Service partnerships as a means to increase the knowledge and understanding of environmental education.

The Courtney amendment goes beyond this focus on the National Park Service, by allowing grant applicants to discuss through the grant application process how they have partnered, or intend to partner, with a state and local park and recreation department.

I support this amendment because it maintains the current funding structure—in which we provide grants to educational organizations—while making clear that students can benefit from the creativity, experience, and resources of local programs. These types of partnerships could benefit students by enriching their environmental education experience, and I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment to clarify that these partnerships are permissible, and welcome, under the legislation.

This amendment builds on the existing emphasis we have placed on partnerships with the National Park Service, and I am happy to support it.

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

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. SARBANES

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, the unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 1 printed in

House Report 110–854 by the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. SARBANES) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIRMAN. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 383, noes 23, not voting 32, as follows:

[Roll No. 612]

AYES—383

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrett (SC)
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Bordallo
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Carter
Castle
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Childers
Christensen
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coble
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Drake
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Everett
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Flake
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Frank (MA)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Lynch
Mack
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murphy, Tim
Murtha
Musgrave
Myrick
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Neugebauer
Norton
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (GA)
Price (NC)
Putnam
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Rehberg
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Richardson
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Ryan (WI)
Salazar
Sali
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Saxton
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Shuster
Simpson
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stearns
Stupak
Sullivan
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Westmoreland
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (OH)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Yarmuth
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—23

Aderholt
Akin
Boyda (KS)
Broun (GA)
Burton (IN)
Cannon
Cantor
Conaway
Deal (GA)
Doolittle
Duncan
Foxx
Gingrey
Hoekstra
Johnson, Sam
Lewis (KY)
Manzullo
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Paul
Tancredo
Weldon (FL)

NOT VOTING—32

Biggert
Bishop (UT)
Brady (TX)
Burgess
Castor
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Dreier
Faleomavaega
Feeney
Fortuño
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hulshof
Issa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
King (NY)
Kingston
Lampson
Mahoney (FL)
Marchant
Nunes
Pence
Peterson (PA)
Pitts
Poe
Pryce (OH)
Sestak
Udall (CO)
Wu

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIRMAN

The Acting CHAIRMAN (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining in the vote.

□ 1647

Messrs. CANTOR, MORAN of Kansas, ADERHOLT, MILLER of Florida, MANZULLO, Mrs. BOYDA of Kansas, Messrs. GINGREY and BURTON of Indiana changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Messrs. TIAHRT, CAMPBELL of California, GOHMERT, FLAKE, BONNER, KING of Iowa, WALBERG and ROHRABACHER changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIRMAN. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute, as amended.

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

The Acting CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEINER) having assumed the chair, Ms. DEGETTE, Acting Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3036) to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 regarding environmental education, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 1441, she reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment to the amendment reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF GEORGIA

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I am.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Price of Georgia moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3036 to the Committee on Education and Labor with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendments:

Page 20, after line 17, insert the following:

(f) PRIORITIES FOR AND PROHIBITIONS ON THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.—The National Environmental Education Act (20 U.S.C. 5501 et seq.), as amended by subsections (d) and (e), is further amended by adding at the end the following:

''SEC. 15. PRIORITIES FOR AND PROHIBITIONS ON THE USE OF FEDERAL FUNDS.

''(a) PRIORITY FOR FEDERAL FUNDS.—In distributing funds under this Act, priority shall be given to applications from local educational agencies before funds are awarded to other eligible applicants.

''(b) PROHIBITION ON LOBBYING.—No funds made available under this Act may be made available to an organization, defined to include any affiliated organization, that lobbies or retains a lobbyist for the purpose of influencing a Federal, State, or local governmental entity or officer, including lobbyists

employed or retained to advocate against the production and exploration of American energy.

''(c) BALANCED PRESENTATION OF INFORMATION.—No funds made available under this Act may be made available to an organization, defined to include any affiliated organization, that, in its information and publications (including paper, electronic, web-based and any other format), fails to provide a balanced presentation of environmental issues by providing readers with the full spectrum of scholarly viewpoints on the subjects examined.''.

Page 20, line 18, strike ''(f)'' and insert ''(g)''.

Page 20, in the matter following line 21, after the table of contents item relating to section 14, insert the following:

''Sec. 15. Priorities for and prohibitions on the use of Federal funds.''.

Mr. SARBANES (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. I object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

The Clerk will continue to read.

The Clerk continued to read.

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

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, environmental education increases awareness and knowledge about environmental issues while providing needed skills to make informed decisions. When utilized appropriately, it enhances critical thinking and problem solving but does so without advocating a particular viewpoint or a course of action.

But the bill before the House today is establishing a framework that could become ripe for abuse, with outside factions directing learning in the classroom. It is why Republicans are offering this motion to recommit in order to ensure there is no undue political influence in the classroom while protecting the interest of taxpayers.

This motion to recommit is a commonsense package of safeguards aimed at protecting taxpayers' wallets, limiting special interest influence, and taking partisanship out of the classroom. Currently, none of those safeguards are present in this bill.

The first safeguard ensures that priority funding goes to local school districts first. Since 1992, more than 50 percent of environmental education grants have gone to nonprofit organizations. American taxpayers are paying for these programs, so it makes sense that their dollars go to local schools and children before third parties.

The second safeguard prohibits funding to any organization that lobbies or retains a lobbyist, especially those special interests that routinely advocate against more American-made energy for Americans. It is no coincidence that the same groups and affiliates which are suing to block oil and gas leases are also lobbying and receiving funds for environmental education.

And the final safeguard makes certain that information in the classroom is fair and balanced. Its aim is to ensure that classrooms remain free of partisan or political influence and that science, not a political or ideological agenda, is what students are taking away from their learning experiences.

In committee I raised the point that certain organizations, textbooks, and curricula have misinformed students by advocating erroneous specific measures to address environmental problems. Even worse, environmental information has been presented with unbalanced or scientifically inaccurate data.

On this side of the aisle, Republicans do not want such uneven portrayal. But there is a greater reason for offering this package of reforms: Republicans do not want the very same radical special interests that are directing energy policy in the United States to have the same influence in our classrooms.

The high price of gasoline is squeezing family budgets. And this Congress has yet to cast a vote during this energy crisis that truly expands exploration and the production of American-made energy.

Republicans have a plan to increase domestic production, provide tax credits to promote clean and reliable sources of energy, and encourage conservation to ease demand for gasoline. But roadblock after roadblock has been erected.

Mr. Speaker, it has been nearly 50 days since the Speaker and this majority, the majority party, turned off the microphones, turned off the cameras, and turned down the lights and silenced the will of the American people on the House floor. Nearly 50 days since the good folks across the aisle made it abundantly clear that election year special interests are more important than the public interests.

Republicans are going to continue to champion for an all-of-the-above energy solution. But this is a moment in which the House can make certain that those who are writing our Nation's anti-energy policies are not directing learning in the classroom as well.

Republicans want to hold these programs to the highest standards of quality, accuracy and neutrality. This will only happen if funding is going to schools first, special interests are not shaping the education agenda, and there is a balanced presentation of information.

In conclusion, this motion to recommit is a trio of commonsense ideas that keeps children at the forefront while maintaining high standards for science in the classroom.

I urge my colleagues to adopt this forthwith motion to recommit.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Speaker, there are two ways to effectively kill a bill. One is to make a motion ''promptly,'' which would send it back to committee. That is not what has happened here. This is a ''forthwith'' motion which brings it right back with the instructions that have been put on it. But the other way to kill a bill is to put instructions on it that essentially gut it and completely undermine what it is supposed to do, and that is the nature of this particular motion to recommit.

I object to it on a number of grounds. First of all, the provision relating to priority with respect to LEAs, there are a number of eligible entities under this bill that can participate in the competitive grant process, local education agencies, State educational agencies, higher education institutions, nonprofits and so forth. They all should be part of the same competitive bidding process to get these dollars to try to fund environmental education.

Secondly, I object because this second provision that has to do with lobbying in fact will end up having the effect that some of the very organizations that are in the best position to provide good strong environmental education to the next generation will be prohibited from delivering. And as far as that goes, it means that A and B are internally inconsistent because A would give a priority to the very kind of organization that B seeks to prevent from getting these funds. So it doesn't make sense on its face.

So I would urge very strongly that my colleagues oppose the motion to recommit forthwith.

This is a good bill. It is an important bill. You don't have to take my word for it. There are 750 organizations across the country that are part of the No Child Left Inside Coalition. This is made up of public health advocates, sportsmen, environmentalists, educators, all recognizing the need to provide this critical education to the next generation.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SARBANES. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GEORGE MILLER of California. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just want my colleagues to fully understand.

This is a bill that is designed for environmental education. I understand the gentleman doesn't like the bill. He voted against it in committee, one of the few Republicans that did. He doesn't like it. They are disappointed because we passed comprehensive energy reform and they have lost their energy debate.

But most importantly this: under this amendment, a school could not get money for environmental education. The Governors Association could not get money for environmental education, universities could not get money for environmental education, so who the hell would get the money for environmental education because

under this amendment the very organizations that are supposed to be developing the program are prohibited because they hire lobbyists. Yes, the Governors have a lobbyist; universities have a lobbyist; school districts have lobbyists for the State or what have you. They are immediately excluded.

So here we are again. The gentleman from Maryland has presented a comprehensive bill, a well-thought-out bill that has incredible support across the board by educational organizations and nonprofits and others who want to engage and step up the environmental education in this country. This amendment would absolutely prohibit these organizations from participating.

I thank the gentleman for yielding.

□ 1700

Mr. SARBANES. Just to reiterate, Mr. Speaker, I oppose this motion vehemently. This bill will provide so many benefits to the next generation, public health benefits by getting our kids outside and into nature and active, economic development benefits because we're going to be educating the next generation of scientists and entrepreneurs that are going to make the difference when it comes to pursuing alternative sources of fuel and renewable sources of fuel. It will engage kids in learning, activate all their senses.

And finally, finally, it's going to raise awareness about the environment. The only way we're going to save our environment, save treasures like the Chesapeake Bay in Maryland is if millions of people develop good habits when it comes to the environment. Our children are the ones that are going to do it, but they can only do it if we provide them with this educational support.

I urge my colleagues to vote against the motion to recommit.

I yield back.

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. PRICE of Georgia. 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. 3036, if ordered; and motion to suspend the rules on H.R. 6460.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 172, noes 230, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 613]

AYES—172

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Bachus
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Capito
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Crenshaw
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Tom
Deal (GA)
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Doolittle
Drake
Duncan
Ehlers
Emerson
English (PA)
Everett
Fallin
Feeney
Ferguson
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gerlach
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Graves
Hall (TX)
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hobson
Hoekstra
Hunter
Inglis (SC)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Keller
King (IA)
Kirk
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Lamborn
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McCaul (TX)
McCotter
McCrery
McHenry
McHugh
McKeon
McMorris Rodgers
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Paul
Pearce
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Platts
Porter
Price (GA)
Putnam
Radanovich
Regula
Rehberg
Renzi
Reynolds
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Schmidt
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Souder
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Terry
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Tiberi
Turner
Upton
Walberg
Walden (OR)
Wamp
Weldon (FL)
Weller
Westmoreland
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOES—230

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Butterfield
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dicks
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Engel
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Filner
Foster
Frank (MA)
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hirono
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Klein (FL)
Kucinich
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McIntyre
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Pomeroy
Price (NC)
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Reichert
Reyes
Richardson
Rodriguez
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Wexler
Wilson (OH)
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—31

Biggert
Bishop (UT)
Brady (TX)
Burgess
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Dingell
Dreier
Flake
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hinojosa
Hulshof
Issa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
King (NY)
Kingston
Lampson
Marchant
Markey
Nunes
Pence
Pitts
Poe
Pryce (OH)
Ryan (OH)
Sestak
Shays
Slaughter

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are less than 2 minutes remaining on the vote.

□ 1717

Mr. HALL of Texas changed his vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, on September 18, 2008, I missed one recorded vote.

I take my voting responsibility very seriously. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on recorded vote No. 613.

Mr. HINOJOSA. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 613, had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 293, nays 109, not voting 31, as follows:

[Roll No. 614]

YEAS—293

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (NY)
Blumenauer
Bono Mack
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Butterfield
Buyer
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doyle
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Emanuel
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Farr
Fattah
Ferguson
Filner
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Frank (MA)
Frelinghuysen
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gonzalez
Gordon
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hare
Harman
Hayes
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McDermott
McGovern
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNerney
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Michaud
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)
Moran (VA)
Murphy (CT)
Murphy, Patrick
Murtha
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal (MA)
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Pallone
Pascrell
Pastor
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Peterson (MN)
Petri
Platts
Pomeroy
Porter
Price (NC)
Putnam
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Regula
Reichert
Renzi
Reyes
Reynolds
Rodriguez
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothman
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Salazar
Sánchez, Linda T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schmidt
Schwartz
Scott (GA)
Scott (VA)
Serrano
Shays
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuler
Sires
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Snyder
Solis
Souder
Space
Speier
Spratt
Stark
Stupak
Sutton
Tanner
Tauscher
Taylor
Terry
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tiberi
Tierney
Towns
Tsongas
Turner
Udall (CO)
Udall (NM)
Upton
Van Hollen
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walsh (NY)
Walz (MN)
Wamp
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson
Watt
Waxman
Weiner
Welch (VT)
Weller
Wexler
Whitfield (KY)
Wilson (OH)
Wittman (VA)
Wolf
Woolsey
Wu
Yarmuth
Young (FL)

NAYS—109

Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Bachmann
Barrett (SC)
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Blackburn
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Boozman
Boustany
Broun (GA)
Brown (SC)
Burton (IN)
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Campbell (CA)
Cannon
Cantor
Carter
Chabot
Coble
Cole (OK)
Conaway
Culberson
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Deal (GA)
Doolittle
Drake
Duncan
Ellsworth
Emerson
Fallin
Feeney
Forbes
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Gallegly
Garrett (NJ)
Gingrey
Gohmert
Goode
Goodlatte
Granger
Hall (TX)
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Hoekstra
Inglis (SC)
Johnson, Sam
Jones (NC)
Jordan
King (IA)
Kline (MN)
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lucas
Lungren, Daniel E.
Mack
Manzullo
McCarthy (CA)
McCotter
McHenry
Mica
Miller (FL)
Miller, Gary
Moran (KS)
Murphy, Tim
Musgrave
Myrick
Neugebauer
Paul
Peterson (PA)
Pickering
Price (GA)
Radanovich
Rehberg
Rogers (MI)
Rohrabacher
Royce
Ryan (WI)
Sali
Saxton
Scalise
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shadegg
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stearns
Sullivan
Tancredo
Thornberry
Tiahrt
Walberg
Weldon (FL)
Westmoreland
Wilson (NM)
Wilson (SC)
Young (AK)

NOT VOTING—31

Biggert
Bishop (UT)
Brady (TX)
Burgess
Cramer
Crowley
Cubin
Dreier
Everett
Flake
Grijalva
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hulshof
Hunter
Issa
Jackson-Lee (TX)
King (NY)
Kingston
Lampson
Marchant
McCrery
McMorris Rodgers
Nunes
Pence
Pitts
Poe
Pryce (OH)
Richardson
Sestak
Walden (OR)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). Members are reminded there are less than 2 minutes remaining in this vote.

□ 1725

Mr. BROWN of South Carolina changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: ''A bill to reauthorize and enhance the National Environmental Education Act, and for other purposes.''.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GREAT LAKES LEGACY REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2008

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on suspending the rules and passing the bill, H.R. 6460, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 6460, as amended.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. UPTON. 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 371, noes 20, not voting 42, as follows:

[Roll No. 615]

AYES—371

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Akin
Alexander
Allen
Altmire
Andrews
Arcuri
Baca
Bachmann
Bachus
Baird
Baldwin
Barrow
Bartlett (MD)
Barton (TX)
Bean
Becerra
Berkley
Berman
Berry
Bilbray
Bilirakis
Bishop (NY)
Blackburn
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehner
Bonner
Bono Mack
Boozman
Boren
Boswell
Boucher
Boustany
Boyd (FL)
Boyda (KS)
Brady (PA)
Braley (IA)
Brown (SC)
Brown, Corrine
Brown-Waite, Ginny
Buchanan
Burton (IN)
Butterfield
Buyer
Calvert
Camp (MI)
Cantor
Capito
Capps
Capuano
Cardoza
Carnahan
Carney
Carson
Castle
Castor
Cazayoux
Chabot
Chandler
Childers
Clarke
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole (OK)
Cooper
Costa
Costello
Courtney
Crenshaw
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Davis (AL)
Davis (CA)
Davis (IL)
Davis (KY)
Davis, David
Davis, Lincoln
Davis, Tom
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
Dent
Diaz-Balart, L.
Diaz-Balart, M.
Dicks
Dingell
Doggett
Donnelly
Doolittle
Doyle
Drake
Duncan
Edwards (MD)
Edwards (TX)
Ehlers
Ellison
Ellsworth
Emanuel
Emerson
Engel
English (PA)
Eshoo
Etheridge
Fallin
Farr
Fattah
Feeney
Ferguson
Filner
Forbes
Fortenberry
Fossella
Foster
Frank (MA)
Gallegly
Gerlach
Giffords
Gilchrest
Gillibrand
Gohmert
Gonzalez
Goode
Goodlatte
Gordon
Granger
Graves
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Gutierrez
Hall (NY)
Hall (TX)
Hare
Harman
Hayes
Heller
Hensarling
Herger
Herseth Sandlin
Higgins
Hill
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hirono
Hobson
Hodes
Hoekstra
Holden
Holt
Honda
Hooley
Hoyer
Inglis (SC)
Inslee
Israel
Jackson (IL)
Jefferson
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (IL)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones (NC)
Jordan
Kagen
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Keller
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kind
King (IA)
Kirk
Klein (FL)
Kline (MN)
Knollenberg
Kucinich
Kuhl (NY)
LaHood
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latham
LaTourette
Latta
Lee
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren, Zoe
Lowey
Lucas
Lynch
Mahoney (FL)
Maloney (NY)
Manzullo
Markey
Marshall
Matheson
Matsui
McCarthy (CA)
McCarthy (NY)
McCaul (TX)
McCollum (MN)
McCotter
McDermott
McGovern
McHenry
McHugh
McIntyre
McKeon
McNulty
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Melancon
Mica
Michaud
Miller (FL)
Miller (MI)
Miller (NC)
Miller, Gary
Miller, George
Mitchell
Mollohan
Moore (KS)
Moore (WI)