

Stockman	Valadao	Webster (FL)
Stutzman	Van Hollen	Welch
Swalwell (CA)	Vargas	Wenstrup
Takano	Veasey	Westmoreland
Terry	Vela	Whitfield
Thompson (CA)	Velázquez	Williams
Thompson (MS)	Visclosky	Wilson (FL)
Thompson (PA)	Wagner	Wilson (SC)
Thornberry	Walberg	Wittman
Tiberi	Walden	Womack
Tierney	Walorski	Woodall
Tipton	Walz	Yarmuth
Titus	Wasserman	Yoder
Tonko	Schultz	Yoho
Tsongas	Waters	Young (IN)
Turner	Waxman	
Upton	Weber (TX)	

NOT VOTING—13

Barton	Maloney, Sean	Schwartz
Campbell	McCarthy (NY)	Wolf
DelBene	Miller, Gary	Young (AK)
Duckworth	Rangel	
Hinojosa	Rice (SC)	

□ 1442

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

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, 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 designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 123 South 9th Street in De Pere, Wisconsin, as the ‘Corporal Justin D. Ross Post Office Building’.”

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ENSURING PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT IN THE CREATION OF NATIONAL MONUMENTS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 1459.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DENHAM). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 524 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1459.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1445

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1459) to ensure that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 applies to the declaration of national monuments, and for other purposes, with Mr. POE in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

□ 1445

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

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

Mr. Chairman, President Obama has not been shy about his willingness or his desire to circumvent Congress and take unilateral action on a variety of issues. This lack of shyness includes the designation of new national monuments.

In fact, during the President’s first term in office, an internal memo was leaked that showed plans to potentially lock up more than 13 million acres of Western land with the simple stroke of the President’s pen.

Major land use decisions such as this should not be made behind closed doors and should fully involve the local citizens whose livelihoods would be directly affected by such action.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, I strongly support H.R. 1459, the Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act, sponsored by our colleague from Utah (Mr. BISHOP). This legislation would require public participation before a President can designate a national monument under the Antiquities Act.

Mr. Chairman, let me repeat this last sentence that I gave because this is the heart of the legislation. This legislation would require public participation before a President can designate a national monument under the Antiquities Act.

Over 100 years ago, the Antiquities Act was passed to allow a President to unilaterally designate national monuments without any input or involvement from the people, communities, or elected officials of the areas that would be directly impacted.

However, this authority was intended to be used under narrow circumstances and in emergencies to prevent destruction of a precious place; but unfortunately, we have seen this power abused by Presidents of both parties. It has been used as a tool to score political points, rather than to protect areas facing imminent threat or harm.

National monuments are one of the most restrictive of all land use designations. They can significantly block public access and limit public recreation and other job-creating economic activities.

The American people and their elected leaders deserve to have a say in which of their lands deserve special protections as national monuments and which should, instead, be allowed to contribute to the full range of recreational, conservation, economic, and resource benefits that carefully managed multiple-use lands provide.

H.R. 1459 would guarantee public involvement and ensure that the designation process is transparent by requiring all national monument designa-

tions made under the Antiquities Act to comply with the NEPA process.

Most, if not all, major land use decisions are statutorily required to go through the NEPA process. Designations made by the President should be treated no differently than those other processes.

I will openly state, however, that I—and many of my Republican colleagues—believe that NEPA is a law that should be streamlined and updated. However, this bill is about transparency and ensuring that the public has a voice.

So let me ask the rhetorical question, Mr. Chairman: If my Democrat colleagues believe that the NEPA is a worthwhile law that works and that NEPA is important, why should they oppose making sure that Presidential designations should not go through the same process?

This bill continues to uphold the original intention of the Antiquities Act, which is to allow the President to act in emergency situations. It protects the President’s ability to act if there is an eminent threat to an American antiquity by allowing for a temporary emergency designation of 5,000 acres or less for a 3-year period.

After that time, in order to ensure public participation in the process, the designation would be made permanent if the NEPA process is completed or if it is approved by Congress.

The bill would also limit national monument declarations to no more than one per State during any 4-year Presidential term and prevent the inclusion of private property in monument designations without the prior written consent of the property owners.

National monument designations deserve public input from the people and communities who are directly impacted. This bill is necessary to stop unilateral actions by the President and ensure participation by the American public.

I commend subcommittee Chairman BISHOP for his work on this bill, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, this week, the majority advanced a bill that would block the administration from implementing a stream buffer zone rule intended to protect waterways from the impacts of mountaintop removal coal mining, adding to the list of their attacks on the environment.

House Republicans ignore the fact that Americans want clean water, clean skies, and more—not less—national parks and national monuments because, now, they are forcing a vote on H.R. 1459, a bill that will make it harder for Presidents to create new national monuments, adding layers upon layers of duplicative oversight and unnecessary congressional review.

This is not what our constituents are asking Congress to do. It is simply another attempt by the majority to stall the protection of Federal land.

In its 100-year history, the Antiquities Act has been used by 16 out of 19 Presidents. In fact, Teddy Roosevelt used it to protect the Grand Canyon, and over half our national parks started out as national monuments.

Congress should not be diluting this popular tool or making it more difficult for future Presidents to set land aside and honor our shared history, but that is exactly what this legislation is trying to do.

There are two ways to create a new national monument. Congress can pass a law, or the President can use the Antiquities Act.

As we all know, it is becoming increasingly difficult to pass a law, even for popular bipartisan conservation measures. Bills languish in Congress for years, and the Antiquities Act is often the only way to move some of these projects across the goal line.

The majority will refute this by pointing the finger at the Senate, blaming the other side of the Hill for inaction, and highlighting their own track record of passing bills out of the House.

That is a smokescreen. They have only moved a fraction of the conservation bills sitting before the House. Many do not even get a subcommittee hearing, and some of these proposals have been around for 10 years.

As Democrats, we are very pleased to create new wilderness in the Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore. Don't get me wrong. This is a good legislation; but passing one standalone wilderness bill, one national monument, and one new national park bill in 3 years is not proof that Congress can do the work of conserving land and creating national monuments.

For example, I introduced a bill to establish a national monument in my district that would honor and recognize land considered sacred by Native American communities in the Southwest.

It is an area full of ancient petroglyphs increasingly under threat for looting and vandalism. A national monument designation will ensure that these cultural treasures receive the level of protection that they deserve.

This proposal is supported by the National Congress of American Indians and every tribe in Arizona. Like many of my colleagues with similar national monument proposals, I am unable to get even a hearing on that particular bill.

If the majority is truly concerned about public input or congressional review of national monuments and conservation of Federal land, why don't they consider bills to establish new monuments, parks, heritage areas, or wilderness?

Nearly 100 conservation designation bills have been introduced in the last two Congresses. Four have become law. This track record doesn't prove that we

need more Congressional review. On the contrary.

If the majority is so eager to apply NEPA to the Antiquities Act, why are they trying to limit its scope for other activities on public lands?

In the Natural Resources Committee alone, the majority has considered and advanced measures to limit public review for timber operations, mining activity, and oil and gas leasing.

Following this logic, there is too much review when foreign corporations want to extract American taxpayer-owned natural resources, but not enough when we set aside land for future generations.

House Republicans have attempted to rewrite California water law, undermine the Endangered Species Act, blow up the Stream Buffer Rule, and encourage State and private takeover of Federal lands, a trust owned by all of the American people.

Putting up barriers to Presidential proclamations of national monuments, as envisioned by H.R. 1459, is just another feather in the antienvironmental cap.

H.R. 1459 will set up arbitrary per-State limits on Presidential monument designations and require congressional review of any monument under 5,000 acres. Monuments over 5,000 acres won't have to be approved by Congress, but they will be delayed by a process intended to evaluate the environmental impact on major Federal actions.

I hate to break it to the majority, but conservation and the establishment of national monuments don't have the same footprint as open-pit mines and oil wells.

Republicans want us to believe that this bill is about protecting private property. The Antiquities Act only applies to Federal land—let me repeat, only applies to Federal land.

If there are some concerned about people who have inholdings within that Federal land, why are they standing in the way of Federal land acquisition and depriving those property owners who are willing sellers of the right to sell?

H.R. 1459 is a wasteful and duplicative piece of legislation that will, like most bills passed out of this House, have no chance of ever becoming law.

I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 1459, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the work of the gentleman from Washington and for his yielding time.

You have just heard one view of what the bill does from our friends on the other side of the aisle. I would bring a different view.

Just a couple of months ago, Secretary Jewell visited a city in my district, Las Cruces, with the full intent—my belief—to create a Presidential executive order creating a monument.

Keep in mind, that monument bill could not be passed through this House under Democrat rule. It could not be passed through the Republican-controlled Senate with a Republican sponsor. It could not be passed through the Democrat-controlled Senate when they had a filibuster-proof majority.

Now, then the President is going to come and unilaterally declare almost one-third of a county to be restricted. The West is starving education because of the public ownership of land. Any time you create a monument, you restrict the ability of local economies to survive.

So the first monument—the first wilderness area that was created by Congress is in my district, the Gila National Wilderness, and they are starving for jobs in that entire region. They are asking: When can we have our jobs back?

So the gentleman describes that it is somehow we, as Republicans, objecting. No. All we are saying is that the President needs to live by the same rules as everyone else. The President is not above the law; neither is his Secretary.

This bill is very simple. It is transparent.

□ 1500

It says that the NEPA process is about public involvement. That public involvement is what has scared away both Democrats and Republicans trying to make this 600,000-acre wilderness happen in the 2nd District of New Mexico.

This bill needs to be passed because Washington needs to understand the people own the land.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. I thank my friend and colleague for the time.

Mr. Chair, since Congress passed the Antiquities Act in 1906, both Republican and Democratic Presidents have used the power granted under the act to protect some of our most recognizable, most beloved natural wonders: Grand Teton in Wyoming, Zion in Utah, Olympic in Washington, and the Statue of Liberty. That is a few.

Last week, I had the opportunity to backpack for 7 days in what is the best known and most visited—4.4 million people last year—the Grand Canyon of the United States.

In 1908, Republican President Teddy Roosevelt granted national monument designation for the Grand Canyon under the Antiquities Act, and all but two Presidents since then have used this authority.

At that time, it was critical to protect the Grand Canyon because tremendous development was being proposed, both for tourism purposes and for commercial uses and mining and other issues, so that was an extraordinary step that that President took back then.

Why would we turn back the clock? Why would we strip this President or future Presidents from having this authority to preserve and conserve national treasures when they are indefinitely stalled, as was the Grand Canyon, in the morass of Congress?

It was dysfunctional for a different reason back then; but it is just as dysfunctional or more dysfunctional today as it was back then. There is going to be no protection passing this House easily or freely with this majority in charge.

Now, it is true that there have been some controversial designations, one mentioned previously and earlier by Chairman BISHOP; but I would also note that no one—no one—has proposed legislation to repeal that designation by President Clinton.

If they are so aggrieved and it is so egregious, I wonder why they haven't done that. Perhaps because it enjoys tremendous popular support, except from among a few people.

Now, they say this is about more control. Let's take a look at what they have done with control. Over the last 4 years, the Republican majority has proposed legislation to sell off public lands.

They have passed multiple bills that would open our public lands, virtually unregulated, as of yesterday, to mountaintop removal, mineral, and energy extraction. They shut down access to our national parks because of their stupid government shutdown last fall, and they found out that wasn't too popular.

Then they held a hearing to find out why the parks were shut down when the government was shut down. Look in the mirror, guys. That is why the parks were shut down. They found out that the parks and these monuments enjoyed tremendous support from the American people.

There have been 89 conservation bills introduced from both sides of the aisle in this House in the last two Congresses, and only four of the 89 have become law. This Republican majority is genuinely openly hostile to conservation designations; yet, today, they are pretending that they actually really care about these iconic places, and they are just making a couple little changes to the law to include more public input.

You know, I have an experience from the Clinton administration for the Steens Mountains in Oregon. We only got it done because President Clinton and Secretary Babbitt said: we are going to make that a monument.

Now, we don't have as much flexibility in designation, but if you would legislate something, we will work with you.

We had a meeting in my office with the Republican Senator, a Republican Member from Oregon, myself, a couple of other Members came in and out, and the Secretary, and we hammered out a bill to protect the Steens Mountains in Oregon, and it passed on a bipartisan basis in a Republican Congress, with a

Republican House and a Republican Senate. Unfortunately, those are the old days.

As I said earlier, 16 out of 19 Presidents have used this power. Teddy Roosevelt said it best, I think, about the Grand Canyon, that we should:

Let this great wonder of nature remain as it now is. Do nothing to mar its grandeur, sublimity, and loveliness. You cannot improve on it, but what you can do is to keep it for your children, your children's children, and all who come after you, as the one great sight which every American should see.

Today, the majority here would undo the potential for future legacies under the Antiquities Act.

Just one side note: Chairman BISHOP made much of talking about, in a Dear Colleague letter, that there was a provision in legislation, of which I was a sponsor, critical and unique to my State, designating the O&C lands, and he said it precludes new monument designations.

Yes, he is right. That was in there at the insistence of the Republican majority. I would have been happy to take it out, but I will cut him a deal. I would be happy to negotiate.

He voted for that bill, but it also includes 1.2 million acres of old growth preservation, 90,000 acres of wilderness, 300,000 acres of riparian set-asides, and 150 miles of wild and scenic designations.

If he will fully support those conservation provisions in my bill, I will, perhaps, negotiate with them, that they could say: well, we won't do any more monuments in that area because we have already had a massive conservation victory.

But that is why it is in the bill. They insisted, not me. Let's not create phony arguments here.

With that, I urge my colleagues to reject this horrible legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. AMODEI).

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Chairman, it is nice to see that the assault on the authority of this branch continues. It is sad that it continues from within, and it is interesting to hear westerners talk about issues that are particularly acute in Western lands.

I happen to hail from a State that is 87 percent owned by the Federal Government. The key word there is "owned."

If you want to protect natural resources that are Federal—which, by the way, this law takes into account—the Federal Government already owns them. You do not have enough authority by virtue of ownership interest over the last 110 years, almost, to protect things? Things have not changed.

I have heard criticism about the mining reform law of 1874 from my colleagues. Here is something from 1906, and it is like, if you can't protect it by being the owner, as the Federal Government—under the land management auspices of multiple Federal land use

agencies, I am wondering why—and I heard somebody say these areas enjoy tremendous support of the people—what is the problem with allowing the people to participate in the process of monument designation?

Why is it awful for these people who want these areas, want to enjoy them, to say, hey, you know, we are thinking of making a monument of this, and even though you control it by virtue of ownership and countless regs? We want to use the regulation that applies to that, to let the people who enjoy them so much participate in the process. We want to cede all authority to the executive branch because we happen to disagree on some things?

Let me tell you, as a member of the Republican side of the aisle who has been advocating for the creation of 96,000 acres of wilderness in a bipartisan context with my colleague from Nevada—which I can't get through yet. I am frustrated too.

I fail to see the harm in allowing the people that so much appreciate these Federal lands to participate in their further designation, adding another layer of administration, as monuments.

Let's, please, defend our authority as this branch, and let's support this bill.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 1459. This bill is a solution in search of a problem. The reference to public participation in the name of the bill implies that there is a complete lack of public input in the process of designating these monuments, that these designations are dropping abruptly and arbitrarily out of the White House.

I will tell you, as the Representative of the newest national monument in the country, that is just not the case.

Before President Obama added Point Arena-Stornetta Public Lands to the California Coastal National Monument, literally, the entire community in that area that I represent, all of the interested stakeholders were not only engaged, they had been engaged for several years.

That includes everyone from the business community, local tribes, conservation groups, and local governments, to schoolchildren in the area. There was no opposition to this proposal.

People came out to public meetings, and that included a public workshop that Secretary Sally Jewell had herself. She came out to the area. I assure you, there was no shortage of public input, no shortage of public participation, so this premise that there is a lack—an absence of public participation is, at least in my experience, totally false.

But so is the political narrative behind this bill, this idea that President Obama has somehow overreached in his exercise of executive authority. In fact,

President Obama has been much more judicious than many of his predecessors in deciding when to designate these monuments.

Prior to this President, 16 Presidents from both parties have used this authority under the Antiquities Act over the course of more than a century, and that ranges from President Roosevelt's designation of the Grand Canyon to 140,000 square miles of marine monument that were designated around Hawaii by President George W. Bush.

By comparison to his predecessors, President Obama has been very sparing in using the Antiquities Act, and he and his Cabinet have been very careful to bring the public in and to be very transparent, so the narrative about executive overreach is also false.

Limiting the Antiquities Act, as this bill would do—and I want to emphasize this—will harm jobs and economic growth; and in the case of my district, in Mendocino County, the community understood that one of the reasons for broad support of this monument designation is that the community understood it was good not just for the environment, but good for the economy.

The travel and tourism industry is one of Mendocino County's biggest industries, bringing in over \$300 million annually, and everybody understood that this monument designation was going to significantly boost that part of our economy; and it is going to happen now, this summer, thanks to what President Obama did.

So why should a community like Mendocino County wait on a monument designation, especially in a situation like this, where there was no opposition to the proposal? No one is saying that Congress shouldn't play a role in protecting our public lands.

It is important to note that bills to protect this part of the Mendocino coast were introduced first more than 2 years ago, so the 112th Congress had a full chance at it.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the gentleman from California an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, we know that Congress can be slow, that there are uncertainties in the process of moving through Congress.

The question is: Why, in the case of something like this, when there is no opposition, all these economic benefits, should my district or any other district have to wait for this critically important designation?

I think we should be very careful about repealing a bill that has stood the test of time and worked well for both Democrats and Republicans for more than a century, and I request a "no" vote on H.R. 1459.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 2 minutes now to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART), a former member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank my good friend

and, really, one of my heroes, Congressman BISHOP of Utah, for bringing attention to, I think, this very important topic, especially one to my home State of Utah.

To my friends across the aisle, I think you have to twist yourselves into pretzels in order to object to this bill. In 1996, nearly 2 million acres in the heart of my district were locked up in the creation of the Grand Staircase-Escalante National Monument—nearly 2 million acres.

It was the largest national monument created in the history of the United States. This massive monument was created with a stroke of the President's pen, without any consultation, without even notice given to the local population, no phone calls, no conversations, nothing.

The President didn't even have the courage to step into my State when he created this monument. He stood on the Arizona border and said: I create a national monument over there.

If the President desires to create new large national monuments, surely he can believe that conducting a thorough environmental analysis is a good thing. NEPA was specifically designed to mandate that Federal agencies stop and think about proposed actions and make sure that those actions are appropriate.

It also mandates that all of those who are impacted by that decision would have sufficient information and approval. If the creation of a national monument is a good idea, shouldn't the monuments have to undergo public scrutiny?

□ 1515

And if the President can take 5 years—5 years and counting—to approve, say, the Keystone pipeline, can't we take an appropriate amount of consideration before we create another massive monument? That is what democracy is all about. That is all that this bill asks for.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is reminded not to engage in personalities toward the President.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 15 seconds to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member.

Mr. DEFAZIO. To the previous speaker and others who have complained about Grand Staircase-Escalante, you could introduce a bill to repeal it. Why don't you?

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), one of my classmates.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I join in support of this bill not just because it is about amendments and the importance of public input, but ultimately because it is about two central tenets that the Founding Fathers laid out that I think are important to both Republicans and Democrats alike.

Quite simply, their belief was that three, four, or five perspectives were

always better than one. They didn't want to see unilateral action, they didn't want to see a king, and the idea of overstepping on that front was contrary to what they set up; and secondly, that the individual was to be the sole repository of power in our political system and that any government had legitimacy only inasmuch as there was consent by the governed. And what you see with many of these monument-type activities is no consent by the locally governed.

So I very much believe in land conservation and have been an advocate for a long time, but I believe in a process that prescribes to that which the Constitution laid out necessary in that process.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Maryland (Ms. EDWARDS).

Ms. EDWARDS. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to join my colleagues in opposition to H.R. 1459, the Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act. It sounds good, but it should be known as the "Preventing New Parks Act."

This bill would severely restrict this and any future President's authority to establish a national monument, eliminating a crucial part of our Nation's conservation strategy. In this current poisonous climate, the majority has made it nearly impossible for Congress to conserve land for future generations using the legislative process. This past Congress, in fact, was the first since World War II to not protect a single acre of land as a national park, monument, or wilderness area—not one single acre.

Just last year, there was a significant bipartisan effort on the part of the President and others to designate the Harriet Tubman National Historical Parks Act, of which I am an original cosponsor, but that bill failed to even make it out of the committee—with public support and with family support, failed to make it out of committee. Just yesterday, we celebrated the first anniversary of the Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad National Monument located in my State of Maryland and designated as a national monument by President Obama using his authority under the Antiquities Act.

I was in the Oval Office with the descendants of Harriet Tubman and the people of that community who had been working for years for this designation. I saw what it meant to the community. They believed that it meant economic development, also.

Had H.R. 1459 been passed a year ago, this monument to a national hero would probably be stuck in the arbitrary hurdles and redundant research this bill proposes.

National monuments are an important part of telling our American story, and yet, currently, only 26 of our Nation's 460 national parks have a primary focus on African Americans, and

just eight are dedicated to women. That includes the Harriet Tubman Park.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the gentlelady an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. EDWARDS. Rather than rolling back the President's ability to preserve both our national history and our natural heritage, we should be encouraging this and future administrations to continue to work for the common good—for the public good—that this necessary preservation work entails.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this restrictive bill, and I urge a "no" vote on the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, before I yield to my colleague from Wyoming, I want to address what the previous speaker mentioned. She was talking about the Tubman bill.

Had this bill that we are debating here today been in effect, we wouldn't have had the problem with the Tubman issue right now. The Tubman issue was designated as a national monument, but it didn't go through the local process, and as a result—as a result of that—there are flaws in that designation. Thus, the bill that the gentlelady from Maryland is introducing is to correct the flaws that were put in place because of the monument designation.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentlelady from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, the State of Wyoming is exempt from the Antiquities Act. I don't know if you knew there is any State that is exempt from the Antiquities Act.

In 1950, when Grand Teton National Park and the Jackson Hole National Monument were combined, lawmakers and President Truman exempted Wyoming from further congressional designations. Now 48 percent of Wyoming is Federal land. We have the first national park, the first national forest, and the first national monument. We have nine total national forests and one national grassland within our State borders. Yet, without having to comply with the Antiquities Act, we created the national migratory bird refuge in Wyoming, which is a massive area that happened with local input.

You don't need the Antiquities Act as it exists to continue to create Federal designations. They can be done with local and State input, which is exactly what this bill will allow. If there are additional unique and special designations necessary, they should go through the congressional process and not be usurped by unilateral Presidential powers.

This is 2014. We are not back in the era when Presidents needed to designate areas that were at risk of being degraded. The ethic of a nation for conservation has come far beyond that. Let's adapt our laws to the morality and the ethics of the times. Let's pass this bill and give people involvement in decisions that are made in their States.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Delaware (Mr. CARNEY).

Mr. CARNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to join my colleagues in opposition to H.R. 1459. This bill will clearly undermine the Antiquities Act, one of our country's most important environmental and historic preservation tools, and one that has been critical to protecting beautiful land in my home State of Delaware.

Currently, Delaware is the only State in the Union without a national park. That means that every summer as families flip through the guidebooks of national parks and search through the Internet for outdoor vacation ideas, Delaware is not on the map, except, of course, for our beautiful beaches. The good news is that, last year, the Antiquities Act helped fix this problem. It allowed for the creation of the First State National Monument, including the historic Woodlawn property, through a process that involved broad public input and public participation.

The Woodlawn property is 1,100 historic acres spanning the border of Delaware and Pennsylvania. It had been privately owned and used for public recreation for over 100 years and was about to be sold, potentially leading to extensive residential development. In response to considerable public outcry about the possible loss of this great property, a private foundation, the Mt. Cuba Center, stepped in with an incredibly generous donation of more than \$20 million to protect the property for future generations. Given the various limitations related to the management and transfer of the property, the Antiquities Act provided the right path for us to move quickly with plenty of public input to ensure that the monument effectively represented our community's goals.

As part of this process, we held over a dozen public meetings on the creation of the monument, including a hearing attended by the National Park Service Director Jon Jarvis and hundreds of Delawareans and Pennsylvanians who expressed strong support for the protection of the Woodlawn property. The First State National Monument continues to enjoy virtually unanimous, enthusiastic support from all stakeholders in our community, including colleagues on the other side of the aisle representing districts in Pennsylvania.

The provisions in this bill under consideration today would have jeopardized this process, and we may not have been able to realize the tremendous gift.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. CARNEY. I thank the gentleman for the additional time.

Teddy Roosevelt, a Republican President, a great outdoorsman, and a lover of nature, said this about the impor-

ance of protecting our national treasures. He said:

It is not what we have that will make us a great nation; it is the way in which we use it.

Let's continue our Nation's tradition of protecting our public lands in a way that reflects the greatness of our Nation. I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time remains on both sides?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington has 16 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Arizona has 9¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, at this point, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1459, the "No More National Monuments Act." I have experienced the Antiquities Act firsthand through my community's efforts and success in establishing Fort Monroe as a national monument in November of 2011.

The history of Fort Monroe is older than the history of the United States, and the story of Fort Monroe is really the story of our Nation. Fort Monroe is also known as "Freedom's Fortress," witnessing both the beginning and the end of slavery in our Nation, and it played a crucial role in nearly every military engagement right up to its closure in 2005. After its closure, the city of Hampton and the entire Hampton Roads region united in support for the inclusion of Fort Monroe in the National Park System.

The creation of Fort Monroe National Monument was the culmination of years of hard work led by then-Hampton Mayor Molly Ward, the citizens of Hampton, conservation and historic preservation groups, Hampton's City Council, Virginia's Governor, and Virginia's congressional delegation. These parties worked together at the local, State, and Federal level to urge the President to use his powers under the Antiquities Act to take immediate action to establish Fort Monroe as a national monument.

While I supported legislation introduced by my neighboring colleague, Congressman SCOTT RIGELL, to enshrine Fort Monroe as part of the National Parks System, this bill stalled in committee and was never given a proper hearing. Without the President's statutory authority to protect this land, it is doubtful that Fort Monroe and the history of the site would be protected as it is today.

Mr. Chairman, had the underlying bill been law in 2011 when President Obama designated Fort Monroe as a national monument, we would be nearing the 3-year approval deadline included in this bill, and the powerful role that Fort Monroe played in our Nation's history would be in danger of

being lost to future generations as the legislation to authorize the President's designation lingered in committee.

While this legislation has been introduced to promote more public participation in the designation process, in my experience, the administration, including the President and the Secretary of the Interior, both went to great lengths to make sure that public input was a top priority in the decision to designate Fort Monroe as a national monument. This legislation, should it become law, would jeopardize the ability of other communities to protect sensitive Federal lands in their areas the same way that my community was able to do.

Mr. Chairman, for these reasons, I oppose the passage of H.R. 1459, and I hope other Members will oppose the legislation as well.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

□ 1530

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, it is with great disappointment that I come to the floor today in opposition to this attempt by my Republican colleagues to undermine the Antiquities Act, a law that has resulted in the protection and preservation of some of our Nation's most cherished lands. The Grand Canyon, Zion National Park, the Cesar Chavez National Monument, and many more have all been protected under the Antiquities Act by Presidents of both parties.

This issue hits close to home for me and my constituents. Last March, President Obama designated the Rio Grande del Norte in northern New Mexico as a national monument under the Antiquities Act. The result was years of work and the community coming together to find consensus on a path forward that respects our traditions and respects our culture. Protecting the Rio Grande del Norte had broad support and a strong coalition worked with the administration and Secretary Salazar to show that protecting this land needed to be a top priority. Whether it is for recreation, farming, or sustaining a way of life, the Rio Grande del Norte impacts all those who visit and all those who live off the sustenance it provides.

It is one of the crown jewels of our State, and if it were not for the Antiquities Act, this majestic land that represents our culture and drives the local economy would not have received the protections that will ensure its vitality for future generations. This attack on the Antiquities Act is an attack on the preservation of lands that are a part of who we are, our rich history as a diverse Nation, and our ability to enjoy these lands in the future. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I ask my friend from Arizona how many more speakers he has.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I have one more speaker, and then I will close.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for allowing me the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1459 because it could have severe unintended consequences for the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey, which I represent.

This is yet once again an attack on the President's authority, but in this case, H.R. 1459 would create unnecessary obstacles regarding the President's ability to conserve lands and protect our country's most notable destinations.

The Antiquities Act has been used to protect a site in my district that commemorates the outstanding achievements of a great American inventor, Thomas Edison. This great innovator produced many of the inventions loved across the world—silent and sound motion pictures, the motion picture camera, phonographs, and the electric storage battery.

For more than 40 years, Thomas Edison's laboratory complex located in West Orange, New Jersey, was cranking out innovation after innovation. The laboratory employed at one time over 100 people, working on various projects from chemistry to physics to metallurgy.

In 1956, President Dwight D. Eisenhower used his authority under the Antiquities Act to establish the Edison Laboratory as a national monument. One year prior, in 1955, Congress had established Thomas Edison's home as a national historic site. Six years later, the Edison National Historic Site legislation combined the two into a unit of the National Park System.

Recently, the laboratory complex underwent an extensive renovation and had a grand reopening in 2009 to welcome America to explore two new floors of the laboratory that were previously closed to the public. The museum collections at Thomas Edison National Historical Park are by far the largest single body of Edison-related material in existence, and it is the third largest museum collection in the National Park Service.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. PAYNE. I don't believe Thomas Edison would appreciate this partisan bill which could turn out the lights on our future national monuments that honor innovators such as him.

I ask my colleagues to vote "no" on H.R. 1459.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the sponsor of this legislation.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, as I said on the rule, sometimes I am

amazed at the kind of misinformation and inaccuracy that is taking place about this bill. This bill does not stop parks. It does not stop monuments. We have heard about the Grand Canyon being made a monument under this act, under this power, but please realize it was a national forest before that, and it was made a park by Congress because only Congress can make parks.

The gentleman from Delaware, I appreciate him being here, he still has his park because only Congress can go through that particular process.

I also get somewhat confused when people talk about how this is a way of rolling back any kind of protection. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government owns over 635 million acres. We already have 336 million acres that presently are in a protected status. There is no way they can be touched by anyone at any time for anything. And those that are for development are only 38 million acres. It is almost a 10 to 1 ratio between the two of them.

I want you to think back on when the Antiquities Act was originally passed. It was 1906. The States of Hawaii, Alaska, New Mexico, Arizona, and Oklahoma did not exist. They were all territories. My home State had only been in the Union for a decade. There were very few environmental laws. Today, if you were to list all of the environmental protections that we have on the statutes, both by the Federal Government and by the States, it would take four or five pages, small type, just to list them all. There could have been a reason for doing this. This is back in the era when there was no Bureau of Land Management. There was not even a Park Service when this was being done. The majority of the designations Teddy Roosevelt made were in territories that were not States. Things have changed since that time. Unfortunately, this law hasn't.

And if you don't allow the NEPA process to allow public input, you make mistakes. You made mistakes in Utah—and, yes, we have had bills that have been filibustered by the Senate to make those changes, but 20 years later we are still trying to work through what ought to have been there.

The gentelady from Maryland was here, and I appreciate her concept. Her Harriet Tubman national monument is a good idea. The unfortunate thing is it was poorly done because you didn't take the time to go through the NEPA process and get some public input. It is still in draft status. This is the boundary within the green. The stuff with the stripes on it are private property they just kind of found within the boundary that now they have to try to get approval to try to acquire that property. The white is also other private property that right now they don't think they need to acquire.

Now, how come we missed all that stuff? It is simply because the President decided to use the Antiquities power without taking the time to get public input to go through those situations.

Yes, a lot of Presidents have used this stuff.

One other thing, too. The proclamation that created Harriet Tubman said there would be 11,750 acres set aside. The Park Service says it is actually 25,000, and no one knows the difference—25,000 acres of Federal, State and private lands. See, that is the problem. If you rush this stuff through without taking the time to get input from people, you make mistakes.

Don't make mistakes.

The National Resources Defense Council said that NEPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, which regulates the requirement to have public input before you go forward with that, held that the Magna Carta protects people from the dangers of monarchy, and NEPA protects people by providing transparency in Federal projects. Both the Magna Carta and NEPA espouse the ideals of public participation and democracy by giving citizens a voice in government decisions.

Giving people the chance to have a voice in government decisions is the purpose of NEPA. Every Federal agency has to use NEPA. Congress has to do something very similar because everything requires some kind of hearing. The only person that doesn't have to do that is the President when he uses this archaic act, over 100 years old, in situations that have changed.

Instead, what was said about this in some of the misinformation going out, they said if this bill is passed, it eviscerates one of the America's bedrock conservation laws. Look, you can't say it is good to have public involvement except here, in which it is bad to have public involvement. Unfortunately, that is exactly what the administration said. The administration said the President should not have to go through NEPA, should not have to get public input because he is only head of the executive branch, he is not an agency of the executive branch. That is intellectual gymnastics, and one of the reasons why we have problems.

This bill doesn't stop anything. Any monument that was made could easily be made. This bill recognizes there may be an emergency situation, and anything less than 5,000 acres can be done.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, what I was trying to say was, this is a damn good bill. And there is a reason why it is a good bill: because it simply requires the President to have public information and get the input of people.

If there is an emergency situation, it allows for them to create something under 5,000 acres on an emergency basis without doing NEPA, it is just that Congress has to respond within 3 years to validate it, otherwise it reverts back. Anything that he wants to do with NEPA, he can do it regardless of

the size. It is the appropriate thing to do.

This bill moves us forward and takes a bill that may have been appropriate in 1906—but we are certainly living in a different time and a different era, and we need to make sure that a President, before he puts his pen to a paper, has actually talked to local people, and it has not always happened.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me just say that at the direction of the Republican leadership, this House has approved a remarkable series of anti-environmental bills in this Congress. While conservation bills languish and are stalled in Congress, we have seen time and time again House Republicans vote to deregulate mining, make drilling on public lands less safe, prevent Federal regulation of fracking, open virtually the entire coast of the United States to unsafe drilling offshore, give away precious public lands, override State and local water laws, and just yesterday, weaken existing limits on dumping coal mining waste in streams and rivers.

In the last 6 years, 7.4 million acres of public lands have been leased for oil and gas drilling; only 2.9 million protected for the future legacy and conservation, for the future use of the public and this Nation. That imbalance is directly the responsibility of a lack of action by this Congress.

Each of these measures were not only poor public policy, but also poor use of our time. They were, thankfully, dead on arrival in the Senate. This bill, H.R. 1459, is simply another bill in this series of deeply flawed proposals, and it will rightly suffer an identical fate.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a couple of points. It is pretty hard to follow-up on what the author of the legislation did, talking about the history of this legislation and why there needs to be some changes. I thought he did that in a very, very good way.

My friends on the other side of the aisle, at least the previous speaker, but also others, have mentioned about different pieces of legislation that we have passed out. I understand that they are probably in opposition to having more exploration, making us less energy dependent with offshore legislation, with onshore legislation, and so forth.

But, Mr. Chairman, what wasn't said in that argument was that in every case, in every case the legislation that the gentleman lamented that we passed, we had a hearing in the committee. We had a hearing and went through the normal legislative process. When you look at what the intent of this legislation is all about, it is simply to have a hearing with consultation and transparency with those that are affected, nothing more. You may not like it, but at least you have that transparency.

Several Members said we haven't passed national park legislation in several years, and that is true. There is some pending, and obviously we hope to have that done by the end. But this point needs to be made, too. The National Park Service, by their own admission, has over a \$10 billion backlog in maintenance. Shouldn't we, as the keeper of the taxpayers' purse, look at that and say before we rush on some of this, let's make sure that we can afford to maintain whatever is going to be ensuing next.

Finally, let me make an observation about my colleague from California, from Mendocino County, Mr. HUFFMAN. He was saying that his community was very in favor of that monument designation that is going to happen, I guess, later on this year.

□ 1545

I don't think the gentleman, however, mentioned that that precise piece of legislation, which was H.R. 1411, passed this House on a voice vote. In other words, there is no need to make a monument designation for that because this House had determined that it was the right thing to do.

The problem is the Senate hasn't moved on that piece of legislation; so, on the one hand, they say we haven't passed legislation, and when we do, the President steps in and, I think, overstates his authority on the Antiquities Act.

I am sorry. Before I close, I did have another speaker. I apologize to my friend. If the gentleman wants to take more time, I will give him more time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE).

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my friend from Washington for yielding and for bringing this bill forward.

We are seeing an abuse of the Antiquities Act where you have got a President using this law to shut off more areas of Federal land to things like energy exploration. That is not what this law was intended to do.

In fact, I think, if you look at the reforms that are included in this law, they are very good and responsible in ensuring that a President still has the ability to designate monuments where appropriate, one in each State for a Presidential term.

If there is some monument that warrants being designated a national monument, that opportunity is still there. You just have to come and talk to Congress.

I know this President has a hard time working with Congress, but we are right here. He talks about he has got a pen and a phone. Pick up the phone, Mr. President.

You can call us, and if it makes sense, we are going to work with you to get it done; but don't abuse the Antiquities Act to go and cordon off Federal land, so that we can't explore for energy and for other great resource needs.

I think it is important that we finally put the brakes on this Presidential land grab that we are seeing.

I encourage all my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I want to, again, make the point there of my colleague from California (Mr. HUFFMAN). He had a bill that passed the House and is pending in the Senate.

There is no need for the President to go through this. All you have to do is pass the legislation which, by the way, had a hearing and was marked up properly in our committee.

This piece of legislation, I think, is a good piece of legislation. I think it corrects abuses that have happened by the way of Presidents in both parties over the years.

I ask my colleagues to support the legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Chair, today I rise in opposition to H.R. 1459.

Exactly one year ago yesterday, the President designated 970 acres of land in my district as the San Juan National Monument. This designation came after years of grassroots work and outreach to create a consensus plan to protect these critically important areas.

It came only because Congress failed to act on that consensus. I know, because I tried to get Congress to act and it didn't happen.

In both the 112th and 113th Congress, I introduced legislation that would have protected these lands in a nearly identical way to the National Monument designation. Unfortunately, those bills stalled because of ideological opposition to conservation.

In the part of the country I represent, people know that conservation isn't just good for the environment, it's good for business. The San Juans and the water around them are home to diverse wildlife from the Island Marble Butterfly to the Southern Resident Killer Whales.

Because of that diversity, they are an economic engine for Northwest Washington that attracts thousands of tourists each year. Every year, fishermen, hunters, tourists, boaters, hikers, snowboarders, and tourists spend millions throughout my state. They come for the natural beauty and abundant outdoor activities we have to offer.

If we do not protect those resources, we lose that business. For many rural areas, outdoor recreation is the driver of the economy.

Unfortunately, this Congress has handcuffed itself when it comes to protecting public lands. And this legislation would handcuff the President and prevent him from providing that protection. I suppose the idea is that the President should follow our bad example. I disagree with that.

Instead of stopping the President from doing his job, we should start doing ours.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 1459

*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 "Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act".

#### SEC. 2. NEPA APPLICABILITY TO NATIONAL MONUMENT DECLARATIONS.

Section 2 of the Act of June 8, 1906 (16 U.S.C. 431; commonly known as the "Antiquities Act of 1906") is amended—

(1) by striking "That the President" and inserting the following:

"(a) That the President";

(2) by striking "discretion, to declare" and inserting "discretion, subject to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), to declare";

(3) by inserting before the final period the following ". No more than one declaration shall be made in a State during any presidential four-year term of office without an express Act of Congress"; and

(4) by adding at the end the following:

"(b) A declaration under this section shall—

"(1) not include private property without the informed written consent of the owner of the private property affected by the declaration;

"(2) be considered a major Federal action under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), if it affects more than 5,000 acres;

"(3) be categorically excluded under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and expire three years after the date of the declaration (unless specifically designated as a monument by Federal law), if it affects 5,000 acres or less; and

"(4) be followed by a feasibility study that includes an estimate of the costs associated with managing the monument in perpetuity, including any loss of Federal and State revenue, which shall be submitted to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate and made available on the website of the Department of the Interior not later than one year after the date of the declaration.".

The CHAIR. No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 113-385. Each such amendment may be offered 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, 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. BISHOP OF UTAH

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 113-385.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, beginning on line 6, strike "if it affects more than 5,000 acres;" and insert "except if it affects 5,000 acres or less, in which case—

"(A) the declaration shall be categorically excluded from the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969;

"(B) the declaration shall expire three years after the date of the declaration; and

"(C) the declaration may become permanent if—

"(i) specifically designated as a monument by Federal statute; or

"(ii) the President follows the review process under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969; and

Page 4, strike lines 8 through 13.

Page 4, line 14, strike "(4)" and insert "(3)".

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

#### SEC. 3. USE OF EXISTING FUNDS.

This Act shall not be construed to increase the amount of funds that are authorized to be appropriated for any fiscal year.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, this amendment tries to clarify the process for monument designations of 5,000 acres or less, providing that they can become permanent if the President follows the regular NEPA public involvement process.

There was a question on the clarity of the language in the underlying bill that is there.

It also ensures that new taxpayer dollars are spent by requiring the use of existing funds to conduct any study or analysis that is in the bill or may be added by an amendment.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HASTINGS).

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I think his amendment adds to this legislation, and I support his amendment.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, we are not really sure what this amendment is trying to achieve. If the underlying goal of the bill is to make sure that every national monument designation goes through a NEPA process or is approved by Congress, this amendment makes things more confusing.

The amendment states that all monuments established through the use of the Antiquities Act shall expire after 3 years. It goes on to say that they may become permanent if the President follows the review process under NEPA.

Does this mean the President could declare the designation a categorical exclusion? If so, what is the point of the amendment? Does that mean the administration has to file an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement? Can they just issue a finding of no significant impact?

Again, the amendment does nothing to fix or clarify the underlying bill. I oppose the legislation and the adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, just to respond one more time, the purpose of this is to make sure that it was



very clear on those emergency situations that were 5,000 or less. If, indeed, the President uses the NEPA process, that 3-year clock does not tick on all those parcels of property. Anything that he does NEPA process, that is okay.

It was not clear in the underlying bill. This attempts to make it clear.

With that, I encourage adoption of the managers' amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BARBER

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 113-385.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 4, line 17, after "revenue," insert "and the benefits associated with managing the monument in perpetuity, including jobs created and tourism dollars associated with managing the monument,".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. BARBER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 1459, the Ensuring Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act.

Under this bill, national monument declarations must include a feasibility study that assesses the costs to the Federal Government to manage the monument in perpetuity. However, costs of managing the monument are only one side of the equation.

As all Arizonans know well, national monuments, like Chiricahua and the Casa Grande Ruins, also bring significant benefits, such as tourism dollars, that create jobs and stimulate local economies. These benefits are real.

Travel and tourism is a major economic driver in Arizona, bringing in millions of dollars to the part of the State that I represent—southern Arizona—and billions of dollars in direct spending statewide.

The same is true for national monuments all across the country. Communities near national monuments would testify to the economic benefits of their national monuments.

My amendment is simple and straightforward. This amendment says that, in addition to assessing the costs associated with managing a monument, we should also look at the many benefits that result from the establishment of a national monument.

Doing so will ensure that Congress and the American people have a thorough and complete picture of how a monument will impact local communities.

This is a commonsense amendment that will not add additional costs to the bill.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I wish to claim the time in opposition, even though I am not opposed to the amendment.

The CHAIR. Without objection, the gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I think what the Barber amendment does is reemphasize the fundamental purpose of this bill, which is to ensure there is transparent public participation and input in making these types of designations.

I appreciate the addition he has made as to what should be studied and what should be encompassed. I think it an addition to the bill. I think it is a good amendment. I would urge its adoption.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BARBER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 113-385.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

**SEC. 3. APPLICABILITY.**

The amendments made by this Act shall not apply to any use of section 2 of the Act of June 8, 1906 (16 U.S.C. 431; commonly known of as the "Antiquities Act of 1906") the purpose of which is the protection or conservation of historic or cultural resources related to American military history.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 524, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, the underlying bill presented before us today is problematic for many reasons, as my Democratic colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee have very clearly outlined on the floor this afternoon.

The Antiquities Act has served our country for well over 100 years and has been used by 16 Presidents to designate over 140 national monuments, many of them protecting American military heritage.

To date, Presidents and Congress have designated 22 military sites as national monuments. One of the many unintended consequences of this legislation is that it would prevent the President from protecting important military cultural and historical sites under the Antiquities Act.

As someone who grew up on military bases both across the country and overseas, I know firsthand the tremendous sacrifices that our servicemembers and their families make on behalf of our Nation.

My father was a survivor of the attack on Pearl Harbor, and the World War II Valor in the Pacific National Monument is just one example of a monument that was designated by Presidential authority under the Antiquities Act.

My amendment preserves the ability of the President to declare as national monuments those that provide for the "protection or conservation of historic or cultural resources related to American military history," regardless of their size.

I urge adoption of this amendment to maintain the President's ability to honor our military and military families and fix one small piece of this misguided legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I claim opposition to the misguided amendment to the well-proportioned bill that is under there.

I appreciate what the gentlewoman from Massachusetts is trying to do. I am an old history teacher, so these sites are important to me.

But as well-intended as this amendment may indeed be, it still undermines the intent of the legislation, which is to make sure that any designation that is at large has public transparency, and you allow the local people to do it, whether it is a military site or not.

This would create a very large loophole that is unnecessary because the provisions of the bill provide for that. If something is smaller than 5,000 and in immediate jeopardy, it can be handled.

If it is larger than that and goes through the NEPA process, it is handled. There is no problem that could develop from this particular piece of legislation.

I might also add that, in the Antiquities Act, any harm to anything that is an antiquity of element on a public property already is subject to fine and imprisonment.

This amendment was attempted in committee—I appreciate the sentiment—but it was also defeated in committee by a vote of 24-13. It is the same amendment here.

I would urge my colleagues to also defeat it, simply because it undermines the very purpose of this bill, and it does not lead to the public process.

With that, Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for his remarks, but I respectfully disagree.

As we know, yet again to reiterate, the Antiquities Act has served our

country well for over 100 years, has been used by Presidents, both Democratic and Republican, to designate over 150 national monuments.

It was created to allow swift action to conserve high priority public lands when Congress is unable to act. It was not the intention of the Antiquities Act to let Congress dictate which national monuments the President can and cannot create.

We have heard from our colleagues from Delaware and New Mexico the robust public input around designating the Antiquities Act. Presidential actions taken under the Antiquities Act are, like all other Presidential actions, exempt from the NEPA process.

It would be a radical departure from long practice to subject Presidential action to NEPA. A significant change like this should not be considered on the fly in a manager's amendment without prior debate in the House.

□ 1600

Again, the underlying intent of this amendment was to protect military monuments. I respectfully disagree with my colleague across the aisle.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts will be postponed.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 113-385 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 3 by Ms. TSONGAS of Massachusetts.

#### AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

#### RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 197, noes 223, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 145]

AYES—197

Barber	Green, Gene	Owens
Barrow (GA)	Grijalva	Pallone
Bass	Gutiérrez	Pascrell
Beatty	Hahn	Pastor (AZ)
Becerra	Hanabusa	Paulsen
Bera (CA)	Hanna	Payne
Bishop (GA)	Hastings (FL)	Pelosi
Bishop (NY)	Heck (WA)	Perlmutter
Blumenauer	Higgins	Peters (CA)
Bonamici	Himes	Peters (MI)
Brady (PA)	Holt	Peterson
Braley (IA)	Honda	Pingree (ME)
Brown (FL)	Horsford	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Hoyer	Polis
Bustos	Huffman	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Israel	Quigley
Capps	Jackson Lee	Rahall
Capuano	Jeffries	Rangel
Carney	Johnson (GA)	Reichert
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Cartwright	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Castor (FL)	Keating	Ruiz
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Chu	Kennedy	Rush
Cicilline	Kildee	Ryan (OH)
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Sánchez, Linda
Clarke (NY)	Kind	T.
Clay	Kirkpatrick	Sanchez, Loretta
Cleaver	Kuster	Sarbanes
Clyburn	Langevin	Schakowsky
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Conyers	Lee (CA)	Schrader
Cooper	Levin	Scott (VA)
Costa	Lewis	Scott, David
Crowley	Lipinski	Serrano
Cuellar	Loebbeck	Sewell (AL)
Cummings	Loftgren	Shea-Porter
Davis (CA)	Lowenthal	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Lowey	Sinema
DeFazio	Lujan Grisham	Sires
DeGette	(NM)	Slaughter
Delaney	Luján, Ben Ray	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	(NM)	Speier
Dent	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	Maffei	Takano
Dingell	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Carolin	Thompson (MS)
Doyle	Maloney, Sean	Tierney
Edwards	Matsui	Titus
Ellison	McCollum	Tonko
Engel	McDermott	Tsongas
Enyart	McGovern	Van Hollen
Eshoo	McIntyre	Vargas
Esty	McNerney	Veasey
Farr	Meeks	Vela
Fattah	Meng	Velázquez
Fitzpatrick	Michaud	Visclosky
Foster	Miller, George	Walz
Fudge	Moore	Wasserman
Gabbard	Moran	Schultz
Gallego	Murphy (FL)	Waters
Garamendi	Nadler	Waxman
García	Napolitano	Welch
Gerlach	Neal	Wilson (FL)
Gibson	Negrete McLeod	Yarmuth
Grayson	Nolan	
Green, Al	O'Rourke	

NOES—223

Aderholt	Capito	Ellmers
Amash	Carter	Farenthold
Bachmann	Cassidy	Fincher
Bachus	Chabot	Fleischmann
Barletta	Chaffetz	Fleming
Barr	Coble	Flores
Barton	Coffman	Forbes
Benishek	Cole	Fortenberry
Bentivolio	Collins (GA)	Foxo
Bilirakis	Collins (NY)	Franks (AZ)
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Frelinghuysen
Black	Cook	Gardner
Blackburn	Cotton	Garrett
Boustany	Cramer	Gibbs
Brady (TX)	Crawford	Gingrey (GA)
Bridenstine	Crenshaw	Gohmert
Brooks (AL)	Culberson	Goodlatte
Brooks (IN)	Daines	Gosar
Broun (GA)	Davis, Rodney	Gowdy
Buchanan	Denham	Granger
Bucshon	DeSantis	Graves (GA)
Burgess	DesJarlais	Graves (MO)
Byrne	Diaz-Balart	Griffin (AR)
Calvert	Duffy	Griffith (VA)
Camp	Duncan (SC)	Grimm
Cantor	Duncan (TN)	Guthrie

Hall	McHenry	Ryan (WI)
Harper	McKeon	Salmon
Harris	McKinley	Sanford
Hartzler	McMorris	Scalise
Hastings (WA)	Rodgers	Schock
Heck (NV)	Meadows	Schweikert
Hensarling	Meehan	Scott, Austin
Herrera Beutler	Messer	Sensenbrenner
Holding	Mica	Sessions
Hudson	Miller (FL)	Shimkus
Huelskamp	Miller (MI)	Shuster
Huizenga (MI)	Mullin	Simpson
Hultgren	Mulvaney	Smith (MO)
Hunter	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NE)
Hurt	Neugebauer	Smith (NJ)
Issa	Noem	Smith (TX)
Jenkins	Nugent	Southernland
Johnson (OH)	Nunes	Stewart
Johnson, Sam	Nunnelee	Stivers
Jolly	Olson	Stockman
Jones	Palazzo	Stutzman
Jordan	Pearce	Terry
Joyce	Perry	Thompson (PA)
Kelly (PA)	Petri	Thornberry
King (IA)	Pittenger	Tiberi
King (NY)	Pitts	Tipton
Kingston	Poe (TX)	Turner
Kinzinger (IL)	Pompeo	Upton
Kline	Posey	Valadao
Labrador	Price (GA)	Wagner
LaMalfa	Reed	Walberg
Lamborn	Renacci	Walden
Lance	Ribble	Walorski
Lankford	Rice (SC)	Weber (TX)
Latham	Rigell	Webster (FL)
Latta	Roby	Westrup
LoBiondo	Roe (TN)	Westmoreland
Long	Rogers (AL)	Whitfield
Lucas	Rogers (KY)	Williams
Luetkemeyer	Rogers (MI)	Wilson (SC)
Lummis	Rohrabacher	Wittman
Marchant	Rokita	Wolf
Marino	Rooney	Womack
Massie	Ros-Lehtinen	Woodall
Matheson	Roskam	Yoder
McAllister	Ross	Yoho
McCarthy (CA)	Rothfus	Young (AK)
McCaul	Royce	Young (IN)
McClintock	Runyan	

NOT VOTING—11

Amodei	DelBene	McCarthy (NY)
Campbell	Duckworth	Miller, Gary
Cárdenas	Frankel (FL)	Schwartz
Courtney	Hinojosa	

□ 1628

Messrs. RYAN of Wisconsin and LAMALFA changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. NEGRETE McLEOD, Messrs. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, HANNA, and CLEAVER changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NUGENT) having assumed the chair, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Acting Chair 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. 1459) to ensure that the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 applies to the declaration of national monuments, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 524, he reported the bill back to the House with sundry amendments adopted in 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 reported from the Committee of the Whole? If not, the Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were 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.

□ 1630

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. DUNCAN). Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the bill.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Rahall moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1459 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

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

**SEC. 3. PROVIDING A WAGE INCREASE FOR AMERICA'S WORKERS.**

This Act shall not take effect until the hourly wage for the lowest 10th percentile of workers for all occupational codes reported by the Bureau of Labor Statistics under the Occupational Employment Statistics survey is no less than \$10.10 an hour.

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

Mr. RAHALL. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill. It will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If the amendment is adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

My amendment is quite simple. It raises the minimum wage to \$10.10. My amendment assures that, in America, if you work hard, you will not be forced to live in poverty.

In this era of stagnant and falling wages, of a widening gap in inequality between the haves and the have-nots, we must ensure that the promise of the American Dream remains a reality for all Americans, not just the wealthiest among us. We can't just say it. We have to act to make it possible.

Today, the minimum wage is 22 percent below its peak level in the 1960s. It has not increased since July 2009, when it reached \$7.25 per hour. It has not been raised in five long years.

It has not increased since the near bottom of the Great Recession, when working Americans were walloped by the greed and reckless behavior of the privileged and the elite on Wall Street.

We like to think that, if you work hard, if you earn calloused hands, you can rise to the heights of success in America. The reality is that, by not raising the minimum wage, we are condoning—we are endorsing a pay cut for the very hardworking Americans

that we speak about in such glowing terms whenever we talk about working our way—working your way up the ladder. Such doublespeak makes a mockery of the American Dream.

This is the House of the people, not the House of the 1 percent. Ours is a government of, for, and by the people and not a government of, for, and by the billionaires, at least not yet. Heaven help us.

As Representatives of the people, we have a constitutional obligation to look after the interests of all of our citizens, but more fundamentally, we have a moral obligation to ensure that opportunity is available to all and not reserved only for the most well-to-do among us.

Each and every year, minimum wage workers face a pay cut as inflation eats away at their earnings. Each and every year, this House, the people's House, sits inactive. It sits silent. It sits shamefully moot.

As the House of the people, we have a moral obligation to do what we can to help boost the paychecks of hardworking Americans. There should be outrage. There should be contempt for our inactivity on this issue.

I am talking about the 3.6 million American workers whose salaries are at or below the current minimum wage, more than three-quarters of whom are adults, nearly two-thirds of whom are female, more than one-third of whom are full-time workers, and nearly three-quarters of whom have graduated from high school.

These are real people—real people, Mr. Speaker, husbands, wives, fathers, mothers. Every day, they must make hard choices to provide for their families. Every day, they look to this body, this House of Representatives, the House of the people, they look to us for help; and every day, this body has nothing to say, nothing new to offer.

Introduced in 1938, the minimum wage has been increased 22 times, by both Republican and Democratic Congresses. It was even raised in the hyperpartisan Congress of the Gingrich impeachment era twice—twice; but it has not been raised in this Congress, nor the last. That is more than shameful. It is immoral.

In running against the do-nothing Republican-controlled House of Representatives in 1948, Harry Truman spoke of the gluttons of privilege, of cold men, of cunning men who were curiously deaf to the voice of the people, but who also were curiously able to hear even the slightest whisper from Big Business.

Here is a case where the government must be an advocate for the people and for the working men and women of this Nation and for the forgotten man, as another great President once said, those at the bottom of the economic pyramid upon which everything else is built.

Vague promises of hope are not sufficient. Economic excuses are not enough. We must act, and we must act

now, and we can. Vote for this amendment to increase the minimum wage for the working men and women of this country.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I am still having a difficult time trying to grasp the concept that my good friend, the gentleman from West Virginia, would be opposed to such a brilliant bill in its current form in the first place; but with that, I appreciate his efforts and his concept dealing with this MTR.

I just want to remind of you of one element. If you pass this motion, you don't raise the minimum wage, and you don't bring about any of the consequences CBO or other organizations talked about, that concept.

All this amendment does is delay the bill. It doesn't raise anything. It simply delays the bill.

This bill, the underlying bill, tries to take an act that is 108 years old and modernize it, so that the American people are given the right to be heard before the President takes his pen and signs his name to a piece of paper and a proclamation.

This bill simply says let Americans have the chance to talk about this before the President acts, like every other element of government has to do.

With that, I urge your rejection of this MTR. I urge you to favorably vote for passage.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. RAHALL. 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 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by 5-minute votes on passage of H.R. 1459, if ordered, and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 227, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 146]

AYES—193

Barber	Blumenauer	Butterfield
Barrow (GA)	Bonamici	Capps
Bass	Brady (PA)	Capuano
Beatty	Braley (IA)	Cardenas
Bera (CA)	Brown (FL)	Carney
Bishop (GA)	Brownley (CA)	Carson (IN)
Bishop (NY)	Bustos	Cartwright



Paulsen	Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (CA)
Payne	T.	Thompson (MS)
Pelosi	Sanchez, Loretta	Tierney
Perlmutter	Sarbanes	Titus
Peters (CA)	Schakowsky	Tonko
Peters (MI)	Schiff	Tsongas
Peterson	Schneider	Van Hollen
Pingree (ME)	Schrader	Vargas
Pocan	Scott (VA)	Veasey
Polis	Scott, David	Vela
Price (NC)	Serrano	Velázquez
Quigley	Sewell (AL)	Visclosky
Rahall	Shea-Porter	Walz
Rangel	Sherman	Wasserman
Reichert	Sinema	Schultz
Richmond	Sires	Waters
Roybal-Allard	Slaughter	Waxman
Ruiz	Smith (WA)	Welch
Ruppersberger	Speier	Wilson (FL)
Rush	Swalwell (CA)	Yarmuth
Ryan (OH)	Takano	

NOT VOTING—8

Campbell	Hinojosa	Miller, Gary
DeBene	Johnson (GA)	Schwartz
Duncan (SC)	McCarthy (NY)	

□ 1656

Mr. CONYERS changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 147, I missed the vote on final passage of H.R. 1459, the Public Involvement in the Creation of National Monuments Act. I supported this bill in the Natural Resources Committee and would have voted in favor of it on final passage. Unfortunately business on the Senate side of the Capitol prevented me from voting before the rollcall ended. Had I been present, I would have voted “aye.”

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PERRY). The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker’s approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker’s approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. ROE of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained during a vote on H.R. 2824, the Preventing Government Waste and Protecting Coal Mining Jobs in America Act, on Lowenthal amendment No. 1. If I had been present, I would have voted “yes.”

In addition, Mr. Speaker, on H.R. 3370, the Homeowner Flood Insurance Affordability Act, I was unavoidably

detained with my constituents in my district. Had I been present, I would have voted a resounding “yes,” for this legislation will bring much-needed relief to our constituents on the gulf coast.

□ 1700

CONGRATULATING THE PENNSYLVANIA UNIVERSITY NITANNY LION FENCING TEAM FOR WINNING 13TH NATIONAL TITLE

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Pennsylvania State University Nitanny Lion Fencing Team. On Sunday, the team won their 13th NCAA championship which took place in Columbus, Ohio. Beating out the second-place Princeton University team, which totaled 159 bout victories, the Nitanny Lions completed the competition with 180 bout victories.

On the individual level, Kaito Streets, a sophomore, claimed the men’s sabre NCAA championship, becoming the 13th individual champion for the team. As a result of this title win, Penn State fencing is now the winningest fencing program in the NCAA.

Mr. Speaker, I want to offer my praise to these student athletes, along with head coach Wes Glon, for their hard work and determination. The University and the Happy Valley community are extremely proud of your efforts, and we congratulate you on another amazing season.

NATIONAL DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES AWARENESS MONTH

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the 27th observance of the National Developmental Disabilities Awareness Month and to add my respect and understanding that developmental disabilities may be visible or invisible and range from physical impairment that involves vision or mobility to those conditions that affect cognitive functions related to how the brain processes information and how someone learns. I am also actively involved in the Dyslexia Caucus in efforts to shine the light on dyslexia.

Developmental disabilities, which include autism, deficit hyperactivity disorder, and other developmental delays, have increased, requiring more health and education services.

I want to reemphasize the need for access to education services but also to work. It is not a respect of age. Sometimes it comes because of accident or of illness that people can become disabled, but they are still deserving of

the opportunity to work, and they also deserve the opportunity to access the various assets that this country has.

It is important that we focus on language, focus on mobility, and we provide the resources necessary. My salute to those who are supporting the improvement of access for those suffering from developmental disabilities or experiencing it. We look forward to working together.

HONORING VEDNITA CARTER, CNN HERO

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a truly remarkable woman and my guest at this year’s State of the Union address, Vednita Carter.

Vednita was recently recognized as a 2014 CNN Hero for her work combating sex trafficking and is truly deserving of this recognition. Her organization, Breaking Free, provides food, clothing, and support for women who are victims of sex trafficking to help them escape from their tragic situations. Breaking Free has helped over 6,000 women leave sex slavery.

Studies have shown, Mr. Speaker, that women who are trafficked often come from difficult home situations and are vulnerable to exploitation. For many of these victims, Vednita is the first person to reach out and try to help them.

With over 100,000 children estimated to be involved in the sex trade in the United States, Vednita’s efforts should serve as a guide to how we can combat this trafficking problem on a wider scale.

Congratulations, Vednita Carter, and thank you for positively impacting so many exploited women’s lives and for inspiring so many others.

WOMEN’S HISTORY MONTH AND WORKDAY INITIATIVE

(Mr. VEASEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the women who have shaped our Nation’s history and those women who continue to make a difference in our communities. Women entrepreneurs are the fastest growing sector in the small business community.

This month, I launched a new initiative to help better understand the challenges that constituents face in their jobs and daily lives by spending the day working as a baking assistant at Del Norte Bakery, a successful women-owned-and-operated Hispanic business in Dallas.

As I rolled up my sleeves and I made pan dulce and other baked goods alongside owners and sisters Carolina Lopez and Gloria De Lira, I gained invaluable