



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 114<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 162

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JULY 12, 2016

No. 112

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBSTER of Florida).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
July 12, 2016.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DANIEL WEBSTER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 5, 2016, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 1 hour and each Member other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip limited to 5 minutes, but in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m.

### RECOGNIZING THE NEED FOR A 21ST CENTURY CAREER AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION SYSTEM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to thank my colleagues on the House Education and the Workforce Committee for their support last week in passing a reauthorization that I offered, the Carl D. Perkins Act, in the form of the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act.

Now, I am proud to say that this bill passed unanimously out of committee, which is good news because a reauthorization is badly needed.

It is no secret that our country continues to face significant economic challenges, and it is no surprise that many men and women are worried about their futures and their family's future. Last week a Gallup poll found that 54 percent—just 54 percent—of Americans believed today's young people will live a better life than their parents.

As a father, I can say there is nothing a parent wants more for their children than a life that is better than their own. When you hear that only half of all Americans expect their children to have a brighter future than they did, it becomes clear that we need to do better. And we can do better, not just for our own kids, but for the neighbor who can't find a job, the friend from church who struggles to make ends meet, the family that has been trapped in poverty with no pathway out, or the high school student who struggles and has no hope or inspiration that he or she has what it takes to succeed.

With the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act, we have an opportunity today to advance reforms that will help these and many other Americans, especially young Americans, obtain the knowledge and skills that they need to break the cycle of poverty and to achieve a lifetime of success. This bill will modernize and improve current law to better reflect the challenges and realities facing students, workers, and employers.

The bill will empower State and local leaders by simplifying the application process for receiving Federal funds and providing them more flexibility to use those resources to respond to the changing education and economic needs. These reforms will help State

leaders focus on preparing students for the workforce—not duplicative or overly prescriptive Federal requirements—and enable them to determine the best way to do so.

To increase transparency and accountability, H.R. 5587 streamlines performance measures to ensure secondary and post-secondary programs deliver results, helping students graduate, prepared to secure a good-paying job or further their education. The bill also includes measures to provide students, taxpayers, and State and local leaders the information that they need to hold CTE programs accountable for delivering those results.

Finally, H.R. 5587 will reduce the Federal role in career and technical education and limiting opportunities for the Federal Government to intervene in State and local decisions and preventing political favoritism.

This is a bipartisan bill, Mr. Speaker. I thank my colleagues on both sides of the aisle for their help in creating it. I look forward to seeing it on the floor of the United States House of Representatives hopefully in the near future.

### IRAN NUCLEAR AGREEMENT ANNIVERSARY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, this month we mark the first anniversary of an historic agreement between Iran and six major world powers, including some of our key western allies, plus Russia and China.

The agreement was designed to force Iran to back away from the nuclear threshold, acquiring nuclear weapons, which everyone agreed would be a disaster.

Instead of sober reflection on the success of the agreement, where we are and where we are going, we will, instead, be discussing legislation that is

☐ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., ☐ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H4663

designed to have the United States break that agreement. In a very dangerous world, that agreement has made us a little bit safer. This would be a mistake of tragic proportions to undermine it.

Last year, Prime Minister of Israel, Benjamin Netanyahu, on this House floor, as part of his campaign to scuttle a potential agreement, warned that Iran was on the verge of acquiring nuclear weapons as thousands of centrifuges were whirling to enrich uranium.

While today, 14,000 centrifuges have been removed from service and placed under international supervision. Iran has removed nuclear material from its once secret facility at Fordow. It has reduced its stockpile of enriched uranium from 12,000 kilograms, with a purity as high as 5 percent, to only 300 kilograms, with a purity of no more than 3-2/3 percent. The core of the heavy water reactor at Arak has been filled with concrete. These are not abstract numbers and mere technicalities. Iran has adhered to the agreement, making a nuclear breakout harder, and take longer.

Make no mistake, Iran has some unsavory hardline people in key positions of leadership, but not everyone. President Hassan Rouhani has been a voice of and a force for moderation. The Iran people voted for him as a repudiation of the hardliners.

The Iranian people are still the most pro-American in the region, where even some of our allies have large anti-American populations. The majority of the Iranian people still like us, despite the fact that America cooperated with Britain to overthrow their popularly elected government in 1953 and install the Shah as dictator, despite the fact that the United States backed Saddam Hussein in the bloody Iraq-Iran war where we would later send American troops to overthrow him. At that time, he used poison gas—and we did nothing to stop him—against Iranians and against some of his own people.

The relationship with Iran is important to not just controlling nuclear threats. Iran is going to play a key role in this troubled area as the major Shia power. Our war against Iraq created huge problems, not just in Iraq, but Syria and Afghanistan. Iran will always play an outsized role. The question is, can we work with them toward peace and reconciliation?

I, for one, will vote against efforts to undercut the agreement when, after a year, all the evidence that I have seen is that the agreement is working and that Iran is complying.

I am encouraged that there is a memorandum of understanding with American company Boeing and Iran to purchase 80 jet airplanes and lease another 29, supporting over 100,000 jobs in the United States over the next decade. Rather than unwinding this agreement, people should support and strengthen it.

Notably, our other partners in the agreement have already started to take

commercial advantage. I would rather have American jobs at Boeing than have Airbus sell even more planes to Iran or the French Bombardier manufacturer. The rest of the world has moved on and America should not move backward.

In a troubled world, an opportunity to strengthen ties with a former enemy through trade, job creation, and bringing us a bit closer together should not be a major cause for concern. It should be a cause for celebration.

#### REMEMBERING MIKE RHYNE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Mike Rhyne, a great man and a friend from Rutherford County, North Carolina.

Mike served as an alderman for Ellenboro, the same town where his brother, Jim, serves as mayor.

Ellenboro is a small town, but they don't actually view themselves that way. In fact, Mike and his late wife, Pat, were instrumental in starting the town's yearly festival. When they decided to figure out a name on what to call it, they called it "Ellenboro's Big Day." That was sort of Mike's personality coming through in just the naming of that event. In fact, Mike gave me a T-shirt—and I still have it—"The Big Day" T-shirt that he gave me a few years ago.

Mike also really deserves a lot of credit for restoring the old Ellenboro train depot and transforming it into the town's history museum. In this history museum, they pay tribute to the countless veterans that grew up, were raised, and came home to Ellenboro and to those that gave their lives in the service of our country. That really pays a special tribute to the community.

To Mike's family, I extend my sympathies. Ellenboro and Rutherford County have lost a true public servant, and I have lost a good friend.

RETIREMENT OF CATAWBA COUNTY CHAMBER  
PRESIDENT DANNY HEARN

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Speaker, I also rise today to honor a great man and a great friend, one of my constituents from Catawba County.

Dave Hearn has served as president of the Catawba County Chamber of Commerce and has done so for the last 12 years. He recently announced his retirement from 43 years of work with chambers of commerce throughout the southeast.

Danny is a graduate of Lenoir-Rhyne University. Shortly after graduation, he went to work at the local chamber of commerce as an intern, and that career would last him until actually just a few months from now.

He served local chambers, rising through the ranks from Norfolk, Virginia; Rockingham, North Carolina; Statesville, North Carolina; and he will finish his career in Hickory.

Danny is well known for a couple of different things in the community. Danny is most well known for his commitment to small business. He has fought tirelessly on behalf of the small business community and the business community generally.

In fact, one of the greatest accomplishments at the Catawba County Chamber of Commerce under Danny's leadership is the Edison project, a competitive contest that awards much-needed start-up capital to local entrepreneurs. He began this initiative in the midst of one of the worst economic downturns in western North Carolina history.

Danny knows that the backbone of our local economy and the backbone of our country is small business. He understands that small business development is the key to our region's economic development, growth, and recovery.

Danny's work with small businesses has truly paid off. Recent statistics show that wages in Catawba County are growing at a faster rate than most counties in the country, and this is a great success under Danny's leadership.

Danny is also extraordinarily well known for his love of golf. Danny's second-to-last day on the job in September will be hosting the chamber's annual golf tournament. What a fitting way and a truly poetic way for Danny to end his chamber career. He will be doing two of the great things that he is passionate about: working with small businesses leaders and playing golf.

So to Danny: You will truly be missed in Catawba County. Your leadership will be truly missed. However, your impact will be felt for generations to come. We thank you for your leadership, and I thank you for your friendship.

#### ADDRESSING SECURITY THREATS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. ASHFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ASHFORD. Mr. Speaker, we should not leave on the longest summer break in more than three decades while our Nation faces serious security threats.

There is no greater responsibility for this body than to keep our communities and our families safe. We face real threats from around the world, from the Zika virus, cyber threats, China, Russia, and North Korea. All of these demand attention, but we must act now to destroy ISIS.

The campaign of destruction waged by ISIS has created the worst crisis in the Middle East in a generation and is threatening American lives at home and abroad.

When I traveled to the Middle East 17 months ago, I came home and said that this must be our top priority. Congress must come together to develop a comprehensive strategy that attacks ISIS on all fronts, online and on the ground,

reducing and eliminating its territory and its ability to direct attacks around the globe. A commitment to this effort will allow our military to make long-term strategic decisions.

It is important for Republicans and Democrats alike to find a common vision for this effort. I do not believe that we cannot have and should not have a do-nothing summer while Americans are in jeopardy.

□ 1015

#### REMEMBERING JACK RUBIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, it is with great sadness and a heavy heart that I come to the floor this morning to commemorate the life of a dear friend, Jack Rubin, who passed away last night at his home in south Florida.

Jack was a Holocaust survivor, the only member of his family to survive. He was liberated from Auschwitz in May of 1945, came to America, and served in our United States Army.

Over the course of his life, Jack dedicated his time to raising awareness about the horrors of the Holocaust and fighting for the needs of survivors. Jack was a regular on Capitol Hill, meeting with Members of Congress and testifying before Congress four times in 2007, 2008, and twice in 2014.

On September 18, 2014, Jack testified before a subcommittee hearing, which I chaired, about the struggles of recovering assets for Holocaust survivors, and the struggle continues. At this important hearing, Jack laid out all of the difficulties, all of the challenges that Holocaust survivors are facing in America today, the continued struggle to find the justice that has evaded most of them for over 70 years, and the poverty, the lack of medical care, dental care, mental health care for many survivors.

That is why my colleague, TED DEUTCH, and I authored a resolution, which already passed the House, urging the German Government to fully fulfill its moral responsibility to Holocaust survivors and urgently provide the financial resources necessary to ensure that survivors live in dignity and comfort in their remaining years.

I urge my colleagues in the Senate to pass this measure immediately because this is about survivors getting all of their needs addressed and getting them addressed immediately.

I offer my sincere condolences to Jack Rubin's widow, Shirley, and their three children—Michael, David, and Lynn—and many grandchildren.

In the 2014 hearing, Mr. Speaker, Jack stated: We are losing more and more survivors every day, and the ones remaining need our help now.

We will never forget you, Jack Rubin. We must honor Jack's legacy, Mr. Speaker, by continuing to pursue justice for all Holocaust survivors.

#### ANNIVERSARIES OF THE IRAN DEAL AND THE AMIA ATTACK

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, this Thursday marks the 1-year anniversary since the administration and the rest of the P5+1 nations signed the weak and dangerous Iran nuclear deal. One year later, and Iran continues its push for ballistic missiles, and we are seeing reports from Germany's intelligence services that Iran's proliferation activities have not stopped, that the regime has increased its efforts to advance its chemical and biological warfare capabilities as well as its nuclear weapons program.

This week, the House will bring to the floor various bills that would amplify sanctions against Iran. We must ensure that Iran is held accountable for its terror activities and that individuals engaged in such activities are brought to justice.

Monday marks the 22nd anniversary of the attack against the Argentinian Jewish Community Center called AMIA in Buenos Aires, Argentina. Iran and its proxy Hezbollah, a designated foreign terrorist organization, were behind this heinous and cowardly attack which killed over 80 people and injured hundreds more.

Unfortunately, thanks to this weak nuclear deal, some of Iran's most notorious criminals will see sanctions against them lifted, including several individuals responsible for the AMIA bombings. One, General Vahidi, for example. He is a former Quds commander, a former Iranian defense minister, and he has been wanted by INTERPOL since 2007 for his direct role in the AMIA attack.

Guess what? His name was one of the ones included in this Iran deal for sanctions to be lifted.

Is that justice, Mr. Speaker?

Last year, the special prosecutor on the AMIA and my dear friend, Alberto Nisman, was killed in his home in Buenos Aires. I urge the Argentine authorities to do everything in their power to continue to properly and thoroughly investigate his death so that those responsible can be brought to justice.

The AMIA attack serves as just one reminder of the many threats from Iran and its nefarious proxies that endanger our national security, the Middle East, and our ally, the Democratic Jewish State of Israel.

As we mark the 1-year anniversary of this horrible nuclear deal and commemorate the 22nd anniversary of the AMIA attack, we must redouble our efforts and commitments to hold Iran and all of its cohorts fully accountable.

#### WE NEED TO STAND UP FOR THE LGBT COMMUNITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, today marks 1 month since the horrific attack on Pulse nightclub that took 49 lives.

Many of us have come here to this floor raising our voices to demand that this House take action to prevent the loss of life from guns in this country.

But one critical, tragic aspect of this crime that sometimes has gotten lost is exactly who was targeted in the shooting. Pulse was a mainstay of Orlando's LGBT community, and of the Latino community in particular. Now, more than ever, we need to unite against hatred, discrimination, and bigotry. We need to stand together in calling for justice, peace, and equality.

I am, frankly, appalled to see that today, today on the 1-month anniversary of the shootings at the Pulse nightclub, instead of standing with the LGBT community, instead of passing background checks, today the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform will be advancing legislation to undermine the existing and insufficient protections that the law provides for LGBT Americans.

I am proud that my home State of Connecticut is one of several States to pass legislation protecting the LGBT community from discrimination, whether folks are at work, at school, at the doctor's office or, yes, using a public bathroom. Our residents support these laws. We support these protections. LGBT folks are our brothers, our sisters, our friends, our neighbors. They are our kids' teachers, coaches, and their friends. They give back to our community. They volunteer at church. They serve in public office.

In Congress we should be focusing on legislation to prevent discrimination and prevent hatred. Our goal should be a country in which all Americans, in every State, can live their lives free from bigotry and harassment and free of the fear of being targeted with guns because of who people are. Quite simply, I can't imagine a worse way for Congress to respond to the massacre in Orlando than with legislation attacking LGBT Americans.

The American people overwhelmingly believe that discrimination targeting the LGBT community has no place in our society, and yet a bill to support that discrimination is getting a full hearing today. Meanwhile, legislation to keep guns out of the hands of terrorists that has broad, bipartisan support among the public cannot get so much as a vote in this House.

In the 3½ years since the Sandy Hook massacre in my State, in my district in Connecticut, this House has failed to take any action, any action whatsoever to prevent the deaths of Americans by guns. In that time, 100,000 Americans have died from guns, 49 of them in the largest mass shooting in American history 1 month ago, targeted because they are LGBT at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to get our priorities straight. It is time for us to do what the American people sent us here to do. Let us send a very clear message: We stand up against hatred and discrimination; we stand with our LGBT

brothers and sisters; and we stand with the American people who are demanding that this House take action to keep guns out of the hands of dangerous people, to keep guns away from terrorists, to keep guns away from criminals, to keep guns away from domestic abusers, and to keep guns away from the dangerously mentally ill.

We need a vote on no fly, no buy. We need a vote on comprehensive background checks on every commercial sale of a gun. The time to act is now, Mr. Speaker, and action is not increasing voting to increase discrimination against our LGBT brothers and sisters and to make them more vulnerable to the gun violence that wracks this country. We need to act. The time is now.

#### REMEMBERING DAVID ELAHI

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Speaker, early on Sunday, July 3, while most of us were resting up for our Independence Day weekends, Sergeant David Elahi was conducting highway safety patrol measures in Sterlington, Louisiana, a city which I represent.

That morning, a drunk driver struck and killed David while he was conducting a traffic stop. The driver injured two other officers as well. David was only 28 years old. Communities in Ouachita Parish and the surrounding areas are still reeling from David's death because, according to all accounts, he was just a great guy.

He was a family man who left behind a 2-year-old daughter and his fiancée, who is expecting a child in January. That shift was supposed to be David's last full-time shift for the Sterlington Police Department. He was planning to retire to take care of home, go back to a business that he had started, wanted to improve it, but he didn't get there.

I rise today because our Nation needs to know about David. They need to know that he was a model citizen pursuing the American Dream. He was proud of his family. He was proud of his church. He was proud of his home, and he was proud of the service he provided.

Last week was a dark week in our Nation. The deaths in my home State of Louisiana as well as those in Texas and Minnesota have once again thrust into the forefront a debate on the role our law enforcement officers play in policing our communities.

There have been calls to harm our police, and one man in Dallas did just that. For the first time in history, graphic scenes from our streets are being live-streamed on the Internet. People are reacting sometimes in violent ways. All loss of life is tragic. More violence is not the answer. When tragedies occur, we must fully investigate them and hold accountable any who acted wrongfully.

But even when bad things happen, we cannot let these events define who we are and react in ways that divide us. Most of us want the same things: to provide for our families, to better our communities, and to serve our God. The Bible tells us that patience is a virtue, and we must use that wisdom today as we seek answers to questions everyone in society is asking.

For me, personally, I believe the overwhelming majority of our police officers are just like David. They serve because they want to make a difference, they want to make their communities a better place. They are there and they serve simply because they care.

I would encourage everyone listening to take a deep breath and reflect on the services of David Elahi. I want you to think about how he served his community. I want you to think about his fiancée, his daughter, and the child who will never know him from this point on. I want to remember that family members of all our law enforcement officers share intimately in the cause of public safety that they want to provide.

I also want to think about those five officers in Dallas who lost their lives in the line of duty and how their fellow officers ran toward the gunfire while others ran away. That is what our officers do. That is why they keep us safe. No institution is perfect. People like David do not deserve to be vilified because they chose to serve and protect. People like those officers in Dallas didn't deserve to be marked for death because they were simply police officers. They did their duty, and they were killed because of it.

So thank a law enforcement officer today for what they do for you and for me. Thank their families for sharing in their sacrifice. Say a prayer for David, his family, and the Sterlington community, and say a prayer for all of those who wear the badge.

□ 1030

#### GIVE US A VOTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, why is it that more than 80 percent of NRA members and over 80 percent of gun owners support background checks? Well, I will tell you why. It is because they are responsible gun owners; and responsible gun owners understand that there is nothing wrong with making sure that a prospective gun buyer isn't a terrorist, a criminal, a domestic abuser, or dangerously mentally ill.

The Supreme Court made that perfectly clear in *District of Columbia v. Heller*. The Court ruled that, while Americans have the right to keep and bear arms, there are no constitutional problems with laws prohibiting felons

and the dangerously mentally ill from carrying guns.

As a responsible gun owner myself, I will never give up my guns, and I will never ask law-abiding individuals without a history of dangerous mental illness to give up theirs. And, like other responsible gun owners, I understand that if gun violence continues unabated, then eventually we will see laws that place substantial and overly burdensome restrictions on our right to own guns.

To reduce gun violence, we don't need to stop law-abiding citizens who use guns for hunting, sport shooting, and personal protection from obtaining those firearms. We need to stop terrorists, criminals, domestic abusers, and those with a history of dangerous mental illness from getting guns.

Our first line of defense when it comes to making sure that guns don't fall into dangerous hands is to conduct a background check. And we know that, when used, background checks work.

Every day, background checks stop more than 170 felons, some 50 domestic abusers, and nearly 20 fugitives from buying a gun. But sadly, a gaping loophole allows those same felons, dangerously mentally ill, and domestic abusers to bypass a background check in 34 States. All they have to do is go online or go to a gun show. That is wrong; that is dangerous; and that loophole needs to be closed.

That is why it is long past time for the Republican leadership to allow a vote on H.R. 1217, my bipartisan, pro-Second Amendment bill to require a background check for all commercial gun sales. The bill bolsters the Second Amendment rights of lawful gun owners by making sure that the bad guys can't easily bypass background checks when trying to buy a gun.

Just as important for the safety and security of our country and our fellow Americans is H.R. 1076, bipartisan, pro-Second Amendment legislation to prohibit those who are on the FBI's terrorist watch list from being able to legally buy a firearm. We should be able to agree that suspected terrorists shouldn't be able to legally buy a gun or guns of their choosing.

As a responsible gun owner, I am fed up with those who are blindly opposed to background checks hiding behind bumper sticker slogans like: "Guns don't kill people; people kill people." Everyone knows that guns don't kill people, which is exactly why responsible gun owners and the overwhelming majority of the American people understand that it is important to run a background check to see if the person buying the gun is a danger to our community.

This debate isn't a choice between respecting the Second Amendment or reducing gun violence. As a responsible gun owner, I am tired of it being framed that way. It is about this Congress doing both.

The Supreme Court's *Heller* ruling provides people on both sides with an

opportunity to work within the confines of the Second Amendment to pass legislation that will reduce gun violence and keep our communities safe. Responsible gun owners across our country understand that. It is time for the Republican leadership in the House to understand it, too.

Mr. Speaker, give us a vote.

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF NICHOLAS "CORKY" DEMARCO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, on Friday afternoon, I was deeply saddened to hear about the passing of one of West Virginia's finest gentlemen, Nicholas "Corky" DeMarco.

A lifelong West Virginian, Corky was a leader in our State, in both private and public service. For those of you who did not have the privilege of knowing him, let me tell you a little bit about him.

I got to know Corky through our discussions about how West Virginia can benefit from our natural bounty. Under Governor Cecil Underwood, Corky served as the director of operations for the State and helped bring more jobs and industries to West Virginia.

Most recently, Corky served as the executive director of the West Virginia Oil and Natural Gas Association. During his time with the association, he more than tripled their membership and made significant contributions to the oil and gas industry in West Virginia.

His devotion to growing jobs in our State was strong, but his love for family came before anything else. For Corky, the most important thing in life was his family: his wife, Catherine; two grown sons, Matthew and Joey; and his stepson, Jason Milano.

I join all West Virginians in keeping Mr. DeMarco's family in our thoughts and prayers during this difficult time. Corky will be truly missed.

#### OPIOID ADDICTION

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, overuse of prescription pain medication is one of the leading causes of opioid addiction. When a patient has more narcotic pain medication than they need after a medical event, this excess medication can fall into the wrong hands.

Narcotic pain medication in the wrong hands often leads to addiction. In fact, the National Institute on Drug Abuse has found that 1 in 15 people who take nonmedical prescription pain relievers will try heroin.

Last year, the number of fatal overdoses from prescription painkillers increased by 16 percent—and 28 percent from heroin—in the United States. In West Virginia, the story is even worse. According to a recent study by the Trust for America's Health, the Mountain State has the highest rate of overdose deaths in the entire United States.

This issue is above party politics. It is a plague that all Americans must come together to solve. That is why, in February, I introduced H.R. 4499, the Promoting Responsible Opioid Prescribing Act. This bipartisan bill strikes a harmful provision of ObamaCare that places unnecessary pressure on doctors and hospitals to prescribe narcotic pain medication.

This concern was brought to my attention while meeting with doctors and other healthcare professionals in Charleston, West Virginia, who are active in our State's medical society. I thank them for bringing this to my attention. It is a perfect example of how government works well. You bring an issue to your Congressman's attention, and he takes action to solve it.

This was their idea. I thank them for bringing it to our attention. I encourage everyone to bring the ideas you have to help fight back against the opioid epidemic to your local Congressman.

I am proud to say that, less than a week ago, the Department of Health and Human Services announced they are implementing the important policy changes contained in my bill. Almost word for word, the new rules are exactly what my bill says need to be done.

Since I first introduced the PROP Act in February, I have been calling on Congress to pass my bill. This bipartisan legislation has 27 Republican cosponsors and 16 Democratic cosponsors. My bill puts doctors, not the Federal Government, in control of opioid-prescribing decisions. This change in policy is an important fight against opioid abuse.

I want to thank the 43 cosponsors in the House and the 8 cosponsors in the Senate in our successful effort to pass this bill's policies through regulation and help put an end to opioid abuse.

#### LET'S PUT AN END TO GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) for 5 minutes.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Speaker, our Nation has been repeatedly confronted by senseless and tragic acts of gun violence; and now our country grieves with yet more heartache following the shocking and horrific attack in Dallas last week, an attack that took place during a peaceful protest where citizens were exercising their basic rights as Americans, as Dallas police officers supported and protected this fundamentally American right.

As President Obama said: "There is no possible justification for these kinds of attacks or any violence against law enforcement."

This event added to an already heartbreaking week, after the deaths of Philando Castile in Minnesota and Alton Sterling in Louisiana. Today, I am thinking of their families, friends,

and loved ones, as I am of the 49 lost at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando just a month ago.

I believe that law-abiding citizens have a constitutional right to own firearms, whether for sport or personal protection; but I also know that responsible personal freedom and public safety are not mutually exclusive.

Shootings have become unacceptably commonplace in our country, and Congress has a responsibility to do more to keep guns out of the hands of criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill. In fact, recent polls show that support for universal background checks hovers around 90 percent.

No other developed country in the world has the same rate of gun violence as the United States. According to United Nations data, the gun homicide rate in our country is more than 7 times that of Sweden, 6 times that of Canada, and, unbelievably, 21 times that of Australia.

As President Obama stated, following the shooting in Oregon: "We are the only advanced country on Earth that sees these kinds of mass shootings every few months."

I agree with Dallas Police Chief David Brown when he said that police departments cannot be expected to solve our Nation's gun violence problem by themselves. As policymakers, we must be doing more. We should all be inspired by Chief Brown's commitment and willingness to work through personal heartbreak toward a more just and violence-free society.

Chief Brown's urgency is echoed in letters I have received from young people in my district. Headlines in our communities and those that make national news do not go unnoticed by our Nation's youngest citizens, children who are growing up with heightened fear, some even afraid to go to school.

Abbey, age 13, from Gardner, Massachusetts, wrote to me: "Every single day at school, I am scared an armed intruder will come in," going on to say that "the amount of gun violence in our country is piling up, and we need to stop it."

Andrew, a high school freshman from Dracut, wrote: "I have been noticing there are more shootings lately, maybe because I am getting old and paying more attention to what is happening around me than I did before." Imagine, at 14, he is feeling old as he watches our news.

Miriam, from Acton, wrote: "I am only 17 years old, so this current climate of fear and violence is all I have ever known. However, I know that this amount and frequency of bloodshed is not and should not be normal."

As a mother, grandmother, and American citizen, it is unconscionable that our children and grandchildren are growing up in a world where they see mass shooting after mass shooting, met only by a moment of silence on this floor.

Mr. Speaker, in Congress, we have a moral responsibility to pursue change.

We must address the senseless violence and injustice afflicting our Nation with “the fierce urgency of now,” to quote the Reverend Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr. Our call to action is made more painful and more real with each passing day.

Mr. Speaker, bring a vote to the floor on commonsense, universal background check legislation that will keep guns out of the hands of terrorists, criminals, domestic abusers, and the dangerously mentally ill.

#### GUN BILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. CURBELO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the bipartisan legislation I have recently filed to keep guns out of the hands of terrorists.

H.R. 5576, the Terrorist Firearms Prevention Act of 2016, is similar to the bipartisan agreement championed by Senator SUSAN COLLINS, and would deny the sale of firearms to individuals on the no fly and selectee lists, while ensuring due process is protected for law-abiding gun owners.

It was recently announced the House is unlikely to consider any legislation this week pertaining to terrorist access to firearms, and for this, I am truly disappointed.

Mr. Speaker, it is time to do something, and this commonsense, bipartisan legislation is a step in the right direction. I will continue to work with Members on both sides of the aisle to strike a bipartisan compromise that will protect law-abiding citizens' constitutional rights, while denying the sale of guns to terrorists.

#### RECOGNIZING NORBERTO ORELLANA

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize Mr. Norberto Orellana, an incredible young man who, despite facing health challenges and long-term homelessness, recently graduated from the School for Advanced Studies at the Miami-Dade College Homestead campus with a near perfect GPA, a full ride to college, and a dream to go to medical school.

Mr. Orellana has already confronted more hardships in his young life than many of us will encounter in our lifetimes, but he does so with a positive attitude that inspires all of us.

Mr. Orellana was born with cerebral palsy, a permanent movement disorder caused by abnormal development in the part of the brain that controls balance and posture.

□ 1045

By the time he was 5, he had undergone three major surgeries to correct a club foot, lengthen his muscles, and reshape his bones.

He and his family also battled homelessness, moving from shelter to shelter. However, he never allowed his circumstances to dictate his attitude or detract from his belief in his own potential. He used his time spent in hos-

pitals to fuel his burning desire to become a pediatric orthopedic surgeon.

It is an honor for me to recognize Mr. Norberto Orellana on the occasion of his graduation. I cannot wait to see what the future holds for such a bright young mind.

#### COMPREHENSIVE STRATEGY TO DESTROY ISIL

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the attacks in Orlando, San Bernardino, and across Europe are a horrific reminder that the war on terror continues, and that radical extremism from groups like ISIL remains a danger to all freedom-loving people. It is critical that a plan is in place to destroy this enemy before the United States and our allies face more senseless violence from cowardly terrorists.

For these reasons, I have cosponsored Representative KINZINGER's bill, H.R. 4869, the Comprehensive Strategy to Destroy ISIL Act of 2016. This legislation directs the Secretaries of State and Defense to submit a joint report to Congress on the strategy to destroy ISIL and its affiliates.

It is imperative the U.S. and our allies defeat these radical terrorists on their home turf, and this legislation will require a plan from the administration to do just that. I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass this critical bill.

#### CONGRATULATING TWO FLORIDA KEYS COMMUNITY COLLEGE STUDENT-TEAMS

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two Florida Keys Community College student-teams who won five medals, two of them gold, at the annual NASA Engineering Challenges at the Kennedy Space Center in Florida.

This yearly competition is geared towards encouraging students to pursue STEM-related fields. The TechKeys and RocketTrees worked together to take home the gold in the high-altitude balloon experiment.

FKCC is one of only three colleges in Florida to receive a \$134,000 grant from the Florida Space Grant Consortium to support the program for 2 years. This grant also provides scholarships to each participating student. Each of these students is also now eligible for an internship at NASA as long as they remain enrolled in a Florida college.

Congratulations to the students and their professor, Dawn Ellis, on this prestigious accomplishment. I am proud that they are bringing awareness to the importance of science, technology, engineering, and math.

#### OUR NATION IS TIRED OF GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) for 5 minutes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, our Nation is grieving. We are tired. We are tired of the violence that too often unsettles our communities.

What a week we had last week. We were horrified by the deaths of Lorne Ahrens, Michael Smith, Michael Krol, Patrick Zamarripa, and Brent Thompson—five officers murdered by a sniper in Dallas while they were on duty.

We saw very troubling videos of Philando Castile and Alton Sterling being shot.

Today we also mark the 1-month anniversary of the shooting at the Pulse nightclub in Orlando, a hateful act on the LGBT community that took the lives of 49 people. This shooting shook the country, as have the many mass shootings that have preceded it.

As we still process these deaths, daily violence continues in communities around the country. Over the weekend, the total number of shootings in Chicago, where I come from, this year exceeded 2,100. Over 300 people in Chicago have now died from gun violence in 2016.

I have received hundreds and hundreds of letters from constituents of all ages concerned about the effect of gun violence in our communities and in their communities.

Yesterday I received a letter from a young constituent, an 8-year-old named Kaline. She wrote: “I read the Sun-Times every day like my dad. I read and still think about the story of Tyshawn Lee. It's just hitting my mind all the time because it's not fair. It makes me cry.”

Tyshawn Lee was a 9-year-old boy in Chicago deliberately assassinated, shot multiple times in the head.

Kaline continues: “I hope people can make better decisions about what to do with guns. I hope people stop fighting about whether we should do gun control because I worry more people and kids like Tyshawn will be killed.”

We can't accept violence as normal. This is not the country Kaline should have to grow up in. And how do you explain to an 8-year old that in America, with 91 people dying from gun violence every single day, we have taken no meaningful action?

We take action all the time to protect our kids from threats to their safety. We have regulations in place on teddy bears and pacifiers, to protect children's health and safety, but nothing for guns.

Guns are specifically exempted from regulation by the Consumer Product Safety Commission, the agency charged with protecting consumers from unreasonable risk or injury or death. Gun manufacturers are protected from liability for damage caused by their weapons. The Centers for Disease Control is actually prohibited, in law, from studying the public health risk of guns.

Robert, a 91-year-old and a veteran of World War II from my district wrote: “You know better than I do the vast array of efforts to protect the American people from the recklessness and avarice in the marketplace, yet Congress has failed the people in the matter of gun control . . . Today the

American public is crying for laws," he says.

Robert is right. I can think of no other product or industry that has so few measures in place to protect our safety, and we need to rethink our approach to guns. We can't put the interests of gun manufacturers and the gun lobby ahead of the safety of our communities. Those of us in Congress have the power to do something, and it is long past time for us to act.

We can start with measures that have broad support among the American people. Ninety percent of Americans support comprehensive background checks. Background checks would help reduce the flood of weapons that come into Chicago from gun shows and online sales.

Would it stop every shooting? Of course it wouldn't. But would it save some lives? Absolutely.

My heart goes out to the families in Dallas and Orlando and Chicago and so many other places that have had the lives of their loved ones stolen away by gun violence, and we need to grieve. But after that moment of silence, we must direct our sadness and our anger into action.

The problem of violence in communities may seem insurmountable, and no single policy will stop every death. But we should start by passing commonsense gun legislation supported by the vast majority of the American people.

We need a vote on legislation to keep guns out of the wrong hands. Republicans and Democrats and gun owners and NRA members agree that background checks for every gun purchase and closing the gun show loopholes and all the other loopholes will help.

So give us a vote, Mr. Speaker. My constituents are crying for action. Let's act, not ignore their cries any longer. Give us a vote.

#### NATIONAL STRATEGY FOR COMBATING TERRORIST, UNDERGROUND, AND OTHER ILLICIT FINANCING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. COSTELLO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 5594, the National Strategy for Combating Terrorist, Underground, and Other Illicit Financing Act. I wish to commend my colleague from Pennsylvania, Congressman MIKE FITZPATRICK, for his leadership on this bill.

This bill would direct the President to work with the Secretaries of the Treasury, State, Defense, and Homeland Security Departments, as well as Federal banking agencies and the Director of National Intelligence to create a comprehensive national strategy to push back against terror financing.

This national strategy would call for an ability to adapt to technology de-

velopments used by terrorists and to use technology to fight terror financing; it would encourage working with private financial institutions; and it would emphasize coordination efforts between international, State, and local officials.

This is a very good bill, and I am proud to support it.

#### SIMPLIFYING THE APPLICATION FOR STUDENT AID

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 5528, the Simplifying the Application for Student Aid Act.

This bill would make it easier for students to fill out the free application for Federal student aid, also known as the FAFSA form, in a number of ways. It would allow students to apply for financial aid earlier by using tax data from the 2 years prior before the FAFSA is dated. Under this legislation, some of the critical information FAFSA requires would be automatically entered, removing barriers that could hinder students in need from applying for aid.

We should do everything we can to assist students who want to attend college. And, Mr. Speaker, this legislation will help many students get more of a head start on responsible financial planning for their future.

#### SOLAR FUELS INNOVATION

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 5638, the Solar Fuels Innovation Act.

This legislation would enable the Federal Government to contribute to advancing energy technology at early stages through the Solar Fuels Basic Research Initiative at the Department of Energy.

The initiative would focus on the areas of science that are necessary to develop solar fuels, such as chemistry and materials science. It is important, indeed, and it is critical that we accelerate the research and deployment of next generation clean energy technologies.

In authorizing this research, which would be made available to companies, the Federal Government would help cutting-edge companies take the critical next steps in energy innovation. If we are thoughtful in how we advance American energy innovation, we can create jobs, preserve our resources, and improve the health of our communities.

#### RECOGNIZING JOSEPH PARIS

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize Joseph Paris, a teacher at the Stetson Middle School in the West Chester Area School District, who received the Bob Thompson Excellence in Energy Award from the National Energy Education Development Project.

Mr. Paris has been bringing technology into the classroom, while spurring interest and encouraging students to succeed. Great job, Mr. Paris.

#### RECOGNIZING THE HOME OF THE SPARROW AS NONPROFIT OF THE YEAR

Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wish to recognize the Home of the Sparrow as Nonprofit of the Year, as recognized by The Main Line Chamber of Commerce.

The Home of the Sparrow provides housing, education, and access to community resources to low-income women in Chester County. And the Home of the Sparrow has helped bring positive change to so many, and continues as a stellar, caring example of making a difference in Chester County.

#### GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. PERLMUTTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. PERLMUTTER. Mr. Speaker, it has been 4 days since the mass shooting in Dallas. It has been a month since the mass shooting in Orlando. It has been 7 months since the mass shooting in San Bernardino, and at the Planned Parenthood clinic in Colorado Springs. It has been a year since the mass shooting in Charleston. It has been 2 years since the mass shooting in Umpqua Community College in Oregon. It has been 3½ years since the mass shooting in Newtown, Connecticut. It has been 4 years since the mass shooting at the theater in Aurora, Colorado. It has been 5½ years since the mass shooting in Tucson, Arizona, where our colleague, Gabby Giffords, was shot.

Mr. Speaker, please talk to Speaker RYAN. Not once, after any of those shootings, in all of these 5½ years, have we had one hearing or one vote on gun violence, not one.

Now, we have had 60 votes on repealing the Affordable Care Act, none of which went anywhere. The Republican majority has spent millions of dollars going after Benghazi or emails to no avail; but not one vote, not one hearing, nothing on gun violence.

□ 1100

Now, Mr. Speaker, you know I would much rather be here talking about the Broncos winning the 50th Super Bowl. I would much rather be talking about the unbelievable accuracy of NASA getting the Juno satellite to Jupiter after 5 years of space travel within 1 second of the planned time. I would much rather be talking about Jenny Simpson, who is a University of Colorado graduate who is going to Rio, and wish her much success and that the wind be at her back. Those would be a lot more fun. Those would be some things I would love to do. But we have got to grapple with this issue. It is not going away, and we are not going away.

We asked for two commonsense pieces of legislation. They certainly aren't going to handle all the ills of society, but one is no fly, no buy; meaning, if you are on the terrorist watch list, you don't get a gun. The second is so common sense, which is background

checks on anybody who wants to purchase a weapon.

Those two simple pieces of legislation we have asked to be brought to this floor. In fact, a couple weeks ago, we were so upset that we actually did a filibuster and broke some rules of this House to try to make our voices heard to have a vote. The Republican majority has refused to let us have that vote.

Let us have a hearing. These are bipartisan pieces of legislation sponsored by Mr. KING. Mr. CURBELO, just a second ago, asked that something be brought up, but it is not going to be brought up.

It is time. It is time that we have a vote. It is time that we have a hearing. It is time that we do something about gun violence.

Today I just brought the picture of Garrett Swasey, the police officer who was killed in the mass shooting at the Planned Parenthood facility in Colorado Springs, and a picture to remember, Alex Teves, who was killed in the Aurora movie theater protecting his girlfriend from being shot by a madman who thought he was The Joker.

It is time, Mr. Speaker. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that we address these things. We can't avoid it any longer. These subjects are not going away. We are not going away. These people cannot have died in vain.

Whether it is the 5 police officers shot last week, the 49 people killed at the nightclub, the hundreds who have been killed by guns over the course of the last few years, it is time for a hearing, and it is time for a vote.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 2 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

#### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Merciful God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Bless the Members of this people's House with wisdom and the courage to address the pressing difficulties of our time. You know each one personally, through and through, and how they relate with one another. You know them, as Your people know them, as the 114th Congress.

Help them to know You. Impel them by Your spirit to act justly and walk humbly with You.

Inspire all of our citizens, as well, to look first to their blessings and then

charitably to the work of this people's House. Each Member chooses to serve another day. May each serve with honor, and merit the appreciation of those whom they serve.

May all that is done this day be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. FORBES) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. FORBES led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to 15 requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

#### RESTORING THE CONSTITUTION

(Mrs. WALORSKI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to take a stand against bureaucracy run amok. Every day I hear from hardworking Hoosiers, small-business owners, and family farmers buried under red tape. They feel like their government is actively working against them. From ObamaCare, to the EPA, to many other agencies, the Obama administration has been churning out complex and costly regulations. This has to stop.

We can't have small business, farmers, and other engines of our economy held back by the threat of a regulator knocking on their door. That is why we have a plan to restore the Constitution. House Republicans recently released our plan for A Better Way to make our government more accountable and transparent and give power back to the people.

Today we are also taking an important step toward reining in regulators and rebuilding the checks and balances our Founding Fathers intended with the Separation of Powers Restoration Act. Mr. Speaker, with this bill, and our A Better Way agenda, the House is standing up for the people against out-of-control bureaucracy.

#### REBUILDING OUR INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Speaker, the poor condition of America's infrastructure costs our economy hundreds of billions of dollars each year. Freight bottlenecks, aviation congestion, inadequate ports, and deteriorating roads will cost 2.5 million American jobs over the next 10 years unless we address it.

Meanwhile, interest rates are at a historic low. The yield on a 10-year Treasury bond is 1.4 percent. Indexed for inflation, the interest rate is negative.

Observing this, Nobel Prize economist Paul Krugman wrote: "They say that money talks; well, cheap money is speaking very clearly right now, and it's telling us to invest in our future," to nation-build in America.

Increasing spending by \$250 billion a year, the amount needed to bring our infrastructure to a state of good repair, would create 3 million jobs and would improve America's competitiveness in the long term.

We should use today's record low rates to finance this inevitable spending. Refusing to do so makes no economic sense. I encourage this Congress to reconsider before this opportunity is lost.

#### TRAGEDY AT THE BERRIEN COUNTY COURTHOUSE

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

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Speaker, southwest Michigan has had some tough times lately, and now we are faced with the news that broke yesterday that two bailiffs at Berrien County Courthouse in my hometown of St. Joseph, Michigan, were slain by an inmate who had overpowered his guard.

So I rise today to offer support and love for the victims' friends, family and certainly our entire community. We should continue to keep those affected in our hearts and in our minds. I also want to thank the countless folks on the front lines who clearly prevented the tragedy from even being worse.

The swift actions of those on the ground need to be commended, particularly the Berrien County Sheriff's Department led by Sheriff Paul Bailey. I was with him just this past Saturday, and what he had to endure the last 24 hours is unthinkable.

I also want to thank the immediate action and outpouring of support from our local officials: St. Joseph Mayor Mike Garey; Benton Harbor Mayor Marcus Muhammad; and State-elected officials, including our Governor Rick Snyder and State legislators John Proos and Al Pscholka. It is times like these when we need to unite as one. This heartbreaking tragedy happened



in the blink of an eye, but we will never forget.

We will remember and honor Joe Zangaro, who I knew personally, who was the head of courthouse security, a retired Michigan State Police officer. We will remember and honor Ronald Kienzle, a U.S. Army veteran, retired Benton Township police officer.

I ask my colleagues and those who hear this message across the country to pray for the families of the two victims, the speedy recovery of another deputy, James Atterberry, Jr., and a civilian caught in the middle, Kenya Ellis. We will get through this together.

#### GUN VIOLENCE

(Ms. MATSUI asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, it has been a challenging and heartbreaking time for our country. Today, we mark the 1-month anniversary of the horrible mass shooting in Orlando.

As we process the pain from the gun violence that continues to shake our Nation, we must come together and find solutions. We all share a desire to feel safe. We all want our children to grow up free from fear. The violence that has gripped our communities has taken many forms, and stems from many causes.

There is no question that we have work to do, and that solutions will not be simple. But we can and should be taking action in Congress to make our citizens safer. We can't solve every problem overnight, but we can take steps now to do some commonsense things Americans agree on, like expanding background checks and passing the bipartisan no fly, no buy bill.

Mr. Speaker, let us work together to find a path forward in our shared commitment to peace in our Nation.

#### MEDICAL DEVICE GUARDIANS

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Medical Device Guardians Act. The Guardians Act updates current laws regarding the reporting of unsafe medical devices by requiring that physicians and their offices be added to the list of entities that must report unsafe medical devices to the device manufacturer and to the FDA.

The tragic stories of women harmed by one particular device known as a laparoscopic power morcellator highlight the need for the Guardians Act. Despite cancer being spread for years by the blades of this device, no one ever reported this deadly safety defect to the FDA. That is until Amy Reed, a mother of six and a doctor underwent morcellation and had cancer spread throughout her body.

It should not have fallen on patients to get the FDA's attention. This bill simply codifies an existing mandate of the American Medical Association's Code of Medical Ethics, which recognizes that physicians are in the best position to identify and report unsafe devices. Today, reporting unsafe devices to the FDA is as easy as downloading an app on a smartphone.

This is a reasonable fix that will save lives. I urge my colleagues to support it.

#### OUR FIRST LINE OF DEFENSE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, more than 80 percent of NRA members and over 80 percent of gun owners support background checks. It is because they are responsible gun owners. Responsible gun owners understand that there is nothing wrong with making sure that a prospective gun buyer isn't a terrorist, a criminal, a domestic abuser, or dangerously mentally ill.

Our first line of defense when it comes to making sure that guns don't fall into dangerous hands is to conduct a background check. But sadly, a gaping loophole allows those same felons, domestic abusers, and fugitives to bypass a background check in 34 States by going online or to a gun show.

That is why it is long past time for the Republican leadership to allow a vote on H.R. 1217, bipartisan, pro-Second Amendment legislation to require background checks for all commercial gun sales. This debate isn't a choice between respecting the Second Amendment or reducing gun violence.

As a responsible gun owner, I am tired of it being framed that way. It is about this Congress doing both. Mr. Speaker, give us a vote.

#### CUBAN AIRPORT SECURITY

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

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5728, the bipartisan Cuban Airport Security Act of 2016.

Over the past several months, the Obama administration and the Cuban Government have stonewalled oversight of airport security arrangements. This lack of transparency is troubling and begs the question: What are they hiding?

As far as we know, Cuban airports don't have proper screening for explosive detection; they can't check for fake IDs and fake passports; they don't allow TSA on the ground to evaluate security; and they don't have air marshals on planes. The administration plans to start flights into Charlotte from Cuba in a few months, but they

are not doing enough to guarantee there won't be a security threat on one of those planes.

After all, Cuba has been a safe haven for terrorists and was just recently removed from the list of state sponsors of terrorism. It is a brutal regime that recently hosted the North Korean equivalent of our CIA Director. We should not allow the proposed 110 flights a day of commercial air flights—indeed, we shouldn't allow a single flight until we are absolutely sure they have the proper security at airports to protect the American people.

This legislation puts the brakes on the President's dangerous plans. I encourage my colleagues to support it.

#### IT IS TIME TO TAKE ACTION

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, today marks 1 month since the worst mass shooting in our Nation's history. This week, we learned that the House majority will not bring a bill to the floor until after the 7-week recess that starts this week.

The majority claims that it needs to show calm, that it needs to show leadership. Well, the majority has already failed to show leadership. That is why we are not calm.

It has been 30 days since Pulse, 223 days since San Bernardino, 226 days since Colorado Springs, 285 days since Roseburg, 362 days since Chattanooga, 390 days since Charleston, 781 days since Isla Vista, 832 days since Fort Hood, 1,030 days since Navy Yard, 1,131 days since Santa Monica, 1,306 days since Newtown, 1,383 days since Minneapolis, 1,437 days since Oak Creek, 1,453 days since Aurora, 1,562 days since Oakland, 1,735 days since Seal Beach, and 2,012 days since Tucson.

This is not leadership. This is cold. This is heartless. This is cowardice. It is time to take action to make our communities safer.

#### 60TH ANNIVERSARY OF OUR NATIONAL MOTTO

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

Mr. FORBES. Mr. Speaker, on July 30 we celebrate the 60th anniversary of our national motto, In God We Trust, which is displayed directly above your chair.

Throughout our history as a nation, we have often struggled to find the right words in time of crisis or great challenge.

In the War of 1812, we found those words in our national anthem when Francis Scott Key wrote: "And this be our motto: In God is our trust."

In 1864, Congress found them when it authorized the Secretary of the Treasury to add the inscription "In God We Trust" on coins.

In 1955, Congress found those words when it extended the “In God We Trust” to be included on our currency, and in 1956, Congress found them when it adopted “In God We Trust” as the official motto of the United States.

Today, as we see a divided Nation, a nation polarized in almost every area, today as we witness a nation facing crisis and challenge in a magnitude we have not seen in many years, as we search for the right words, let us hope we find them once again in the simple but powerful phrase, “In God We Trust.”

So today, we celebrate the anniversary of this motto and pray for God’s continued blessing on our land.

□ 1215

#### GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

(Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Speaker, there have been 231 mass shootings in 193 days so far in 2016. That is more than one per day. We are all directly affected by this gun violence epidemic in this country. In my own State and community, we have in fact seen a dramatic increase in this violence.

We cannot passively accept that the epidemic of gun violence kills as many people as car accidents every year. And while the mass shootings in this country have in fact become commonplace, I cannot continue to bear witness to the totality of human suffering that this is causing: the mothers and fathers who have lost children, the children who have lost parents, thousands who have lost loved ones, and all those who will in fact endure a lifetime of pain and suffering.

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I joined all my Democratic colleagues in an unprecedented sit-in to urge Republican leadership to allow us to vote on legislation to close glaring problems in our Nation’s background check system, including a loophole that has allowed 2,000 individuals on the FBI’s terrorist watch list to successfully purchase a firearm since 2004.

Americans have a constitutional right to live without fear of gun violence in our communities.

#### TREATMENT BEFORE TRAGEDY

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

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, over the past several years, I have met with thousands of families of those suffering with severe mental illness. These conversations led to my introduction of the Helping Families in Mental Health Crisis Act.

Last Wednesday, the House of Representatives passed this legislation

with a near unanimous vote of 422–2. This historic vote closed a tragic chapter in our Nation’s treatment of serious mental illness and welcomed a new dawn of help and hope. We have overwhelmingly chosen to deliver treatment before tragedy.

I now hope our colleagues in the Senate take up the next chapter and pass H.R. 2646. The current chaotic patchwork of antiquated Federal programs and laws make it impossible for those with serious mental illness to get meaningful care. My bill eliminates wasteful and effective programs and directs money where it is needed most. It is endorsed by over 50 professional organizations and over 60 newspapers.

We cannot let these families down. Lives are depending on it. We must continue to work this bill all the way to the President’s desk for signature.

#### ORLANDO SHOOTING 1-MONTH ANNIVERSARY

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, 1 month ago, 49 innocent individuals were mowed down and killed and 53 more were injured. Yet today, the Chamber’s business is still not focused on making our open spaces safer and passing safe gun measures to help protect our people.

It has been 1 month after the worst killing in United States history since 9/11, and we still have not taken up commonsense gun safety measures to protect our citizens. Instead, it is business as usual: another bill to impede a woman’s right to choose, another appropriations bill that will undermine the Clean Water Act.

As Members of Congress, we have to respond and answer to the American people that we represent—and they are asking for action. Enough is enough. The human rights and civil rights issue of our time is to protect our churches, our movie theaters, and our open spaces from mass murders by guns.

Let’s have a vote, Mr. Speaker. Let’s take back our streets and make the Nation safer.

#### CUBAN AIRPORT SECURITY

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

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my concerns about the Obama administration’s plans to restore regular air service to Cuba.

Just 2 weeks ago, I was scheduled to go on a congressional delegation to Cuba to examine the security measures at Cuba’s 10 international airports to ensure the safety and security of Americans flying to Cuba. This trip was necessitated by stonewalling tactics used by administration officials when asked about security at Cuba’s airports during a recent Transportation Security Subcommittee hearing.

However, the Cuban Government denied my visa as well as visas of every single member of the delegation. Because of that, I have serious concerns, as do my colleagues, about the capabilities of Cuba’s airport screening equipment and procedures, how Cuban airport workers are vetted, whether or not Federal air marshals will even be allowed to fly missions on American planes to and from Cuba, and many other questions.

As the chairman of the Transportation Security Subcommittee, I believe it is my duty to do everything in my power to secure the security of the traveling American public, and I take that seriously. That is why I have introduced H.R. 5728, legislation to stop the administration from moving forward with flights to Cuba until these security concerns are adequately addressed. I hope my colleagues will join me in supporting this important piece of legislation.

#### GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION

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

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I represent Orlando, the site of the worst mass shooting in the history of the United States: 49 dead in a matter of just minutes. So far, there has been no action by this body to address any grievances.

For instance, we have no action on PETER KING’s bill, the no fly, no buy terrorist gun bill. We have no action on PETER KING’s second bill, H.R. 1217. We have no action on DAVID CICILLINE’s bill to reinstate the assault weapons ban, H.R. 4269; no action on SHEILA JACKSON LEE’s bill, H.R. 4316; no action on the second bill that she introduced, H.R. 5470; no action on MIKE THOMPSON’s recently introduced bill, H.R. 5504; no action on my own bill to reinstate the assault weapons ban; no action even to show our respect for the dead by passing H. Res. 789, stalled in this body for a month.

I don’t think we should be doing anything unless we are going to do something about making the American people safe again. Therefore, I move to adjourn in respect of Stanley Almodovar, one of the victims, and the remainder.

#### MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTMORELAND). The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 0, nays 377,

answered “present” 1, not voting 55, as follows:

[Roll No. 404]

NAYS—377

Abraham	Dingell	Knight
Adams	Doggett	Kuster
Aderholt	Dold	Labrador
Aguilar	Donovan	LaHood
Allen	Duckworth	LaMalfa
Amash	Duffy	Lamborn
Amodei	Duncan (SC)	Lance
Ashford	Edwards	Langevin
Babin	Ellison	Larsen (WA)
Barr	Ellmers (NC)	Larson (CT)
Bass	Emmer (MN)	Latta
Beatty	Engel	Lawrence
Becerra	Eshoo	Lee
Benishek	Farenthold	Levin
Bera	Farr	Lewis
Beyer	Fitzpatrick	Lieu, Ted
Bilirakis	Fleischmann	Lipinski
Bishop (MI)	Fleming	LoBiondo
Bishop (UT)	Flores	Loebsack
Black	Fortenberry	Lofgren
Blackburn	Foster	Long
Blum	Frankel (FL)	Love
Blumenauer	Franks (AZ)	Lowenthal
Bonamici	Frelinghuysen	Lowe
Bost	Fudge	Lucas
Boustany	Gabbard	Lujan Grisham
Boyle, Brendan F.	Gallego	(NM)
Brady (PA)	Garamendi	Lujan, Ben Ray
Brady (TX)	Garrett	(NM)
Brat	Gibbs	Lummis
Bridenstine	Gibson	Lynch
Brooks (IN)	Gohmert	MacArthur
Brown (FL)	Goodlatte	Maloney,
Brownley (CA)	Gosar	Carolyn
Buchanan	Gowdy	Maloney, Sean
Buck	Graham	Massie
Buechson	Granger	Matsui
Burgess	Graves (GA)	McCarthy
Butterfield	Graves (LA)	McCaul
Calvert	Graves (MO)	McClintock
Capps	Green, Gene	McCollum
Capuano	Griffith	McDermott
Cárdenas	Grothman	McGovern
Carney	Guinta	McHenry
Carson (IN)	Guthrie	McKinley
Carter (GA)	Gutiérrez	McMorris
Carter (TX)	Hahn	Rodgers
Cartwright	Hanna	McNerney
Castor (FL)	Hardy	McSally
Castro (TX)	Harper	Meadows
Chabot	Harris	Meehan
Chaffetz	Hartzler	Meeks
Chu, Judy	Heck (WA)	Meng
Cicilline	Hensarling	Messer
Clark (MA)	Herrera Beutler	Mica
Clarke (NY)	Higgins	Miller (FL)
Clay	Hill	Miller (MI)
Cleaver	Himes	Moolenaar
Clyburn	Holding	Mooney (WV)
Coffman	Honda	Moore
Cohen	Hoyer	Moulton
Cole	Hudson	Mullin
Collins (GA)	Huelskamp	Mulvaney
Collins (NY)	Huffman	Murphy (FL)
Comstock	Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)
Conaway	Hultgren	Nadler
Connolly	Hunter	Napolitano
Conyers	Hurd (TX)	Neal
Cook	Hurt (VA)	Neugebauer
Cooper	Israel	Newhouse
Costello (PA)	Issa	Noem
Courtney	Jeffries	Nugent
Crawford	Jenkins (KS)	Nunes
Crenshaw	Jenkins (WV)	O'Rourke
Crowley	Johnson (OH)	Olson
Cuellar	Johnson, Sam	Palazzo
Culberson	Jones	Pallone
Curbelo (FL)	Jordan	Palmer
Davidson	Joyce	Pascrell
Davis (CA)	Kaptur	Paulsen
Davis, Rodney	Katko	Payne
DeFazio	Keating	Pearce
Delaney	Kelly (IL)	Perry
DeLauro	Kelly (MS)	Peters
DelBene	Kelly (PA)	Pingree
Denham	Kennedy	Pittenger
Dent	Kildee	Pitts
DeSantis	Kilmer	Pocan
DeSaulnier	Kind	Poliquin
DesJarlais	King (IA)	Polis
Deutch	King (NY)	Pompeo
Diaz-Balart	Kinzinger (IL)	Posey
	Kline	Price (NC)

Price, Tom	Schrader	Upton
Quigley	Schweikert	Valadao
Rangel	Scott (VA)	Vargas
Ratcliffe	Scott, Austin	Vela
Reed	Scott, David	Velázquez
Reichert	Sensenbrenner	Visclosky
Renacci	Serrano	Wagner
Rice (NY)	Sessions	Walberg
Rice (SC)	Sewell (AL)	Walden
Richmond	Sherman	Walker
Rigell	Shimkus	Walorski
Roby	Shuster	Walters, Mimi
Roe (TN)	Simpson	Walz
Rogers (AL)	Sinema	Wasserman
Rogers (KY)	Slaughter	Schultz
Rohrabacher	Smith (MO)	Waters, Maxine
Rokita	Smith (NE)	Watson Coleman
Rooney (FL)	Smith (NJ)	Welch
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (TX)	Wenstrup
Roskam	Smith (WA)	Westerman
Ross	Speier	Westmoreland
Rothfus	Stefanik	Whitfield
Rouzer	Stewart	Williams
Roybal-Allard	Swalwell (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Royce	Takano	Wilson (SC)
Ruiz	Thompson (CA)	Wittman
Ruppersberger	Thompson (MS)	Womack
Rush	Thompson (PA)	Woodall
Russell	Thornberry	Yarmuth
Ryan (OH)	Tipton	Yoder
Salmon	Tonko	Yoho
Sanford	Torres	Young (IA)
Sarbanes	Trott	Young (IN)
Scalise	Tsongas	Zeldin
Schakowsky	Turner	

ANSWERED “PRESENT”—1

Grayson

NOT VOTING—55

Barletta	Green, Al	Peterson
Barton	Grijalva	Poe (TX)
Bishop (GA)	Hastings	Ribble
Brooks (AL)	Heck (NV)	Sánchez, Linda T.
Bustos	Hice, Jody B.	Sanchez, Loretta T.
Byrne	Hinojosa	Schiff
Clawson (FL)	Jackson Lee	Sires
Costa	Johnson (GA)	Stivers
Cramer	Johnson, E. B.	Stutzman
Cummings	Jolly	Takai
Davis, Danny	Kirkpatrick	Tiberi
DeGette	Loudermilk	Titus
Doyle, Michael F.	Luetkemeyer	Van Hollen
Duncan (TN)	Marchant	Veasey
Esty	Marino	Weber (TX)
Fincher	Nolan	Webster (FL)
Forbes	Norcross	Young (AK)
Fox	Pelosi	Zinke
	Perlmutter	

□ 1244

Mr. HARPER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Messrs. NEUGEBAUER, YOHO, WOODALL, Ms. GRANGER, Messrs. BISHOP of Utah and DIAZ-BALART changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. SCHIFF. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted: On rollcall No. 404, “nay.”

Ms. ESTY. Mr. Speaker, On Tuesday, July 12, I unfortunately missed a rollcall vote on a motion to adjourn. Had I been present, I would have voted “no” on Rep. GRAYSON’s motion to adjourn (Rollcall No. 404).

□ 1245

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, July 12, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on July 12, 2016 at 11:11 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 44. With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

JUSTICE GINSBURG SHOWED BAD JUDGMENT

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, in a front page New York Times article, it was reported that Supreme Court Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg made derogatory statements about Donald Trump. Justice Ginsburg was being interviewed by the newspaper so she knew that her remarks would be made public. They were particularly personal and demeaning.

The Code of Conduct for judges states: “A judge should not publicly endorse or oppose a candidate for public office.”

It was totally inexcusable and unprofessional for Justice Ginsburg to insult a Presidential candidate. It hurt the credibility of the Supreme Court and showed bad judgment. It will be difficult for the American people to believe Justice Ginsburg can be impartial in any rulings that involve political issues.

Her verbal attack on Donald Trump only contributes to the public’s feeling that the justice system may be rigged.

REMEMBERING AND HONORING THE DEATH OF OFFICER LORNE AHRENS OF BURLESON, TEXAS

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

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, the city of Dallas experienced tremendous tragedy last week. It was the deadliest day for law enforcement since September 11, 2011.

Burleson resident, Lorne Ahrens, was one of the five officers who so courageously made the ultimate sacrifice. I am honored to have been able to say he hailed from Texas’ 25th Congressional District. At 6 feet, 5 inches, and 300 pounds, Officer Ahrens has been described as “a big guy with an even bigger heart.”

His colleagues said he always had a smile on his face. He was a loving and devoted husband and father. Officer Ahrens often volunteered at his children’s schools. He was known to be a jokester, a friend, and a true cop. The day before his death, it was reported

that Officer Ahrens bought dinner for a homeless man and his dog. This is who he was. This is who we lost.

A semi-pro football player, Officer Lorne Ahrens began as a dispatcher at the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department and joined the Dallas police force in 2002, eventually becoming a senior corporal.

There are no words to express the sadness felt by the entire Burleson community. I send my prayers to his wife Katrina and their family.

I am encouraged by the outpouring of support Officer Ahrens' family has received, and I know it will continue in our community.

May the Lord's strength give their hearts and souls peace and comfort. In God we always trust.

#### 125 YEARS OF MINNESOTA SUCCESS

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

Mr. EMMER of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an incredible company and true Minnesota original, Hormel Foods, which is celebrating 125 years of success.

Ever since George Hormel founded what is known today as the Hormel Foods Corporation in 1891, this company has created some of the most well-known products in the food industry.

Hormel started off as a small-town business in Austin, Minnesota, but quickly evolved with offices opening all over the State and Nation after the introduction of products like the world's first canned ham. One of the best known products that introduced Hormel to the country and the world is the Minnesota staple called SPAM.

Over the past 125 years, Hormel has continued to invent and acquire new products like Skippy Peanut Butter and Applegate Farms. In fact, Forbes has named Hormel one of the most innovative companies in the food processing industry.

I want to thank Hormel for being such a great Minnesota company for the past 125 years and for feeding our State, Nation, and the world. Congratulations, Hormel. Minnesota is proud to call you one of our own.

#### IRAN DEAL DOOMED FROM BEGINNING

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, this Thursday marks the 1-year anniversary of the Iran nuclear deal.

Despite assurances from the Obama administration, it is clear we need to do more to curb Iran's state sponsorship of terrorism, human rights abuses, and their ability to destabilize the region. This week, the House of Representatives will vote on commonsense measures to address these concerns.

Heavy water plays an important role in developing nuclear weapons. Yet the Iran nuclear deal allows Iran to possess heavy water up to a certain amount and then sell any additional heavy water on the international market.

As a result, the United States, in April, purchased 32 metric tons of heavy water from Iran, which means we are currently subsidizing and rewarding Iran's production of a key building block for a nuclear weapons program. This just doesn't make sense and is certainly outside of the idea of the deal that was made over a year ago; that, combined with testing of missiles, new contracts for Iran, and the \$150 billion that was released to them.

H.R. 5119, introduced by my colleague, Representative POMPEO, would further prohibit that. H.R. 5631 would hold Iran accountable for its State sponsorship of terrorism and other threatening activities. We need to move these measures and hold them accountable.

#### HONORING THE MEMORY OF WEST POINT CADET TOM SURDYKE

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of West Point Cadet Tom Surdyke from Festus, Missouri.

I had the honor to appoint Tom to West Point in 2015 and to share in his family's celebration the day he earned his Eagle Scout. Tom was a member of Missouri Boys State and an honor student at St. Pius High School. He was the proud son of Tim and Janice Surdyke and the beloved brother of Elaine, Rosemary, and Francie.

Tom chose a life of service at West Point, and in his death, he proved that serving others was always in his heart.

While on vacation on June 24, 2016, Tom and another swimmer he had just met on shore were caught in a rip tide. Tom instinctively went to the other young man who could not swim, keeping him afloat. But Tom was pulled under. Tom died in the hospital 4 days later.

Continuing his ultimate goal to serve, Tom donated his organs. He was buried at West Point on July 4, 2016—on his 19th birthday. He was given the Soldier's Medal, the Army's highest non-combat valor award because he saved the life of another.

I grieve the loss of this gifted young man who would have no doubt distinguished himself in a life of military service. But, today, I celebrate Tom Surdyke's spirit, his character, and the selfless act that distinguished him in death.

#### MAYS' FAMILY REUNION

(Mr. FARENTHOLD asked and was given permission to address the House

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate a family of Texas pioneers who lived in Robstown, Texas, for 108 years. The first of the Mays family to settle in Robstown were Ella and Riley, along with their 12 children. They arrived in 1912 as the first African American family in the city. On August 7 of this year, they will be holding a family reunion at the Richard M. Borchard Regional Fairgrounds in Robstown.

Once Ella and Riley settled, they founded the Mt. Zion Missionary Baptist Church, which served as both a church and the first public African American school in the city. They were important members of the community. The city of Robstown even named a street after Riley, who served as the deacon and Sunday school teacher of Mt. Zion where Ella was a nurse and missionary. Their hard work and dedication to faith, family, and community is an inspiration to us all.

I ask my colleagues to join me in celebrating the Mays' wonderful legacy and lasting impact they have had on Robstown, the Coastal Bend, and beyond.

May God bless you all.

#### LABELING REQUIREMENTS HURT CRAFT BREWERIES

(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, Minnesota is the proud home to over 100 craft breweries. Many of these breweries are small, but they still provide jobs and a real impact to our local economies across our great State. There are nearly 5,000 craft brewers across the country.

Unfortunately, a provision buried deep within the President's new healthcare law mandates that brewers label every single beer they produce with detailed calorie information.

This labeling requirement is projected now to cost \$77,000 per brewery. It is a financial burden that will be simply too steep for a lot of brewers who are just trying to get up and running and operating with little or no profit.

This is just the latest excessive and onerous burden placed upon small businesses by the President's new healthcare law. Mr. Speaker, Washington should be getting out of the way so that craft breweries have a chance to thrive, not putting up more unnecessary red tape that makes it impossible to do business.

It is time to act and repeal this harmful labeling requirement to prevent jobs from being lost, and to allow Americans to continue enjoying their locally produced craft beverage.

GIRL SCOUTS' GOLD AWARD  
CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Girl Scouts of the USA who have received their Gold Award for 2016, and to celebrate the 100th anniversary of this prestigious award.

In 1916, the Girl Scouts of the USA, which was founded in Savannah, Georgia, 5 years earlier, created the Gold Award as their highest achievement for a Girl Scout.

Since its creation, there have been only 1 million Girl Scouts who have received this award. Young women who receive the Gold Award are true leaders and make a significant impact in their community and around the world. This award is extremely competitive, and recipients show a true commitment in making a difference.

The women who receive this award have shown to be more engaged in leadership and community service positions and gain a stronger sense of self. For example, over half the women in the 114th Congress were Girl Scouts at one point.

Today, I would like to recognize the positive impacts of the Girl Scouts' Gold Award and celebrate its 100th anniversary. I look forward to another 100 years of this leadership and making a difference.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF H.R. 5538, DEPARTMENT OF  
THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT,  
AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JULY 15, 2016, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 5, 2016; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 820 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 820

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations.

SEC. 2. (a) After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as read through page 184, line 21. Points of order against provisions in the bill for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI are

waived except as follows: page 71, line 19, through page 71, line 25.

(b) No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution, and pro forma amendments described in section 4 of this resolution.

(c) Each amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as 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 except as provided by section 4 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of this resolution, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

SEC. 5. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommend with or without instructions.

SEC. 6. Section 454 of H.R. 5538 shall be considered to be a spending reduction account for purposes of section 3(d) of House Resolution 5.

SEC. 7. During consideration of H.R. 5538, section 3304 of Senate Concurrent Resolution 11 shall not apply.

SEC. 8. On any legislative day during the period from July 15, 2016, through September 5, 2016—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 9. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 8 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

SEC. 10. Each day during the period addressed by section 8 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar day for purposes of section 7 of the War Powers Resolution (50 U.S.C. 1546).

SEC. 11. Each day during the period addressed by section 8 of this resolution shall

not constitute a legislative day for purposes of clause 7 of rule XIII.

SEC. 12. Each day during the period addressed by section 8 of this resolution shall not constitute a calendar or legislative day for purposes of clause 7(c)(1) of rule XXII.

SEC. 13. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of July 14, 2016, or July 15, 2016, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

SEC. 14. The Committee on Appropriations may, at any time before 5 p.m. on Friday, July 29, 2016, file privileged reports to accompany measures making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017.

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

□ 1300

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 820, providing for consideration of an important piece of legislation, H.R. 5538, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2017.

The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 5538 under a structured rule, which is a standard tool currently available under the rules of the House and previously used by both Republicans and Democrats for consideration of appropriation bills. However, the Rules Committee received 178 amendments to this bill and undertook a long, arduous, and very open process to make as many amendments in order as possible. While 10 were withdrawn, out of the remaining 168 amendments, the committee made 131 in order, almost equally divided between Republicans and Democrats, ensuring that both sides of the aisle have the opportunity to offer their amendments and provide their input on this very important measure.

Mr. Speaker, the bill appropriates funding for the Department of Interior, the EPA, the U.S. Forest Service, the Indian Health Service, and various independent and related agencies. This is a fiscally responsible measure that appropriates \$32.095 billion in discretionary spending, which is a \$64 million decrease from fiscal year 2016 and a \$1

billion reduction from the President's request. While this bill respects our country's current fiscal year situation, where our national debt is approaching \$20 trillion, it provides the means necessary to fund the Department of Interior and environmental programs that protect and promote our natural resources within a responsible, yet sustainable budget.

The legislation includes funding for many important priorities, such as the PILT program that provides funds for local governments in 49 States to help offset losses in property taxes due to nontaxable Federal lands within their counties. Without congressional action, many rural communities would face huge budget shortfalls because of Federal land ownership, which would impact public safety, education, and other local government responsibilities.

The bill also rejects a White House proposal that would have raised fees on American ranchers for grazing on Federal lands, which is another costly Federal proposal that ranchers simply cannot afford. It allocates an increase for on-the-ground sage grouse conservation to protect the species, while also preserving Federal lands for public and private uses, such as energy development, ranching, recreation, as well as military training.

Finally, it provides the National Park Service with targeted funding increases for park operations and maintenance to help reduce the Park Service's maintenance backlog, which currently stands at an astonishing \$12 billion, and we simply must address.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5538 also includes conservative policy provisions to stop the bureaucratic regulatory overreach that is harming the United States. Job creation and wage growth continue to be stifled by EPA and other Federal regulations.

In response, this bill denies funding for job-killing rules and contains provisions to stop the regulatory overreach that is restricting economic activity. Specifically, the bill reduces funding for the EPA by \$164 million below the fiscal year 2016 level and \$294 million below the President's request. Within this total, EPA's regulatory programs are reduced by \$43 million from the current level.

Additionally, it rejects the President's proposal to increase staffing at the EPA and holds the agency to the current capacity of 15,000 positions, which is the lowest level since 1989.

Over the past few years, we have heard time and again about the EPA overstepping its authority, whether by lobbying for the misguided and unconstitutional WOTUS rule, or by providing funds to groups that openly advocate and lobby for antiagricultural policies and legislation, which happened in my State of Washington with the illegal "what's upstream" campaign.

To hold the EPA accountable and stop its antigrowth agenda of numer-

ous harmful, costly, and potentially job-killing regulations, the bill contains a number of legislative provisions to halt these actions.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation also includes language prohibiting the Forest Service or the BLM from issuing new closures of public lands to hunting and recreational shooting, which will preserve public access so that everyone can enjoy these American pastimes on our treasured Federal lands and national forests.

Further, the measure prevents the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service from closing fish hatcheries, a key salmon recovery tool in the Pacific Northwest and in other parts of the country, and continues a 1-year delay on any further Endangered Species Act status reviews, determinations, and rulemakings for the greater sage grouse.

Additionally, H.R. 5538 provides critical funding for the Department of Interior and the U.S. Forest Service to prevent and combat devastating wildfires. This is particularly important to me and the people of Washington's Fourth Congressional District. My State and much of the West have experienced catastrophic wildfire seasons over the last 2 years, with the State of Washington enduring back-to-back years of record-setting fires, which have been fueled by not only a lack of rainfall and extremely arid conditions, but also poor forest management. It also includes \$575 million for hazardous fuels management, which is \$30 million above the fiscal year 2016 level, and will help ensure our forests are cleared, healthy, and better prepared to withstand future wildfires, something that is badly needed not only in central Washington, but across the West, as we head into another dry fire season.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good rule that provides for consideration of the FY 2017 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill, which promotes the responsible use of our natural resources, provides the tools necessary to protect and combat devastating wildfires, and invests in programs and infrastructure to improve the quality of life for families across the country. However, most importantly, this is a fiscally responsible bill that reflects the priorities of House Republicans in tackling our yearly deficits and out-of-control national debt. I think it strikes a smart, intentional balance between funding essential programs and making responsible reductions to lower priority activities to make sure we meet our tight budget guidelines, which is why I urge my colleagues to support the rule and the underlying bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

MOTION OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON OF FLORIDA

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state his motion.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, if we are not going to do anything about gun

violence today, maybe we can do something about it tomorrow.

I move to postpone this question to a date certain tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 6(b) of rule 13, the gentleman's motion is not in order.

Mr. GRAYSON. I appeal the ruling of the Chair.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman's appeal may not be entertained. As reflected by the ruling of Speaker Crisp of September 20, 1893, an appeal of the Chair's refusal to entertain a motion on the grounds that it is dilatory within the meaning of clause 6(b) of rule XIII is itself dilatory within the meaning of that rule.

#### MOTION TO ADJOURN

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to adjourn offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 0, nays 362, answered "present" 1, not voting 70, as follows:

[Roll No. 405]

NAYS—362

Abraham	Castor (FL)	Doyle, Michael
Adams	Castro (TX)	F.
Aderholt	Chabot	Duckworth
Aguilar	Chaffetz	Duffy
Allen	Chu, Judy	Duncan (SC)
Amash	Cicilline	Duncan (TN)
Amodei	Clark (MA)	Ellmers (NC)
Ashford	Clarke (NY)	Emmer (MN)
Babin	Clay	Engel
Barr	Cleaver	Eshoo
Barton	Clyburn	Esty
Beatty	Coffman	Farenthold
Becerra	Cohen	Farr
Benishek	Cole	Fitzpatrick
Bera	Collins (GA)	Fleischmann
Beyer	Conaway	Fleming
Bilirakis	Connolly	Flores
Bishop (MI)	Conyers	Fortenberry
Bishop (UT)	Cook	Foster
Blackburn	Cooper	Frankel (FL)
Blum	Costa	Frelinghuysen
Blumenauer	Costello (PA)	Fudge
Bonamici	Courtney	Gabbard
Bost	Cramer	Gallego
Boustany	Crenshaw	Garrett
Boyle, Brendan	Crowley	Gibbs
F.	Cuellar	Gibson
Brady (PA)	Culberson	Gohmert
Brady (TX)	Cummings	Goodlatte
Brat	Curbelo (FL)	Gosar
Bridenstine	Davis (GA)	Gowdy
Brooks (AL)	Davis, Rodney	Graham
Brooks (IN)	DeFazio	Graves (GA)
Brown (FL)	DeGette	Graves (LA)
Brownley (CA)	Delaney	Graves (MO)
Buchanan	DeLauro	Green, Gene
Buck	DelBene	Griffith
Bucshon	Denham	Grothman
Burgess	Dent	Guinta
Bustos	DeSantis	Guthrie
Byrne	DeSaulnier	Gutiérrez
Capps	DesJarlais	Hahn
Capuano	Deuth	Hanna
Carney	Diaz-Balart	Hardy
Carson (IN)	Dingell	Harper
Carter (GA)	Doggett	Harris
Carter (TX)	Dold	Hartzler
Cartwright	Donovan	Heck (NV)

Hensarling	McCarthy	Royce
Herrera Beutler	McCaul	Ruiz
Hice, Jody B.	McClintock	Ruppersberger
Higgins	McCollum	Rush
Hill	McDermott	Ryan (OH)
Himes	McHenry	Salmon
Holding	McKinley	Sarbanes
Honda	McMorris	Scalise
Hoyer	Rodgers	Schakowsky
Hudson	McNerney	Schiff
Huelskamp	McSally	Schrader
Huffman	Meadows	Schweikert
Huizenga (MI)	Meehan	Scott, Austin
Hunter	Meeks	Scott, David
Hurd (TX)	Meng	Scott, David
Hurt (VA)	Messer	Sensenbrenner
Issa	Mica	Serrano
Jeffries	Miller (MI)	Sessions
Jenkins (KS)	Moolenaar	Sherman
Jenkins (WV)	Mooney (WV)	Shimkus
Johnson (OH)	Moore	Shuster
Johnson, Sam	Moulton	Sinema
Jones	Mullin	Sires
Joyce	Mulvaney	Slaughter
Kaptur	Murphy (FL)	Smith (MO)
Katko	Murphy (PA)	Smith (NE)
Keating	Nadler	Smith (WA)
Kelly (IL)	Napolitano	Speier
Kelly (MS)	Neal	Stefanik
Kelly (PA)	Neugebauer	Stewart
Kennedy	Newhouse	Swalwell (CA)
Kildee	Noem	Takano
Kilmer	Norcross	Thompson (CA)
Kind	Nunes	Thompson (MS)
King (IA)	O'Rourke	Thompson (PA)
King (NY)	Olson	Thornberry
Kinzinger (IL)	Palazzo	Tipton
Kirkpatrick	Pallone	Tonko
Kline	Palmer	Torres
Knight	Pascrell	Trott
Kuster	Paulsen	Tsongas
Labrador	Payne	Turner
LaHood	Pearce	Upton
LaMalfa	Perry	Valadao
Lance	Peters	Van Hollen
Langevin	Pingree	Vargas
Larson (CT)	Pittenger	Vela
Latta	Pitts	Velázquez
Lawrence	Pocan	Visclosky
Lee	Poliquin	Walberg
Levin	Polis	Walden
Lewis	Pompeo	Walker
Lieu, Ted	Posey	Walorski
Lipinski	Price (NC)	Walters, Mimi
LoBiondo	Price, Tom	Walz
Loeb sack	Quigley	Wasserman
Lofgren	Ratcliffe	Schultz
Long	Reed	Waters, Maxine
Loudermilk	Reichert	Watson Coleman
Love	Renacci	Welch
Lowenthal	Rice (NY)	Wenstrup
Lowey	Rice (SC)	Westerman
Lucas	Richmond	Westmoreland
Luetkemeyer	Roby	Whitfield
Lujan Grisham	Roe (TN)	Williams
(NM)	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (FL)
Luján, Ben Ray	Rogers (KY)	Wilson (SC)
(NM)	Rohrabacher	Wittman
Lynch	Rokita	Womack
MacArthur	Ros-Lehtinen	Woodall
Maloney,	Roskam	Yoder
Carolyn	Ross	Yoho
Maloney, Sean	Rothfus	Young (IA)
Massie	Rouzer	Young (IN)
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Zeldin
		Zinke

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Grayson

NOT VOTING—70

Barletta	Garamendi	McGovern
Bass	Granger	Miller (FL)
Bishop (GA)	Green, Al	Nolan
Black	Grijalva	Nugent
Butterfield	Hastings	Pelosi
Calvert	Heck (WA)	Perlmutter
Cárdenas	Hinojosa	Perlmutter
Clawson (FL)	Hultgren	Peterson
Collins (NY)	Israel	Poe (TX)
Comstock	Jackson Lee	Rangel
Crawford	Johnson (GA)	Ribble
Davidson	Johnson, E. B.	Rigell
Davis, Danny	Jolly	Rooney (FL)
Edwards	Jordan	Russell
Ellison	Lamborn	Sánchez, Linda
Fincher	Larsen (WA)	T.
Forbes	Lummis	Sanchez, Loretta
Foxx	Marchant	Sanford
Franks (AZ)	Marino	Scott (VA)
		Sewell (AL)

□ 1343

Messrs. GOHMET, COFFMAN, LABRADOR, and CARTER of Georgia changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the motion to adjourn was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5538, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JULY 15, 2016, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 5, 2016; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for graciously yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, despite the repeated claims by the majority that the Chamber is an open one and represents the American people, we have not had a single open rule since Speaker RYAN assumed the gavel. Although they claim there are many restricting amendments processed to prevent so-called "poison pill" amendments, nothing could be further from the truth, and, frankly, even poison pill amendments are allowable.

The bill before us contains several controversial policy riders that virtually guarantee the President's veto and blocks a number of amendments that would be in order under the standing rules of the House.

□ 1345

The bill drastically underfunds important agencies and programs by more than \$1 billion below the President's request. This sends a message that the majority puts what is best for their special interests ahead of what is best for the health of our communities.

I am particularly concerned that the bill makes draconian cuts to the Environmental Protection Agency, which will undercut the health and safety of all Americans—these cuts, despite the ongoing public health disaster in Flint, Michigan, where, for the rest of their lives, the children who were poisoned by lead in their drinking water could suffer from neurodevelopmental damage that could lead to everything from behavioral changes, to anemia, to hypertension.

All across the Nation, there are century-old water pipes in older cities in desperate need of replacement. Although lead pipes were banned 30 years

ago, there are an estimated 3 to 10 million still in service today. My district has an estimated 23,000 lead service lines that lead from the water main to the curb, and that is 40 percent of all the water lines in the district.

Multiple schools in the district recently tested have found elevated lead levels in their water sources. The majority refuses to make virtually any investments in our Nation's infrastructure as it crumbles. But as you know, Mr. Speaker, lead has been found in the drinking water in the Cannon Building, one of the legislative office buildings. I can almost guarantee you that before the next week is out, that that will be taken care of. I don't know how this Congress can ignore the needs of the young people in Flint, Michigan, and other children throughout this country who are drinking lead water in their schools such that we will take care of what happens here in Congress and completely overlook and ignore their needs.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, being as we have no additional speakers, I just would like to inquire of the gentleman from New York if she is ready to close.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, every day we are here considering bills like this that will never become law, and every time we do that, that is another day that we have failed to combat the gun violence epidemic that is tearing our country apart.

Mr. Speaker, an epidemic of gun violence is happening all across the country, and the majority should stop the political games and the gimmicks. Instead of voting on another one-House bill that is sure to be vetoed by the President should it ever become a two-House bill, we should be voting on no fly, no buy. It is astonishing to American citizens that persons who are on the no-fly list as suspected terrorists can nonetheless buy guns.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up this important legislation. No fly, no buy is a commonsense, bipartisan bill that would keep guns out of the hands of suspected terrorists. In the interest of public safety, if nothing else, we should be doing that by all means. It is supported by nearly 90 percent of the public and deserves our consideration.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of the amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on ordering the previous question, the rule, and the underlying bill.

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

The rule we have considered today provides for consideration of an important and badly needed bill. This legislation funds critical activities, such as wildfire mitigation and response, PILT payments for counties with large amounts of Federal lands, fish hatcheries that are helping to meet salmon recovery goals, the \$12 billion maintenance backlog on our National Park Service lands, and the need to address the problem of lead in drinking water across our country.

This is also a fiscally responsible bill that reflects House Republicans' priorities in tackling our out-of-control national debt. This is accomplished by striking a smart balance between funding essential programs and making responsible reductions to lower priority activities to ensure we meet our tight budget guidelines. This bill includes provisions that will roll back and prevent many harmful Federal regulations that have had a chilling effect on business development and economic activity at a time when we can ill afford either.

The measure protects the rights of law-abiding Americans by prohibiting Federal agencies from issuing new closures of public lands to hunting and recreational shooting as well as from regulating the lead content of ammunition and fishing tackle.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation recognizes and respects the current fiscal landscape, lowers overall funding in the bill by \$64 million below current levels and \$1 billion below the President's request, yet it still provides the means necessary to fund the Department of the Interior and environmental programs that protect and promote our natural resources with a responsible, yet sustainable, budget.

Additionally, the measure provides critically needed funds to ensure forest health and combat wildfires, a priority for many living in the West who have seen devastating wildfires destroy homes, businesses, and millions of acres of land over the last few years.

This is a strong rule that provides for the consideration of a very important bill, and I urge my colleagues to support the rule's adoption and invest in a prosperous future for our country by passing the FY 2017 Interior and environment appropriations bill.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 820 OFFERED BY  
MS. SLAUGHTER

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 15. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist.

The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 16. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amend-

ment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION  
OF H.R. 4992, UNITED STATES FINANCIAL SYSTEM PROTECTION ACT OF 2016; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5119, NO 2H2O FROM IRAN ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5631, IRAN ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2016

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 819 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 819

*Resolved*, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 4992) to codify regulations relating to transfers of funds involving Iran, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Financial Services; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5119) to prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds available to any Federal department or agency for any fiscal year to purchase or issue a license for the purchase of heavy water produced in Iran. All



points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5631) to hold Iran accountable for its state sponsorship of terrorism and other threatening activities and for its human rights abuses, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs; and (2) one motion to recommit.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 819 allows for consideration of three very important bills relating to the national security of the United States of America. Each of these bills deals with Iran, the world's leading state sponsor of terrorism.

The conduct of the Iranian Government continues to be very concerning. Iran has a clear record of human rights violations and mistreatment of its citizens. Iran also has continued aggressive behavior, including testing intercontinental ballistic missiles, which can be used to attack our allies in the Middle East, like Israel, as well as the potential to strike us here at home.

Director of National Intelligence James Clapper wrote in testimony to the Senate Committee on Armed Services earlier this year: "The Islamic Republic of Iran presents an enduring threat to U.S. national interests because of its support to regional terrorist and militant groups and the Asad regime, as well as its development of advanced military capabilities."

Iran is not becoming a better partner or neighbor. Just look no further than the capture at gunpoint and detention of 10 U.S. sailors earlier this year. A Navy investigation released a few

weeks ago found that Iran violated international law and violated sovereign immunity during that episode. Clearly, they are no friend of the United States.

So these bills address three different areas where the United States can stand up to Iran and encourage them to stop with their rogue actions and putting lives at risk. First, the resolution allows for consideration of H.R. 4992, the United States Financial System Protection Act. This legislation will codify existing requirements that prohibit the Obama administration from allowing the U.S. dollar to be used to facilitate trade transactions with Iran. These requirements will remain in place until the President certifies that Iran is no longer supporting terrorism, developing ballistic missiles, abusing human rights, or laundering money in support of dishonest activity.

Iran's financial sector poses a clear risk to financial markets around the world, given their track record of corruption and support for terrorism. In fact, the Financial Action Task Force, an organization created by the G7 to set standards regarding money laundering, has labeled Iran as a Non-Cooperative Country or Territory. If Iran doesn't want to be subject to these restrictions, then it is simple: they just need to stop supporting terrorism and conducting other illicit activities. I don't think that is too much to ask.

The bill also allows for consideration of H.R. 5119, the No 2H2O from Iran Act. This straightforward bill prohibits the United States from purchasing heavy water from Iran.

For those who do not know—and until I learned about this, I would have been one of those—heavy water is essential to the production of weapons-grade plutonium. News reports from just yesterday indicate the Obama administration has officially purchased 32 metric tons of heavy water from Iran for \$8.6 million. That is \$8.6 million in U.S. taxpayer money that will be going to the largest state sponsor of terrorism. That is simply absurd.

If Iran isn't producing nuclear weapons, then why do they need such large amounts of heavy water to begin with? Iran needs to stop with their production of heavy water altogether. The last thing the United States should do is continue to support and condone their illicit activities.

Finally, the bill also provides for consideration of H.R. 5631, the Iran Accountability Act. This bill will ensure strong sanctions remain in place against Iran for their support of terrorism as well as their human rights violations and continued ballistic missile program.

Holding Iran accountable is critically important, and it is clear that our sanctions against Iran work. Robust economic sanctions will force Iran to back down from their rogue activities and stop supporting terrorism.

□ 1400

Just consider the serious threats posed by Iran's ballistic missile pro-

gram. Mr. Clapper, the Director of National Intelligence, has also written in testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee that "Iran's ballistic missiles are inherently capable of delivering weapons of mass destruction, and Tehran already has the largest inventory of ballistic missiles in the Middle East."

The United States cannot stand by and become complicit with these actions by Iran. We must stand up for freedom, justice, and good around the globe.

Mr. Speaker, I want to quickly make one other point. I know Members of this House have different opinions about the Iran nuclear agreement. Personally, I was and am strongly opposed, because I think it makes the world less safe.

But regardless of your views on the Iran deal, can we not all agree that Iran should stop supporting terrorism? Can we not all agree that Iran should face consequences for the continued violation of human rights? Can we not all agree that Iran should stop producing ballistic missiles that can be used to attack U.S. servicemembers and our allies and us here at home?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stand up to Iran. Support House Resolution 819 and the underlying legislation.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman for yielding the customary time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule that provides for consideration of three bills: H.R. 5631, H.R. 5119, H.R. 4992.

Mr. Speaker, the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action is an agreement which was the culmination of 2 years of negotiations between the United States, the United Kingdom, France, Russia, China, Germany, and Iran. It was really a turning point in the history of nuclear disarmament and prevention of nuclear proliferation.

We have certifiable assurance from Iran that it will cease to develop its nuclear weapons program. It was an historic diplomatic effort. Obviously, the jury is still out on whether it works. But at this point, we need to move forward on the rigid implementation of this agreement.

While any multilateral agreement, by its very nature, is far from perfect, many believe that this deal represented the best shot at preventing a nuclear-armed Iran. So far, it is too early to say whether the agreement is working.

There is no doubt—and I think there is agreement—that Iran is a destabilizing force in the region. It is a hostile regime. The regular regime and their theocracy and the Ayatollah regularly spout anti-American, anti-Israel, anti-Semitic, anti-gay statements. They have a track record of supporting terrorist activities and have a horrible domestic record on human

rights. But as many renowned experts, including military officials and non-proliferation experts and nuclear physicists have recognized, there weren't any better options on the table than the JCPOA to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons.

The deal is not based on blind trust. It is predicated on third-party verification and strong international monitoring provisions that need to be fully implemented so that we will know if the Iranians cheat. The deal mandates that if Iran violates any aspect of the deal, there are tough snapback sanctions that would be employed against the Iranians.

Keep in mind that there are a number of sanctions that are not related to nuclear deterrence. Those are still in place with regard to Iran, and will remain in place with regard to terrorist activity and human rights. The bill does not remove the military option from the table if today's Iranian regime or future Iranian regimes fail to abide by the agreement.

In contrast, the three bills under consideration today are an effort to undermine the direction that America and Israel are going with regard to rigid implementation of the JCPOA.

Let's start with the flawed process. None of these bills have had a chance to be considered by committee. They just sort of appeared here in the Rules Committee. They didn't go through the Foreign Affairs Committee or the Armed Services Committee or any other committee. They skipped a markup. They skipped bipartisan negotiations. As far as I know, I certainly didn't see them. I don't think any Members on my side of the aisle saw them—if the gentleman has other information, let us know—until earlier this week.

So I am not aware of any bipartisan negotiations. Certainly, that normally occurs in the committee. This leapt over the committee and went right to the Rules Committee and, of course, will be considered under a closed rule, which means Members of this body, Democratic and Republicans, had no chance to amend these bills that mysteriously appeared on Monday. They didn't have a chance in committee. It went through committee. They don't have a chance here because the Rules Committee actually blocked every amendment by having a closed process.

We have an amendment process for a reason, under regular order. It provides Members of this body, the majority and minority party, the opportunity for input and debate. It often leads to a better work product. Unfortunately, under this rule, it is not being allowed on those bills.

These bills short-circuited the process. They are bad bills. It is only through continued engagement and rigid implementation that we can continue to make sure that Iran does not develop nuclear weapons, by keeping our voice and the conversation at the table. If we don't do that, it would be a critical miscalculation.

We can agree that the Iranian regime can be untrustworthy, and that is why we need rigid implementation of the JCPOA. Getting Iran to the negotiating table reduces the risk of adding another nuclear state to a secure world. We need to verify, verify. And, of course, all options remain on the table.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I was listening to the gentleman's comments. The reason why I know amendments were made in order is that only one amendment was received by the committee. It was received after we had finished having the testimony before the committee and shortly before the committee was going to take up the rule.

So there really wasn't any reasonable way to consider that particular amendment. And since no other Member of the House had offered any amendments, there really weren't any amendments to make in order.

The second point he said is that we are proceeding on the assurance that Iran is going to comply with the agreement—the assurance of Iran, when we have recent news reports that people in other countries that are working on this, particularly in Germany, have found that there have already been violations of this agreement by Iran. So there is every reason to believe that an assurance from Iran means nothing. Nothing.

He says we need to move forward with implementation. Well, there is nothing in the underlying bills that would stop implementation of this agreement that the President agreed to and that, unfortunately, not enough of us were against to stop. So the agreement is going forward, much to my chagrin.

These three bills deal with specific threats from Iran that have nothing to do with the agreement. They deal with the production of heavy water. There is no reason for us to buy heavy water. There is no reason for them to produce heavy water unless they are producing weapons-grade plutonium. And there is no reason for them to produce weapons-grade plutonium unless they are producing weapons, which is a violation of the agreement.

They should not be able to use American currency to effect their transactions. And we should put very heavy sanctions on them while they continue to support terrorism around the world and while they continue to support ever bigger, ever longer-range ballistic missiles.

Let's make no mistake about it. Long-range ballistic missiles are not needed to hit Israel. Long-range ballistic missiles are needed to hit Europe and the United States of America.

So these three bills don't get at the agreement that the President has already agreed to and that people on the other side of the aisle and some others

said were okay. These get to the remaining threats against the people of the United States.

I would suggest to the gentleman that these three bills are very much important to what we need to do to protect the American people.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, one year ago, America made a momentous decision concerning the best way to deal with Iran, a dangerous, authoritarian regime with a history of promoting terrorism. We made a choice between war and peace. We learned something from the colossal failure of the Bush-Cheney go-it-alone, war-of-choice in Iraq. We wisely chose the path of diplomacy.

Now, one year after these very difficult negotiations with Iran, we should recognize that success has been achieved. And even though we have not limited every danger from Iran, we have limited the most significant danger, the development of a nuclear weapon. Whereas before, Iran could have developed a nuclear weapon within a few months, it now would take a year or more, if Iran made that horrible decision to produce a nuclear weapon.

Before the agreement, Iran's nuclear program was cloaked in secrecy. Now we have inspectors and the opportunity for rigorous examination of their sites on a regular basis.

Tomorrow, if Iran were to decide to produce a nuclear weapon, not only would it take four to six times longer than before, we would quickly be aware of it and would be able to take appropriate action.

Iran has shipped over 8.5 tons of enriched uranium to Russia. It has disabled more than 12,000 centrifuges and poured concrete into the core of a reactor at Arak designed to produce plutonium. Now, it is the United States that is acquiring some of Iran's heavy water that might have gone to nuclear production.

Each of these steps carries us further on a long and important road toward eliminating Iran's short-term uranium and plutonium pathways to a nuclear weapon. That is progress, by every measure. America and our key allies are safer today than we were a year ago, and before that—safer than if we had followed their path of confrontation and war. Continuous, intrusive monitoring is the key to keeping our families safe and avoiding war.

An impressive bipartisan group of some 75 high-profile signatories—Nobel laureates, generals, diplomats, and legislators—have approved this accord, advising the President and Congress yesterday that this agreement is “providing greater security to our friends and partners in the region and to the world,” noting that “all pathways to an Iranian nuclear weapon have been blocked.”

After doing everything they possibly could think of to subvert and undermine the negotiations while they were underway with Iran—even an outrageous letter from a Republican group of Senators telling the Iranians to believe them and not the President of the United States—the Republicans today continue to interfere with and refuse to accept peace as the better course to safeguard our families.

Through today's debate, they launched yet one more partisan attack on this agreement. In all, they have authored more than 20 pieces of legislation attempting to undermine this agreement.

While the administration properly focuses our energy on enhanced verification, Republicans focus theirs instead on how to destroy the agreement. It is much like the debate we had over the Affordable Care Act. All they are concerned with is one vote of repeal after another, and they offer no viable alternatives. That is the case here. Instead of focusing on how to make us safer, their goal is to undermine the President of the United States and destroy this agreement.

As usual, my colleagues are choosing inaction over a Plan of Action. They know the President has issued a veto threat. In the unlikely event that this regressive legislation were to be approved in Congress, it would never become law.

Today they are adopting a procedural rule so that this House will waste a full day discussing how to destroy the Iran nuclear agreement. It will not address gun violence. It will not address the failure to fund research for a vaccine to prepare and prevent the Zika virus from spreading. It will not do anything about voting rights or a host of other issues this Congress should be considering. Instead, it is raising three bills going the wrong direction.

Some of those that reject diplomacy today are the same people that were backing the go-it-alone invasion of Iraq, a debacle second to none in the history of America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. One country, more than any other, benefited from their wrong-headed decision, and was empowered. That country was Iran. Today, diplomacy, the opposite of war, is hard to start and easy to end. Let us continue on that path.

The path ahead remains difficult. Iran will be challenging. We must watch it like a hawk and monitor it, but we need not yield to the hawks who reject peace.

□ 1415

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman said that the decision made last year was a momentous decision. I agree with him. It was a momentous decision and I fear it is a decision that our chil-

dren, our grandchildren and great grandchildren will come to regret, a decision that will give us not only a nuclearized Iran, but a nuclearized Middle East.

He said there was a choice between war and peace. That was a false choice. There was a choice between keeping the sanctions in place to get a better deal or giving in, and we gave in. So the truth of the matter is that we had a real option out there, and that was to stick to our guns and get a better deal. We didn't do that.

We could sit back and watch what is happening, or we can do something. These bills do something that don't undermine the agreement that has already been reached and already been basically approved by a number of people in this House.

What we are looking at is a nuclearized Middle East, unless we take some steps now, and these underlying bills do that. We are not safer today because of what we did. The world is far more dangerous.

I sit on the Armed Services Committee. I can tell you that that decision last summer has destabilized further the Middle East, not further stabilized it.

Finally, the gentleman brought up the Zika virus. We passed a responsible bill through this House that dealt with the Zika virus and sent it to the Senate and Democrats in the Senate are blocking that bill from coming up.

So who is being responsible about Zika? The Republicans are being responsible about Zika and the Democrats are being irresponsible.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire if the gentleman has any additional speakers.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I do not, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I will be offering a motion in a moment that, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to bring up the bipartisan "No Fly No Buy" legislation, so this will give Members of this body another opportunity to vote on bringing up the bill that would bar the sale of explosives and firearms to terrorists, and help make sure that terrorists don't assemble arsenals in our country to commit terrorist acts against our country. The time to act is now.

To discuss our previous question, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT).

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I think the previous question is extremely important because Republicans, just as they fled in the middle of the night from discussing gun violence before the July 4 break, have now decided not to consider a gun bill at all, even an NRA-backed proposal they have rejected.

But I want to ask the gentleman specifically about the comments that were

just made about the Zika virus and the possibility of an epidemic, because it is so important. Am I correct that that proposal that he says they passed is the first one in the history of my time here, and perhaps in the history of this body, where they prohibited even one minute of debate of the way that they were funding Zika by taking the funds away from Ebola and threatening our public health system?

It is not a question of Democrats having blocked something. It has been their refusal to deal with and recognize the public health challenge, denying \$4 of \$5 asked for by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention to deal with Zika, even threatening the possibility of developing a vaccine.

Is that correct, this has been the history of their failure to come to terms with a major public health crisis and listen to the scientists and the physicians and the public health experts and, instead, pursuing this ideological crusade to take away money from public health?

Mr. POLIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DOGGETT. I yield to the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. The gentleman from Texas is correct. Effectively, rather than actually find resources to develop a vaccine against Zika, they basically said, we are going to be taking the money from Ebola, which, by the way, still exists, still is a threat. We need to be ready for the next threat of an Ebola or Ebola-like danger to our citizens from a public health perspective.

In addition, the initial Republican attempts included things that they long wanted to do, like remove dangerous insecticides from the list of insecticides that are prohibited, due to their harm to human health as well as ecosystems and animal health.

The solution is straightforward. We need to develop a vaccine. We need to increase our public health infrastructure around this menace, and the bill fell short on that account because, effectively, it said, we might be able to not deal with Ebola and deal with this instead.

The truth is, the American people want a public health infrastructure that keeps them safe from Ebola and Zika and every other potential biological threat that is out there. The American people want to be safe. It is a dynamic world with increased travel, increased commerce. There are biological threats from all quarters, and we need the public health infrastructure to keep up with that.

Mr. DOGGETT. Those Texas-size mosquitos that are beginning to spread around my part of the country, they can't tell a Republican from a Democrat. Young women desirous of having a family, people of all ages and genders, are threatened by Zika.

It is just a matter of time before the Continental United States faces some of the problems that Puerto Rico already faces, and what we need is to

come together and have a bipartisan solution, not something offered in the middle of the night on which all debate is denied, a totally partisan approach.

So just as I am pleased that we have strong bipartisan support for the Iran Nuclear Agreement, coming together with this major letter that was sent to us yesterday, that is the kind of bipartisan approach I hope we can work to eventually, perhaps when we come back after this long Republican recess, one of the longest in the history of the Congress, to address Zika, and address these other problems that they refuse to deal with today.

I thank the gentleman.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. Speaker, the time to act is now. If we can defeat this particular previous question, we will bring up the bill that prevents terrorists from assembling arsenals of weapons.

We also, of course, want to be part of a constructive discussion around combating the Zika menace. I am hopeful that the House will find time to do that in the next few days.

I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD along with extraneous material immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” to defeat the previous question so that we can keep our country safer. Vote “no” on the rule. Vote “no” on the underlying bills because they interfere with our efforts to prevent Iran from developing nuclear weapons in the rigid implementation of the JCPOA.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

As frequently happens around here, the House passed one version of the Zika bill, the Senate passed another version. The Senate version contained \$1.1 billion in spending. The House, in our agreement to the conference committee, agreed with the \$1.1 billion, so we, essentially, agreed to what the Senate wanted to have in terms of the dollar amount.

So we brought that conference report to the floor of this House so that we could go ahead and move that before we went out for Fourth of July recess. But, instead of helping us to pass that, my friends from the other side of the aisle blocked the well, tried to stop us from bringing it up.

And I would say this: There was some talk about amendments. We don't normally have amendments to conference reports. That is not typical procedure around here.

Perhaps more to the point, we couldn't get to an amendment debate because of the way we had behavior on the floor of the House that evening

which, by the way, was in violation of the House rules.

So it has been the Republicans that have tried to get something that would help with this Zika virus problem, and we have been blocked, almost completely blocked here on the floor of the House by the Democrats, and then blocked completely over in the Senate by the Democrats in the Senate.

The Republicans are taking a responsible, constructive approach, and the Democrats, they just want to block things to try to make some political points and raise money or whatever it is they are trying to do.

The material previously referred to by Mr. POLIS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 819 OFFERED BY  
MR. POLIS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1076) to increase public safety by permitting the Attorney General to deny the transfer of a firearm or the issuance of firearms or explosives licenses to a known or suspected dangerous terrorist. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 1076.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as “a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge.” To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that “the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition” in order to offer an amendment. On March

15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: “The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition.”

The Republican majority may say “the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever.” But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: “Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment.”

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled “Amending Special Rules” states: “a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate.” (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: “Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support House Resolution 819 and the underlying bill.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER  
PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings

today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or on which the vote incurs objection under clause 6 of rule XX.

Record votes on postponed questions will be taken later.

#### TESTED ABILITY TO LEVERAGE EXCEPTIONAL NATIONAL TALENT ACT OF 2016

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5658) to amend title 5, United States Code, to codify the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5658

*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 “Tested Ability to Leverage Exceptional National Talent Act of 2016” or the “TALENT Act of 2016”.

#### SEC. 2. PRESIDENTIAL INNOVATION FELLOWS PROGRAM.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### “SUBCHAPTER V—PRESIDENTIAL INNOVATION FELLOWS PROGRAM

#### “§ 3171. Presidential Innovation Fellows Program

“(a) POLICY.—It is in the national interest for the Government to attract the brightest minds skilled in technology or innovative practices to serve in the Government to work on some of the Nation’s biggest and most pressing challenges. This subchapter establishes a program to encourage successful entrepreneurs, executives, and innovators to join the Government and work in close cooperation with Government leaders, to create meaningful solutions that can help save lives and taxpayer money, fuel job creation, and significantly improve how the Government serves the American people.

“(b) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Administrator of General Services shall continue the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program (hereinafter referred to as the ‘Program’) to enable exceptional individuals with proven track records to serve time-limited appointments in Executive agencies to address some of the Nation’s most significant challenges and improve existing Government efforts that would particularly benefit from expertise using innovative techniques and technology.

“(c) ADMINISTRATION.—The Program shall be administered by a Director, appointed by the Administrator under authorities of the General Services Administration. The Administrator shall provide necessary staff, resources and administrative support for the Program.

“(d) APPOINTMENT OF FELLOWS.—The Director shall appoint fellows pursuant to the Program and, in cooperation with Executive agencies, shall facilitate placement of fellows to participate in projects that have the potential for significant positive effects and are consistent with the President’s goals.

“(e) APPLICATION PROCESS.—

“(1) IN GENERAL.—The Director shall prescribe the process for applications and nominations of individuals to the Program.

“(2) PROGRAM STANDARDS.—Following publication of these processes, the Director may accept for consideration applications from

individuals. The Director shall establish, administer, review, and revise, if appropriate, a Governmentwide cap on the number of fellows. The Director shall establish and publish salary ranges, benefits, and standards for the Program.

“(f) SELECTION, APPOINTMENT, AND ASSIGNMENT OF FELLOWS.—

“(1) PROCEDURES.—The Director shall prescribe appropriate procedures for the selection, appointment, and assignment of fellows.

“(2) CONSULTATION.—Prior to the selection of fellows, the Director shall consult with the heads of Executive agencies regarding potential projects and how best to meet those needs. Following such consultation, the Director shall select and appoint individuals to serve as fellows.

“(3) TIME LIMITATION.—Fellows selected for the Program shall serve under short-term, time-limited appointments. Such fellows shall be appointed for no less than 6 months and no longer than 2 years in the Program. The Director shall facilitate the process of placing fellows at requesting Executive agencies.

“(g) RESPONSIBILITIES OF AGENCIES.—Each Executive agency shall work with the Director and the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program advisory board established under section 3172 to attempt to maximize the Program’s benefits to the agency and the Government, including by identifying initiatives that have a meaningful effect on the people served and that benefit from involvement by one or more fellows. Such agencies shall ensure that each fellow works closely with responsible senior officials for the duration of the assignment.

#### “§ 3172. Presidential Innovation Fellows Program advisory board

“(a) IN GENERAL.—The Administrator of General Services shall continue an advisory board to advise the Director of the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program by recommending such priorities and standards as may be beneficial to fulfill the mission of the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program and assist in identifying potential projects and placements for fellows. The advisory board may not participate in the selection process under section 3171(f).

“(b) CHAIR; MEMBERSHIP.—The Administrator shall designate a representative to serve as the Chair of the advisory board. In addition to the Chair, the membership of the advisory board shall include—

“(1) the Deputy Director for Management of the Office of Management and Budget;

“(2) the Director of the Office of Personnel Management;

“(3) the Administrator of the Office of Electronic Government of the Office of Management and Budget;

“(4) the Assistant to the President and Chief Technology Officer; and

“(5) other individuals as may be designated by the Administrator.

“(c) CONSULTATION.—The advisory board may consult with industry, academia, or nonprofits to ensure the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program is continually identifying opportunities to apply advanced skillsets and innovative practices in effective ways to address the Nation’s most significant challenges.”

(b) CLERICAL AMENDMENT.—The table of sections for chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code, is amended by adding at the end the following:

##### “SUBCHAPTER V—PRESIDENTIAL INNOVATION FELLOWS PROGRAM

#### “3171. Presidential Innovation Fellows Program.

#### “3172. Presidential Innovation Fellows Program advisory board.”

(c) TRANSITION.—The Presidential Innovation Fellows Program established pursuant to Executive Order 13704 (5 U.S.C. 3301 note) as in existence on the day before the date of enactment of this Act shall be considered the Presidential Innovation Fellows Program described under this section.

(d) NO ADDITIONAL FUNDS AUTHORIZED.—No additional funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out this Act or the amendments made by this Act. This Act and the amendments made by this Act shall be carried out using amounts otherwise authorized.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) and the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

##### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. FARENTHOLD. 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 the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 5658, the TALENT Act of 2016, introduced by our distinguished majority leader, Representative KEVIN MCCARTHY of Bakersfield, California. I commend the leader for bringing before the House this bill as part of his Innovation Initiative, rethinking what government does and how government operates.

Mr. Speaker, the TALENT Act makes permanent the Presidential Innovation Fellows program that was created by the administration in 2012. This highly competitive program recruits talented innovators and technologists to Federal agencies from the private sector.

During this short timeframe, fellows work on initiatives to transfer ideas into tangible results for American taxpayers at startup speeds. Since 2012, 96 top innovators have been recruited into the program from across the country.

Presidential Innovation Fellows are rethinking what government does and how government operates. Consider one example of the program’s work. Presidential Innovation Fellows improved services available to veterans, transitioning servicemembers, and their spouses. As a result, veterans now have better access to a résumé-builder, a military skills translator, and detailed career and training resources all together in one place.

Mr. Speaker, the Presidential Innovation Fellowship program is demonstrating results and should continue. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 5658.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of the TALENT Act. I believe it will help our government

continue to attract the best and the brightest to help some of our Nation's largest challenges.

This Act codifies Executive Order 13704, and ensures the continuation of the Presidential Innovation Fellows program, which helps bring private-sector information technology solutions to Federal agencies.

Established by President Obama in 2012, this program has matched over 100 innovators with top civil servants at 25 different Federal departments and agencies. These partnerships harness new technology and tools to create a more effective and efficient government. During their tenure, fellows work to quickly deliver innovative products and services that help improve the way the Federal Government interacts with the American people.

The fellows are as diverse as our country and come from every region, age, skill, race, and gender. They have experience at companies like Google and Facebook, degrees from some of our top universities, extensive experience in nonprofits and, most importantly, a desire to harness their skills for public service.

Past projects include the Blue Button Initiative, which allows 150 million Americans access to their own health data so they can make informed decisions about their family's care.

The GeoQ project provides FEMA with better on-the-ground knowledge in times of disaster, using crowdsourced pictures to better assess damages and needs.

The NotAlone.gov project provides students and law enforcement personnel resources on responding and preventing sexual assault on college campuses.

And as a veteran myself, I appreciate the Veterans Employment Center, which has created a central hub for those who served with resources and potential employers to help them make the transition to civilian life.

This is a good bill that would make permanent a successful program. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the majority leader.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the American people deal with their government in different ways almost every day; veterans trying to navigate the Federal bureaucracy, entrepreneurs dealing with regulations, citizens looking to access public information.

□ 1430

Dealing with the government is never as clear, as easy, or as efficient as it should be. That is because, while the world has changed in so many ways, government has stayed in the past.

Just think of how little government has changed. In the 1930s, we got our

news from the radio and the morning paper; today we get it on our phones. In the 1930s, we would cool off by opening the window or using a fan; today we have central air. In the 1930s, the VA processed paper disability claims; today it still processes paper disability claims.

Why is it that we expect more technology from our phones every month yet tolerate the exact same from our government year after year after year? Government is stuck in the past. We need to bring it into the future, and that is one of the two pillars of the Innovation Initiative.

Bringing government into the 21st century demands challenging the status quo. That begins with people, making sure the American people benefit from the best talent our country has to offer.

The Presidential Innovation Fellows program allows highly talented professionals—that means engineers, designers, and innovators from across the country—to build a more efficient, effective, and accountable government. They challenge old ways of thinking and introduce new approaches to make our government work the way American people believe and deserve it to work.

Now, I sponsored the TALENT Act to make sure this program continues into future administrations. By codifying the Presidential Innovation Fellows program into law, we can continue bringing positive disruptors to Washington and modernize our government.

The greatest resource we have in our country is the American people. We need the talent of the American people now more than ever before so we can reform government so it works well for everyone.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

This is a great piece of legislation. Regardless of which side of the aisle we sit on and regardless of whether we think government is too big or too small, I think almost everybody in this Chamber should be able to agree that the government needs to do its job well. It needs to spend taxpayer money efficiently. It needs to get the job done for the American people.

One of the ways it can do that is by adopting modern technology and taking advantage of the disruption that we have seen in the private sector that has brought us innovations like our phone that now is more powerful than a desktop computer just a few years ago.

I agree with the gentleman from California. It is absolutely imperative that we provide better, more efficient service to our veterans, but the same should be true in dealing with every area of government. You should get as good service from the government as you do in the private sector.

We can talk all we want about the Federal bureaucracy, and I am sure I

will probably disagree with some of the folks on the other side of the aisle about some of the pros and cons of this. But I think what we have seen in California, in Texas, in the Carolinas, in Boston, and all over this great Nation, as we have seen this boom in technology, as we have seen the changes that are coming that we are able to do more with less, we are able to do things faster, we are able to be more efficient, and we are able to give people more leisure time. This innovation economy, this mindset of the entrepreneur is something that this program brings into the Federal Government.

Many people spend long careers in the Federal Government where it is often disincentivized to innovate. This short-term program that brings the best of the best into the government for short periods of time to shake things up and to rethink how we do things is one of the ways that we can make it where the Federal Government actually can compute its way out of a paper bag. It is a way we are able to help our veterans. It is a way we are able to help all of our citizens by providing the services that we choose to provide as a government in the most efficient manner, and it gives us an opportunity for somebody who is standing outside of the box to take a look at what we are doing so maybe we can act a little bit outside of the box and do a better job.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this phenomenal bill.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5658.

The question was taken.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

#### NATIONAL SECURITIES EXCHANGE REGULATORY PARITY ACT OF 2016

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 5421) to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to apply the exemption from State regulation of securities offerings to securities listed on a national security exchange that has listing standards that have been approved by the Commission, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5421

*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 “National Securities Exchange Regulatory Parity Act of 2016”.

**SEC. 2. APPLICATION OF EXEMPTION.**

(a) AMENDMENTS.—Section 18(b)(1) of the Securities Act of 1933 (15 U.S.C. 77r(b)(1)) is amended—

(1) by striking subparagraph (A);  
 (2) in subparagraph (B), by striking “that the Commission determines by rule (on its own initiative or on the basis of a petition) are substantially similar to the listing standards applicable to securities described in subparagraph (A)” and inserting “that have been approved by the Commission, consistent with section 2(c) of the National Securities Exchange Regulatory Parity Act of 2016”;

(3) in subparagraph (C), by striking “or (B)”;

(4) by redesignating subparagraphs (B) and (C) as subparagraphs (A) and (B), respectively.

(b) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendments made by subsection (a) shall take effect—

(1) on the date of enactment of this Act, with respect to a national securities exchange registered with, and whose listing standards have been approved by, the Securities and Exchange Commission on or before the date of enactment of this Act; and

(2) on the date the Securities and Exchange Commission issues the final rule required by subsection (c), with respect to a national securities exchange not described under paragraph (1).

(c) REPLACEMENT STANDARDS.—Not later than 360 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Securities and Exchange Commission shall, by rule subject to public notice and comment, establish minimum core quantitative listing standards pursuant to section 6 of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

**GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include any extraneous material on this bill.

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

There was no objection.

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

I rise today in support of H.R. 5421. This is the National Securities Exchange Regulatory Parity Act.

If you go back to 1996, as part of the National Securities Market Improvement Act, Congress acted to exempt the listed securities on three specific stock exchanges from State-by-State registration. Why was that exemption important? You can ask anyone from Massachusetts who tried to invest in a little company called Apple during its December 1980 IPO. State regulators banned Apple stock for sale to the public for, in the view of State regulators, being too risky.

Congress passed a good bill in 1996, but we got one thing wrong. We couldn't predict the future. Today, only two of the original three exchanges exist, and many more, many

more exchanges have joined the fray. The SEC's interpretation of the law has, in fact, created a two-tiered legal structure by giving this blue-sky exemption exclusively to the original three named exchanges.

The bill before us today simply gives all national securities exchanges equal treatment under the law. We give an immediate exemption to securities listed on a national securities exchange registered with the SEC and whose listing standards have already been approved by the Commission, and we ask the SEC to engage in a rulemaking to establish minimum core quantitative standards for any new exchanges that register with the Commission after the bill's enactment.

With so many regulatory impediments to capital formation, it is important we encourage new exchanges to become listing venues and a source of capital for companies looking to go public, looking to expand, and looking to hire more workers.

So I want to thank Ranking Member MAXINE WATERS. I also want to thank her staff for working with us to get this bill to the floor. I also want to thank my good friend from New York, Congresswoman CAROLYN B. MALONEY, for her constructive additions to the bill since committee markup. Finally, I would like to thank Chairman HENSARLING and his able staff, Rebekah Goshorn and Kevin Edgar, for all of their hard work.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this common-sense legislation.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to first thank my Republican colleagues for amending H.R. 5421 in an attempt to improve the status quo for the benefit of securities exchanges and the investors that trade on them and provide the Securities and Exchange Commission with additional discretion in a currently inflexible process.

H.R. 5421 would modernize a 1996 law that governs the process used by the SEC in determining whether an approved listing standard of a national securities exchange should be exempt from State regulation and oversight. That outdated process currently requires the SEC to compare listing standards to an imperfect baseline—the standards of the New York Stock Exchange, the American Stock Exchange, and the NASDAQ Stock Market.

Twenty years later, that baseline does not make much sense, as the American Stock Exchange no longer exists, and we have six other exchanges that are approved to list securities without State oversight. It neither seems fair to the other exchanges nor sufficiently protective of investors to allow the three named exchanges to effectively dictate listing standards.

However imperfect, the current standard has guided the SEC to create

an informal framework to consider certain core listing standards, such as minimum revenue, market capitalization, number of shareholders, and share price.

Now, the bill that we marked up in committee would have upended this framework and preempted States for any approval listing standard. I opposed that bill, as I believe it would have removed a valuable analysis that protects investors and ensures appropriate State oversight of smaller companies that may, in the future, list on a venture exchange.

Since that time, however, my Republican colleagues have worked to take into account these concerns and have amended the bill for the better. I want to thank Mr. ROYCE for his leadership and for the work that he has done on this issue and the time that his staff has spent with my staff.

Under the bill before us today, the SEC would have nearly a year to engage in a rulemaking to establish minimum core quantitative listing standards that protect investors and the public interest. That rulemaking would provide clarity and transparency to the preemption process and leave the issue of State oversight over small company trading on venture exchanges with the SEC. Most importantly, it would provide investors and interested members of the public the opportunity to comment on the overall process in a space where investors and the public do not have the resources to comment on each of the 1,000 rules proposed each year.

I do have some remaining concerns that the bill directs the SEC to implement only core quantitative standards and does not mention qualitative standards. However, under the bill, the quantitative standards are to be informed by qualitative factors like investor protection and the public interest, and the SEC retains its authority to apply other qualitative factors, as it does now, in its initial rule approval and the preemption process.

Moreover, I would expect the SEC, in its rulemaking, to establish quantitative standards for some of the qualitative factors that it currently considers, such as the number or percentage of independent board directors and certain shareholder meeting requirements.

So I would like to thank Mr. ROYCE and my Republican colleagues for amending H.R. 5421.

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

Mr. ROYCE. I want to thank the gentlewoman from California for her work to improve the bill.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN). He would like to speak on the bill.

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the National Securities Exchange Regulatory Parity Act of 2016. I want to thank the chairman of the Foreign Affairs Committee, Mr. ROYCE, for introducing this legislation.

I am a proud cosponsor. I was also excited to see a very strong bipartisan vote of support in the Financial Services Committee.

□ 1445

This is a simple technical fix to a 20-year-old statute that didn't foresee, or at least didn't contemplate, an increase in the number of exchanges and today's competitive market structure.

In 1996, Congress enacted the National Securities Markets Improvement Act, which codified the blue sky exemption for companies listed on the three predominant listed venues of that time: the New York Stock Exchange, the American Stock Exchange, and the NASDAQ. The blue sky exemption means securities will not be subject to both State and Federal regulation, which can be redundant and overly burdensome.

Currently, exchanges not enumerated by the Act must have "substantially similar" listing standards as those that are specifically named in the Act. This puts these exchanges in an unnecessary, government-created, competitive disadvantage. It functionally prevents a handful of exchanges from being a first mover in adopting innovative listing standards.

The unintended consequences of Congress' amendment to include specific references to just a few exchanges is a two-tiered regulatory structure and is unfair to exchanges that have since registered with the SEC.

According to the Chicago Stock Exchange, it is not currently a primary listing exchange for any securities, "in part because such securities would be subject to both Federal and State regulation, which is prohibitively costly and overly burdensome to potential listing companies. This change would remove this current impediment to companies listing their securities on CHX and would help in the exchange's efforts to develop a robust primary listing market here in Illinois."

Furthermore, this legislation would benefit the options industry, which has its home in Chicago as well. The Chicago Board Options Exchange is the largest market for stock options. Why should one of the most innovative and respected markets have to jump through unnecessary hurdles to update its listing standards?

We should not have artificial impediments to accessing the capital markets.

I urge all my colleagues to oppose this commonsense legislation.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I urge an "aye" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 5421, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the

rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 820;

Adoption of House Resolution 820, if ordered;

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 819;

Adoption of House Resolution 819, if ordered;

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 5658.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5538, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017; PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM JULY 15, 2016, THROUGH SEPTEMBER 5, 2016; AND FOR OTHER PURPOSES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 820) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes; providing for proceedings during the period from July 15, 2016, through September 5, 2016; and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 236, nays 174, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 406]  
YEAS—236

Abraham	Brat	Collins (NY)
Aderholt	Bridenstine	Comstock
Allen	Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Amash	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Amodei	Buchanan	Costello (PA)
Babin	Buck	Cramer
Barletta	Bucshon	Crawford
Barton	Burgess	Crenshaw
Benishek	Byrne	Culberson
Bilirakis	Calvert	Curbelo (FL)
Bishop (MI)	Carter (GA)	Davidson
Black	Carter (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Blackburn	Chabot	Denham
Blum	Chaffetz	Dent
Bost	Clawson (FL)	DeSantis
Boustany	Coffman	DesJarlais
Brady (TX)	Cole	Diaz-Balart

Dold	Kinzinger (IL)	Roe (TN)
Donovan	Kline	Rogers (AL)
Duffy	Knight	Rogers (KY)
Duncan (SC)	Labrador	Rohrabacher
Duncan (TN)	LaHood	Rokita
Ellmers (NC)	LaMalfa	Rooney (FL)
Emmer (MN)	Lamborn	Ros-Lehtinen
Farenthold	Lance	Roskam
Fincher	Latta	Ross
Fitzpatrick	LoBiondo	Rothfus
Fleischmann	Long	Rouzer
Fleming	Love	Royce
Flores	Lucas	Russell
Forbes	Luetkemeyer	Salmon
Fortenberry	Lummis	Sanford
Franks (AZ)	MacArthur	Scalise
Frelinghuysen	Massie	Schweikert
Garrett	McCarthy	Scott, Austin
Gibbs	McCaul	Sensenbrenner
Gibson	McClintock	Sessions
Gohmert	McHenry	Shimkus
Goodlatte	McKinley	Shuster
Gosar	McMorris	Simpson
Gowdy	Rodgers	Smith (MO)
Granger	McSally	Smith (NE)
Graves (GA)	Meadows	Smith (NJ)
Graves (LA)	Meehan	Smith (TX)
Graves (MO)	Messer	Stefanik
Griffith	Mica	Stewart
Grothman	Miller (FL)	Stivers
Guinta	Miller (MI)	Thompson (PA)
Guthrie	Moolenaar	Thornberry
Hanna	Mooney (WV)	Tiberi
Hardy	Mullin	Tipton
Harper	Mulvaney	Trott
Harris	Murphy (PA)	Turner
Hartzler	Neugebauer	Upton
Heck (NV)	Newhouse	Valadao
Hensarling	Noem	Wagner
Herrera Beutler	Nugent	Walberg
Hice, Jody B.	Nunes	Walden
Hill	Olson	Walker
Holding	Palazzo	Walorski
Hudson	Palmer	Walters, Mimi
Huelskamp	Paulsen	Weber (TX)
Huizenga (MI)	Pearce	Webster (FL)
Hultgren	Perry	Wenstrup
Hunter	Peterson	Westerman
Hurd (TX)	Pittenger	Westmoreland
Hurt (VA)	Pitts	Whitfield
Issa	Poliquin	Williams
Jenkins (KS)	Pompeo	Wilson (SC)
Jenkins (WV)	Posey	Wittman
Johnson (OH)	Price, Tom	Womack
Johnson, Sam	Ratcliffe	Woodall
Jordan	Reed	Yoder
Joyce	Reichert	Yoho
Katko	Renacci	Young (AK)
Kelly (MS)	Ribble	Young (IA)
Kelly (PA)	Rice (SC)	Young (IN)
King (IA)	Rigell	Zeldin
King (NY)	Roby	Zinke

NAYS—174

Adams	Cooper	Grijalva
Aguilar	Costa	Gutiérrez
Ashford	Courtney	Hahn
Bass	Crowley	Heck (WA)
Beatty	Cuellar	Higgins
Becerra	Cummings	Himes
Bera	Davis (CA)	Honda
Beyer	Davis, Danny	Hoyer
Bishop (GA)	DeFazio	Huffman
Blumenauer	DeGette	Israel
Bonamici	Delaney	Jeffries
Boyle, Brendan	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
F.	DelBene	Kaptur
Brady (PA)	DeSaulnier	Keating
Brown (FL)	Deuch	Kelly (IL)
Brownley (CA)	Dingell	Kennedy
Bustos	Doggett	Kildee
Butterfield	Doyle, Michael	Kilmer
Capps	F.	Kind
Capuano	Duckworth	Kirkpatrick
Cárdenas	Edwards	Kuster
Carney	Ellison	Langevin
Cartwright	Engel	Larsen (WA)
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Larson (CT)
Castro (TX)	Esty	Lawrence
Chu, Judy	Farr	Lee
Cicilline	Foster	Levin
Clark (MA)	Frankel (FL)	Lewis
Clarke (NY)	Fudge	Lieu, Ted
Clay	Gabbard	Lipinski
Cleaver	Gallego	Loeb
Clyburn	Garamendi	Loeb
Cohen	Graham	Loftgren
Connolly	Grayson	Lowenthal
Conyers	Green, Gene	Lowey



Lujan Grisham (NM)	Perlmutter	Sinema
Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Peters	Sires
Lynch	Pingree	Slaughter
Maloney, Carolyn	Pocan	Smith (WA)
Maloney, Sean	Polis	Swalwell (CA)
Matsui	Price (NC)	Takano
McCollum	Quigley	Thompson (CA)
McDermott	Rangel	Thompson (MS)
McGovern	Rice (NY)	Titus
McNerney	Richmond	Tonko
Meeks	Roybal-Allard	Torres
Meng	Ruiz	Tsongas
Moore	Ruppersberger	Van Hollen
Moulton	Rush	Vargas
Murphy (FL)	Ryan (OH)	Vela
Nadler	Sánchez, Linda T.	Velázquez
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Visclosky
Neal	Schakowsky	Walz
Norcross	Schiff	Wasserman
O'Rourke	Schrader	Schultz
Pallone	Scott (VA)	Waters, Maxine
Pascrell	Scott, David	Watson Coleman
Payne	Serrano	Welch
	Sewell (AL)	Wilson (FL)
	Sherman	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—23

Barr	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Bishop (UT)	Johnson, E. B.	Poe (TX)
Carson (IN)	Jolly	Sanchez, Loretta
Collins (GA)	Jones	Speier
Foxx	Loudermilk	Stutzman
Green, Al	Marchant	Takai
Hastings	Marino	Veasey
Hinojosa	Nolan	

□ 1510

Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BARR. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 406, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yes.”

(By unanimous consent, Mr. BARTON was allowed to speak out of order.)

2016 CONGRESSIONAL BASEBALL GAME

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, first, I think we should all recognize that this is a moment of tragedy in our great country. Our President and former President, as we speak here on the House floor, are in Dallas, Texas, at a memorial service for the officers who were killed and wounded and for the two civilians in the shooting incident in Dallas last Friday; so this is a solemn day for our country.

But, here in Washington, several weeks ago, we had our annual congressional baseball game. As you can tell by the piece of hardware to my right, for the first time in 8 years, the Republicans won, which is something that we can be proud of.

Before I comment for the winning side, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE), my good friend and the manager of the congressional Democratic team.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Texas. All of us on this side of the aisle share the grief and the sadness we all feel about the lives lost in Dallas, in Louisiana, in Minnesota, and anywhere in this country where innocent victims lose their lives.

Well, this is unfamiliar territory for me. I haven't had a speech prepared for this one.

Mr. BARTON. It doesn't feel very good, does it?

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, that trophy sure looks out of place on that side of the aisle, but I want to say congratulations to the Republican team. You guys played a good game, and you deserved to win. We make no excuses. It was a very exciting contest for the fans in the stands to watch.

As always, Joe, as you and I both know, the big winners are the Boys and Girls Club of Washington, D.C., the Washington Literacy Council, and the Dream Foundation. I believe we were able to raise \$500,000 this year. And that is really what this is all about and why we play this game and the camaraderie that goes along with it.

So I would say to my friend from Texas, enjoy that trophy in your office this year because it is coming back to a different location next year.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE). He and I serve on the same committee, and both of our staffs have worked well together on this game.

Mr. Speaker, in 2013, the Republicans were outscored 22-0 in this game. That was the low point of my entire congressional career, not just baseball, I mean, legislative, you name it.

But we have risen from the ashes. My coach, Representative ROGER WILLIAMS, who is right behind me, has worked tirelessly. We had 32 Republican Members who suited up for the game. Twenty-seven of those were able to play in the game. We had great pitching from MARK WALKER, JOHN SHIMKUS, and our closer PAT MEEHAN. We had great hitting. I think we got 14 hits.

We were comfortably ahead, and then the Democrats came back in the sixth inning and went ahead. And then we came back in the bottom of the seventh with two outs. Our slugger from the Sunshine State of Florida, Mr. TOM ROONEY, slammed one down the right field line. And BOB DOLD from Illinois scurried home, and I will be darned if we didn't win the game by one run. So we kind of slaughtered you all this year.

It is going to be a competitive game next year, Mr. DOYLE. In all honesty, it is one of the highlights of my year. I am not like Roger. I don't like getting up at 6:30 in the morning to practice, but we do it.

I would like for every Member of the Republican team that has played and practiced to stand up. I would like all my team members to stand up.

I didn't hear much applause on that side of the aisle.

Mr. Speaker, it is a great game for charity. I think the series now is 39 and 39; is that right? So next year, it is bragging rights for the century.

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I would ask our Democratic Members to stand up and be recognized, too.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Speaker, we have a Member from the other body who actually was one of our stars, Senator JEFF FLAKE of Arizona. So we appreciate him coming over.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, 5-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 237, nays 179, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 407]

YEAS—237

Abraham	Freilinghuysen	McMorris
Aderholt	Garrett	Rodgers
Allen	Gibbs	McSally
Amodel	Gibson	Meadows
Babin	Gohmert	Meehan
Barletta	Goodlatte	Messer
Barr	Gosar	Mica
Barton	Gowdy	Miller (FL)
Benishek	Granger	Miller (MI)
Bilirakis	Graves (GA)	Moolenaar
Bishop (MI)	Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	Mullin
Black	Griffith	Mulvaney
Blackburn	Grothman	Murphy (PA)
Blum	Guinta	Neugebauer
Bost	Guthrie	Newhouse
Boustany	Hanna	Noem
Brat	Hardy	Nugent
Bridenstine	Harper	Nunes
Brooks (AL)	Harris	Olson
Brooks (IN)	Hartzler	Palazzo
Buchanan	Heck (NV)	Palmer
Buck	Hensarling	Paulsen
Bucshon	Herrera Beutler	Pearce
Burgess	Hice, Jody B.	Perry
Byrne	Hill	Pittenger
Calvert	Holding	Pitts
Carter (GA)	Hudson	Poliquin
Carter (TX)	Huelskamp	Pompeo
Chabot	Huizenga (MI)	Posey
Chaffetz	Hultgren	Price, Tom
Clawson (FL)	Hunter	Ratcliffe
Coffman	Hurd (TX)	Reed
Cole	Hurt (VA)	Reichert
Collins (GA)	Issa	Renacci
Collins (NY)	Jenkins (KS)	Ribble
Comstock	Jenkins (WV)	Rice (SC)
Conaway	Johnson (OH)	Rigell
Cook	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Costello (PA)	Jordan	Roe (TN)
Cramer	Joyce	Rogers (AL)
Crawford	Katko	Rogers (KY)
Crenshaw	Kelly (MS)	Rohrabacher
Culberson	Kelly (PA)	Rokita
Curbelo (FL)	King (IA)	Rooney (FL)
Davidson	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Davis, Rodney	Kinzinger (IL)	Roskam
Denham	Kline	Ross
Dent	Knight	Rothfus
DeSantis	Labrador	Rouzer
DesJarlais	LaHood	Royce
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Russell
Dold	Lamborn	Salmon
Donovan	Lance	Sanford
Duffy	Latta	Scalise
Duncan (SC)	LoBiondo	Schweikert
Duncan (TN)	Long	Scott, Austin
Ellmers (NC)	Loudermilk	Sensenbrenner
Emmer (MN)	Love	Sessions
Farenthold	Lucas	Shimkus
Fincher	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
Fitzpatrick	Lummis	Simpson
Fleischmann	MacArthur	Sinema
Fleming	McCarthy	Smith (MO)
Flores	McCaull	Smith (NE)
Forbes	McClintock	Smith (NJ)
Fortenberry	McHenry	Smith (TX)
Franks (AZ)	McKinley	Stefanik

Stewart  
Stivers  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg

Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)

Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

## NAYS—179

Adams  
Aguilar  
Amash  
Ashford  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty

Farr  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Graham  
Grayson  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Massie  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore

Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schradler  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—17

Brady (TX)  
Foxx  
Green, Al  
Hastings  
Hinojosa  
Jackson Lee

Johnson, E. B.  
Jolly  
Marchant  
Marino  
Nolan  
Pelosi

Poe (TX)  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Stutzman  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw

□ 1523

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4992, UNITED STATES FINANCIAL SYSTEM PROTECTION ACT OF 2016; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5119, NO 2H2O FROM IRAN ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5631, IRAN ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 819) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4992) to codify regulations relating to transfers of funds involving Iran, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5119) to prohibit the obligation or expenditure of funds available to any Federal department or agency for any fiscal year to purchase or issue a license for the purchase of heavy water produced in Iran; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5631) to hold Iran accountable for its state sponsorship of terrorism and other threatening activities and for its human rights abuses, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 241, nays 174, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 408]

YEAS—241

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw

Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gossar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris

Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Massie

McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey

Price, Tom  
Ratchliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)

Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

## NAYS—174

Adams  
Aguilar  
Ashford  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr

Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Graham  
Grayson  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Massie  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)

Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schradler  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth



Johnson (GA) Miller (MI) Schrader  
 Johnson (OH) Mooleenaar Schweikert  
 Johnson, Sam Mooney (WV) Scott (VA)  
 Jordan Moore Scott, Austin  
 Joyce Moulton Scott, David  
 Kaptur Mullin Serrano  
 Katko Mulvaney Sessions  
 Keating Murphy (FL) Sewell (AL)  
 Kelly (IL) Murphy (PA) Sherman  
 Kelly (MS) Nadler Shimkus  
 Kelly (PA) Napolitano Shuster  
 Kennedy Neal Simpson  
 Kildee Neugebauer Sinema  
 Kilmer Newhouse Sires  
 Kind Noem Slaughter  
 King (IA) Norcross Smith (MO)  
 King (NY) Nugent Smith (NE)  
 Kinzinger (IL) Nunes Smith (NJ)  
 Kirkpatrick O'Rourke Smith (TX)  
 Kline Olson Smith (WA)  
 Knight Palazzo Speier  
 Kuster Pallone Stefanik  
 Labrador Palmer Stewart  
 LaHood Pascrell Stivers  
 LaMalfa Paulsen Swallow (CA)  
 Lamborn Payne Takano  
 Lance Pearce Thompson (CA)  
 Langevin Perlmutter Thompson (MS)  
 Larsen (WA) Peters Thompson (PA)  
 Larson (CT) Peterson Thornberry  
 Latta Pingree Tiberi  
 Lawrence Pittenger Tipton  
 Lee Pitts Titus  
 Levin Pocan Tonko  
 Lewis Poliquin Torres  
 Lieu, Ted Polis Trott  
 Lipinski Pompeo Tsongas  
 LoBiondo Posey Turner  
 Loeb sack Price (NC) Upton  
 Lofgren Price, Tom Valadao  
 Long Quigley Van Hollen  
 Loudermilk Rangel Vargas  
 Love Ratcliffe Vela  
 Lowenthal Reed Velázquez  
 Lowey Reichert Visclosky  
 Lucas Renacci Wagner  
 Luetkemeyer Ribble Walberg  
 Lujan Grisham Rice (NY) Walden  
 (NM) Rice (SC) Walker  
 Luján, Ben Ray Richmond Walorski  
 (NM) Rigell Walters, Mimi  
 Lummis Roby Walz  
 Lynch Roe (TN) Wasserman  
 MacArthur Rogers (AL) Schultz  
 Maloney, Carolyn Waters, Maxine  
 Carolyn Rohrabacher Watson Coleman  
 Maloney, Sean Rokita Weber (TX)  
 Matsui Rooney (FL) Webster (FL)  
 McCarthy Ros-Lehtinen Welch  
 McCaul Roskam Wenstrup  
 McClintock Ross Westerman  
 McCollum Rothfus Westmoreland  
 McDermott Rouzer Whitfield  
 McGovern Roybal-Allard Williams  
 McHenry Royce Wilson (FL)  
 McKinley Ruiz Wilson (SC)  
 McMorris Wittman  
 Rodgers Rush Womack  
 McNerney Russell Woodall  
 McSally Ryan (OH) Yarmuth  
 Meadows Salmon Yoder  
 Meehan Sánchez, Linda Yoho  
 Meeks T. Young (AK)  
 Meng Sarbanes Young (IA)  
 Messer Scalise Young (IN)  
 Mica Schakowsky Zeldin  
 Miller (FL) Schiff Zinke

## NAYS—8

Amash Jones Sanford  
 Brooks (AL) Massie Sensenbrenner  
 Grothman Perry

## NOT VOTING—16

Foxx Jolly Sanchez, Loretta  
 Green, Al Marchant Stutzman  
 Hastings Marino Takai  
 Hinojosa Nolan Veasey  
 Jackson Lee Pelosi  
 Johnson, E. B. Poe (TX)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1542

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

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SEPARATION OF POWERS  
RESTORATION ACT OF 2016

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 796 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4768.

Will the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) kindly take the chair.

□ 1543

## 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 further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4768) to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions, with Mr. SIMPSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Monday, July 11, 2016, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-641, offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) had been postponed.

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-641 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. MEEKS of New York.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

Amendment No. 5 by Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

## AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 223, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 411]

AYES—194

Adams	Foster	Moulton
Aguilar	Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)
Ashford	Fudge	Nadler
Bass	Gabbard	Napolitano
Beatty	Gallego	Neal
Becerra	Garamendi	Norcross
Bera	Gibson	O'Rourke
Beyer	Graham	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Grayson	Pascrell
Bishop (MI)	Green, Gene	Payne
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Gutiérrez	Peters
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hahn	Peterson
Brady (PA)	Heck (WA)	Pingree
Brown (FL)	Higgins	Pocan
Brownley (CA)	Himes	Polis
Bustos	Honda	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Hoyer	Quigley
Capps	Huffman	Rangel
Capuano	Huizenga (MI)	Rice (NY)
Cárdenas	Israel	Richmond
Carney	Jeffries	Ros-Lehtinen
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ruiz
Castor (FL)	Katko	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Keating	Rush
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Ryan (OH)
Ciциlline	Kennedy	Sánchez, Linda T.
Clark (MA)	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clay	Kind	Schiff
Cleaver	Kirkpatrick	Schrader
Clyburn	Kuster	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Lance	Scott, David
Connolly	Langevin	Serrano
Conyers	Larsen (WA)	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Costa	Lawrence	Sires
Costello (PA)	Lee	Slaughter
Courtney	Levin	Smith (WA)
Crowley	Lewis	Speier
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Stefanik
Cummings	Lipinski	Swallow (CA)
Curbelo (FL)	LoBiondo	Takano
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Thompson (CA)
Davis, Danny	Lofgren	Thompson (MS)
DeFazio	Lowenthal	Titus
DeGette	Lowey	Tonko
Delaney	Lujan Grisham (NM)	Torres
DeLauro	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)	Trott
DelBene	Lynch	Tsongas
Dent	Maloney, Carolyn	Upton
DeSaulnier	Maloney, Sean	Van Hollen
Deutch	Matsui	Vargas
Dingell	McCollum	Vela
Doggett	McDermott	Velázquez
Dold	McGovern	Walberg
Doyle, Michael F.	McMorris	Walz
Duckworth	McNerney	Wasserman
Edwards	Meeks	Schultz
Ellison	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Engel	Miller (MI)	Watson Coleman
Eshoo	Moolenaar	Welch
Esty	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Farr		Yarmuth
		Zeldin

NOES—223

Abraham	Buck	Denham
Aderholt	Bucshon	DeSantis
Allen	Burgess	DesJarlais
Amash	Byrne	Diaz-Balart
Amodei	Calvert	Donovan
Babin	Carter (GA)	Duffy
Barletta	Carter (TX)	Duncan (SC)
Barr	Chabot	Duncan (TN)
Barton	Chaffetz	Ellmers (NC)
Benishek	Clawson (FL)	Emmer (MN)
Bilirakis	Coffman	Farenthold
Bishop (UT)	Cole	Fincher
Black	Collins (GA)	Fitzpatrick
Blackburn	Collins (NY)	Fleischmann
Blum	Comstock	Fleming
Bost	Conaway	Flores
Boustany	Cook	Forbes
Brady (TX)	Cramer	Fortenberry
Brat	Crawford	Franks (AZ)
Bridenstine	Crenshaw	Frelinghuysen
Brooks (AL)	Culberson	Garrett
Brooks (IN)	Davidson	Gibbs
Buchanan	Davis, Rodney	Gohmert

Goodlatte Luetkemeyer  
 Gosar Lummis  
 Gowdy MacArthur  
 Granger Massie  
 Graves (GA) McCarthy  
 Graves (LA) McCaul  
 Graves (MO) McClintock  
 Griffith McHenry  
 Grothman McMorris  
 Guinta Rodgers  
 Guthrie McSally  
 Hanna Meadows  
 Hardy Meehan  
 Harper Messer  
 Harris Mica  
 Hartzler Miller (FL)  
 Heck (NV) Mooney (WV)  
 Hensarling Mullin  
 Herrera Beutler Mulvaney  
 Hice, Jody B. Murphy (PA)  
 Hill Neugebauer  
 Holding Newhouse  
 Hudson Noem  
 Huelskamp Nugent  
 Hultgren Nunes  
 Hunter Olson  
 Hurt (TX) Palazzo  
 Hurt (VA) Palmer  
 Issa Paulsen  
 Jenkins (KS) Pearce  
 Jenkins (WV) Perry  
 Johnson (OH) Pittenger  
 Johnson, Sam Pitts  
 Jones Poliquin  
 Jordan Pompeo  
 Joyce Posey  
 Kelly (MS) Price, Tom  
 Kelly (PA) Ratcliffe  
 King (IA) Reed  
 King (NY) Reichert  
 Kinzinger (IL) Renacci  
 Kline Ribble  
 Knight Rice (SC)  
 Labrador Rigell  
 LaHood Roby  
 LaMalfa Roe (TN)  
 Lamborn Rogers (AL)  
 Latta Rogers (KY)  
 Long Rohrabacher  
 Loudermilk Rokita  
 Love Rooney (FL)  
 Lucas Roskam

NOT VOTING—16

Foxx Jolly  
 Green, Al Marchant  
 Hastings Marino  
 Hinojosa Nolan  
 Jackson Lee Pelosi  
 Johnson, E. B. Poe (TX)

□ 1548

Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. KATKO changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. MEEKS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. MEEKS) 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 243, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 412]  
 AYES—174  
 Adams Farr  
 Aguilar Poster  
 Ashford Frankel (FL)  
 Bass Fudge  
 Beatty Gabbard  
 Becerra Gallego  
 Bera Garamendi  
 Beyer Graham  
 Bishop (GA) Grayson  
 Blumenauer Green, Gene  
 Bonamici Grijalva  
 Boyle, Brendan Gutierrez  
 F. Hahn  
 Brady (PA) Heck (WA)  
 Brown (FL) Higgins  
 Brownley (CA) Himes  
 Bustos Honda  
 Butterfield Hoyer  
 Capps Huffman  
 Capuano Israel  
 Cárdenas Jeffrey  
 Carney Johnson (GA)  
 Carson (IN) Kaptur  
 Cartwright Keating  
 Castro (FL) Kelly (IL)  
 Castro (TX) Kennedy  
 Chu, Judy Kildee  
 Cicilline Kilmer  
 Clark (MA) Kind  
 Clarke (NY) Kirkpatrick  
 Clay Kuster  
 Cleaver Langevin  
 Clyburn Larsen (WA)  
 Cohen Larson (CT)  
 Connolly Lawrence  
 Conyers Lee  
 Cooper Levin  
 Costa Lewis  
 Courtney Lieu, Ted  
 Crowley Lipinski  
 Cuellar Loebsack  
 Cummings Lofgren  
 Davis (CA) Lowenthal  
 Davis, Danny Lowey  
 DeFazio Lujan Grisham  
 DeGette (NM)  
 Delaney Luján, Ben Ray  
 DeLauro (NM)  
 DeBene Lynch  
 DeSaulnier Maloney,  
 Deutch Carolyn  
 Dingell Maloney, Sean  
 Doggett Matsui  
 Doyle, Michael McCollum  
 F. McDermott  
 Duckworth McGovern  
 Edwards McNeerney  
 Ellison Meeks  
 Engel Meng  
 Eshoo Moore  
 Esty Moulton

NOES—243

Abraham Clawson (FL)  
 Aderholt Coffman  
 Allen Cole  
 Amash Collins (GA)  
 Amodei Collins (NY)  
 Babin Comstock  
 Barletta Conaway  
 Barr Cook  
 Barton Costello (PA)  
 Benishek Cramer  
 Bilirakis Crawford  
 Bishop (MI) Crenshaw  
 Bishop (UT) Culberson  
 Black Curbelo (FL)  
 Blackburn Davidson  
 Blum Davis, Rodney  
 Bost Denham  
 Boustany Dent  
 Brady (TX) DeSantis  
 Brat DesJarlais  
 Bridenstine Diaz-Balart  
 Brooks (AL) Dold  
 Brooks (IN) Donovan  
 Buchanan Duffy  
 Buck Duncan (SC)  
 Bucshon Duncan (TN)  
 Burgess Ellmers (NC)  
 Byrne Emmer (MN)  
 Calvert Farenthold  
 Carter (GA) Fincher  
 Carter (TX) Fitzpatrick  
 Chabot Fleischmann  
 Chaffetz Fleming

Huizenga (MI) Miller (MI)  
 Hultgren Moolenaar  
 Hunter Mooney (WV)  
 Hurd (TX) Mullin  
 Hurt (VA) Mulvaney  
 Issa Murphy (PA)  
 Jenkins (KS) Neugebauer  
 Jenkins (WV) Newhouse  
 Johnson (OH) Noem  
 Johnson, Sam Nugent  
 Jones Nunes  
 Jordan Olson  
 Joyce Palazzo  
 Katko Palmer  
 Kelly (MS) Paulsen  
 Kelly (PA) Pearce  
 King (IA) Perry  
 King (NY) Peters  
 Kinzinger (IL) Peterson  
 Kline Pittenger  
 Knight Pitts  
 Labrador Poliquin  
 LaHood Pompeo  
 LaMalfa Posey  
 Lamborn Price, Tom  
 Lance Ratcliffe  
 Latta Reed  
 LoBiondo Reichert  
 Long Renacci  
 Loudermilk Ribble  
 Love Rice (SC)  
 Lucas Rigell  
 Luetkemeyer Roby  
 Lummis Roe (TN)  
 MacArthur Rogers (AL)  
 Massie Rogers (KY)  
 McCarthy Rohrabacher  
 McCaul Rokita  
 McClintock Rooney (FL)  
 McHenry Ros-Lehtinen  
 McKinley Roskam  
 McMorris Ross  
 Rodgers Rothfus  
 McSally Rouzer  
 Meadows Royce  
 Meehan Russell  
 Messer Salmon  
 Mica Sanford  
 Miller (FL) Scalise

Schweikert  
 Scott, Austin  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Sinema  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Stefanik  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tipton  
 Trott  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Posey  
 Price, Tom  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walker  
 Walorski  
 Walters, Mimi  
 Weber (TX)  
 Webster (FL)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Westmoreland  
 Whitfield  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Yoho  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (IA)  
 Young (IN)  
 Zeldin  
 Zinke

NOT VOTING—16

Foxx Jolly  
 Green, Al Marchant  
 Hastings Marino  
 Hinojosa Nolan  
 Jackson Lee Pelosi  
 Johnson, E. B. Poe (TX)

□ 1552

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 174, noes 243, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 413]  
 AYES—174

Adams  
 Aguilar  
 Ashford  
 Bass

Beatty  
 Becerra  
 Bera  
 Beyer

Bishop (GA)  
 Blumenauer  
 Bonamici

Boyle, Brendan F.  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Brownley (CA)  
 Bustos  
 Butterfield  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cárdenas  
 Carney  
 Carson (IN)  
 Cartwright  
 Castor (FL)  
 Castro (TX)  
 Chu, Judy  
 Cicilline  
 Clark (MA)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Connolly  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Courtney  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Cummings  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delaney  
 DeLauro  
 DelBene  
 DeSaulnier  
 Deutch  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doyle, Michael F.  
 Duckworth  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Esty  
 Farr  
 Foster  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Fudge  
 Gabbard  
 Gallego  
 Garamendi

NOES—243

Abraham  
 Aderholt  
 Allen  
 Amash  
 Amodei  
 Babin  
 Barletta  
 Barr  
 Barton  
 Benishek  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (MI)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Blum  
 Bost  
 Boustany  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brat  
 Bridenstine  
 Brooks (AL)  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Buchanan  
 Buck  
 Bucshon  
 Burgess  
 Byrne  
 Calvert  
 Carter (GA)  
 Carter (TX)  
 Chabot  
 Chaffetz  
 Clawson (FL)  
 Coffman  
 Cole  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY)  
 Comstock  
 Conaway

Gibson  
 Graham  
 Grayson  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Gutiérrez  
 Hahn  
 Heck (WA)  
 Higgins  
 Himes  
 Honda  
 Hoyer  
 Huffman  
 Israel  
 Jeffries  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Kaptur  
 Keating  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Kennedy  
 Kildee  
 Kilmer  
 Kind  
 Kirkpatrick  
 Kuster  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lawrence  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis  
 Lieu, Ted  
 Lipinski  
 Loeb sack  
 Lofgren  
 Lowenthal  
 Lowey  
 Lujan Grisham (NM)  
 Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)  
 Lynch  
 Maloney, Carolyn  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Matsui  
 McCollum  
 McDermott  
 McGovern  
 McNeerney  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Moore  
 Moulton  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Nadler

Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Norcross  
 O'Rourke  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Payne  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Pingree  
 Pocan  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Rangel  
 Rice (NY)  
 Richmond  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruiz  
 Kennedy  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Kilmier  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez, Linda T.  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Scott (VA)  
 Serrano  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Sherman  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Speier  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Torres  
 Tsongas  
 Van Hollen  
 Vargas  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth

LaHood  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Latta  
 Lobiando  
 Long  
 Loudermilk  
 Love  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lummis  
 MacArthur  
 Massie  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McHenry  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McSally  
 Meadows  
 Meehan  
 Messer  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Mullin  
 Mulvaney  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Neugebauer  
 Newhouse  
 Noem  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Olson  
 Palazzo  
 Palmer  
 Paulsen

Foxx  
 Green, Al  
 Hastings  
 Hinojosa  
 Jackson Lee  
 Johnson, E. B.

Pearce  
 Perry  
 Peterson  
 Pittenger  
 Pitts  
 Poliquin  
 Pompeo  
 Posey  
 Price, Tom  
 Ratcliffe  
 Reed  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Ribble  
 Rice (SC)  
 Rigell  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita  
 Rooney (FL)  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothfus  
 Rouzer  
 Royce  
 Russell  
 Salmon  
 Sanford  
 Scalise  
 Schrader  
 Schweikert  
 Scott, Austin  
 Scott, David  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson

NOT VOTING—16

Jolly  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Nolan  
 Pelosi  
 Poe (TX)  
 Sanchez, Loretta  
 Stutzman  
 Takai  
 Veasey

□ 1556

So the amendment was rejected.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
 The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 235, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 414]

AYES—181

Adams  
 Aguilera  
 Ashford  
 Bass  
 Beatty  
 Becerra  
 Bera  
 Beyer  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Blumenauer  
 Bonamici

Boyle, Brendan F.  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brown (FL)  
 Brownley (CA)  
 Bustos  
 Butterfield  
 Capps  
 Capuano  
 Cárdenas  
 Carney  
 Carson (IN)  
 Cartwright  
 Castor (FL)  
 Castro (TX)  
 Chu, Judy  
 Cicilline  
 Clark (MA)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn

Cohen  
 Connolly  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Costa  
 Costello (PA)  
 Courtney  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Cummings  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny  
 DeFazio  
 DeGette  
 Delaney  
 DeLauro  
 DelBene  
 DeSaulnier  
 Deutch  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doyle, Michael F.  
 Duckworth  
 Edwards  
 Ellison  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Esty  
 Farr  
 Foster  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Fudge  
 Gabbard  
 Gallego  
 Garamendi  
 Gibson  
 Graham  
 Grayson  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Gutiérrez  
 Hahn  
 Heck (WA)  
 Higgins  
 Himes  
 Honda  
 Hoyer  
 Huffman  
 Israel  
 Jeffries  
 Johnson (GA)

NOES—235

Curbelo (FL)  
 Davidson  
 Davis, Rodney  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DeSantis  
 DesJarlais  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Dold  
 Donovan  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Ellmers (NC)  
 Emmer (MN)  
 Farenthold  
 Fincher  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Fleischmann  
 Fleming  
 Flores  
 Forbes  
 Fortenberry  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Garrett  
 Gibbs  
 Gohmert  
 Gosar  
 Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (LA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Griffith  
 Grothman  
 Guinta  
 Guthrie  
 Hanna  
 Hardy  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Heck (NV)  
 Hensarling  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Hice, Jody B.  
 Hill  
 Holding  
 Hudson  
 Huelskamp  
 Huizenga (MI)  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurd (TX)  
 Hurd (VA)  
 Issa  
 Jenkins (KS)  
 Jenkins (WV)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones  
 Jordan  
 Joyce  
 Katko  
 Kelly (MS)  
 Kelly (PA)  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kinzinger (IL)  
 Kline  
 Knight  
 Labrador  
 LaHood  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Latta  
 Long  
 Loudermilk  
 Love  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lummis  
 MacArthur  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McHenry

McKinley	Reichert	Stewart
McMorris	Renacci	Stivers
Rodgers	Ribble	Thompson (PA)
McSally	Rice (SC)	Thornberry
Meadows	Rigell	Tiberi
Meehan	Roby	Tipton
Messer	Roe (TN)	Trott
Mica	Rogers (AL)	Turner
Miller (FL)	Rogers (KY)	Upton
Miller (MI)	Rohrabacher	Valadao
Moolenaar	Rokita	Wagner
Mooney (WV)	Rooney (FL)	Walberg
Mullin	Ros-Lehtinen	Walden
Mulvaney	Roskam	Walker
Murphy (PA)	Ross	Walorski
Neugebauer	Rothfus	Walters, Mimi
Newhouse	Rouzer	Weber (TX)
Noem	Royce	Webster (FL)
Nugent	Russell	Westerman
Nunes	Salmon	Westmoreland
Olson	Sanford	Whitfield
Palazzo	Scalise	Williams
Palmer	Schweikert	Wilson (SC)
Paulsen	Scott, Austin	Wittman
Pearce	Sensenbrenner	Womack
Perry	Sessions	Woodall
Peterson	Shimkus	Yoder
Pittenger	Shuster	Yoho
Pitts	Simpson	Young (AK)
Pompeo	Sinema	Young (IA)
Posey	Smith (MO)	Young (IN)
Price, Tom	Smith (NE)	Zeldin
Ratchliffe	Smith (NJ)	Zinke
Reed	Smith (TX)	

NOT VOTING—17

Foxx	Johnson, E. B.	Poe (TX)
Goodlatte	Jolly	Sanchez, Loretta
Green, Al	Marchant	Stutzman
Hastings	Marino	Takai
Hinojosa	Nolan	Veasey
Jackson Lee	Pelosi	

□ 1600

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, on rolcall No. 414, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “no.”

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. SIMPSON, 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. 4768) to amend title 5, United States Code, with respect to the judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions, and, pursuant to House Resolution 796, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

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

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

Mr. KEATING. I am in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Keating moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4768 to the Committee on the Judiciary with instructions to report the same to the House forthwith with the following amendments:

Page 3, line 11, insert after “extent necessary” the following “, and except as otherwise provided in this section”.

Page 4, line 3, insert after the period at the end the following:

**SEC. 3. EXCEPTED RULES REGARDING THE PREVENTION OF FIREARMS TRANSFERS TO CRIMINALS AND SUSPECTED TERRORISTS.**

Section 706 of title 5, United States Code, as amended by this Act, is further amended by adding at the end the following:

“(c) In the case of a rule made by the Attorney General pertaining to the implementation of the national instant firearms background check system, including rules pertaining to the denial of firearms transfers to international or domestic terrorist suspects, to the extent necessary to decision and when presented, the reviewing court shall decide all relevant questions of law, interpret constitutional and statutory provisions, and determine the meaning or applicability of the terms of an agency action.”.

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

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

My amendment doesn’t delay or send back the underlying bill. It does, however, deny firearms transfers to international domestic terror suspects.

Mr. Speaker, before I came to this Congress I was a prosecutor. I was a district attorney. And under Massachusetts law, I was individually responsible for investigating every death in my district for foul play.

Many times, I was at a violent crime scene where families had lost a son or a daughter, a brother or a sister, a mother or a father. Every time, I would meet with these families after these terrible tragedies, if not at the crime scene, then at the hospital, or at their home, or in my office.

And what was the first thing I told them after telling them how sorry I was for this tragedy?

I think every single person in this Chamber knows what I told them because I sincerely believe that every Member in this Chamber would say the same thing if they were in that position. I have come to know you, I have come to learn about you, and I sincerely believe that you would ask this very same question. That question is, if there is anything, anything at all that I can do for you, please let me know.

There are few, if any, more helpless feelings I have ever felt in my life than during those moments. Never did I want to do so much, yet felt powerless to do so little.

Even years after a conviction, during the appeals process, the family members would talk when we would meet as if it were yesterday. They would talk about things like how they still kept a jersey or some jeans in a drawer at home because they didn’t want to let go of the memory of a son who would never wear those clothes again.

Whether it was their faith in God or being strong for their family, they somehow went on. I never have witnessed courage quite like theirs.

Invariably, there was one thing that they did ask me, every single family that I can remember, they said: Please do everything you can so that another family doesn’t go through what we are going through.

My team did everything we could so that those criminals we prosecuted did not do what they did to another person again.

And isn’t that what we are being asked to do in this Congress?

We all realize that there is no single way to prevent every gun death, but we can reduce them.

Some of the hardest cases I witnessed were motor vehicle homicide cases, lives snatched away in an instant. Yet, decades ago, Congress worked together to reduce the number of deaths on the road. They worked together for safer roads, safer cars with air bags and infant seats.

In 1972, over 54,000 people were killed on the road in this country. Yet, 4 decades later, that number went down by 40 percent, all the while Americans driving more miles than they ever had any time before.

The very same thing can be achieved with universal background checks, limiting the sales of assault weapons, restricting access of deadly weapons to those on the terror watch list.

So families are asking us, because we are the only ones they have to ask, to do everything that you can so that another family doesn’t go through what they went through.

We can keep guns out of the hands of terrorists, and we will. Ninety percent of the public supports these actions. We will protect these families, and we will save lives. We are the only ones that are there to prosecute this case, and I respectfully—and I mean respectfully—call for your help. It can’t come soon enough.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

You know, there are real discussions that we are having here, and I understand the passion and the forthrightness with what has been delivered just now in the asking of this motion to recommit; but I also want to remind Members on both sides of the aisle the

underlying bill and the very principle why we are here.

The very principle behind the bill that we are dealing with goes back—even back right now, in just a couple of months, there will be young boys and girls going back to the classrooms, they will be going back to their school-rooms, and they will be going around and they will be learning about this wonderful place called Washington, D.C. They will be learning about their Founders, and they will be learning about the Constitution where it says there is a President that we are going to elect this November, and there is an executive branch that carries out the laws. There is a legislative branch, us, that make the laws; and there is a judicial branch that interprets the laws.

Now, what is happening here today—and we can talk about a lot of things, but let's focus for a moment on what we are going to vote on. In this country, the regulatory burden has become crippling on our economy. It is tearing us apart in jobs, in creation, and the things we have.

In fact, right now more law is being made downtown in cubicles than right here in Congress. My question for you today is, if you want to be making law from cubicles, then get out from the cubicle, pay your qualifying fee, and run for Congress. Don't keep ranking it up like this, because Congress has to assert its right in making the laws.

What this bill takes into account is, unfortunately, the Judiciary has decided to side with the executive, and this doctrine called the Chevron gives deference to the very agencies that make the rules and regulations.

So it is very simple here. We can be distracted on a motion to recommit at this point, or we can go back and say this: Congress still matters, that the election cycle still matters, that the Founders were right. There are three branches of government, not one, that wants to tear down and do whatever they want.

No matter what, they need three branches. Vote "no" on the motion to recommit, and vote "yes" on the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, this 5-minute vote on the motion to recommit will be followed by a 5-minute vote on passage of the bill, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 169, nays 236, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 415]

YEAS—169

Adams  
Aguilar  
Ashford  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.

Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Ciulline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen

Connolly  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.

Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)

Farr  
Poster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Graham  
Grayson  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Honda  
Huffman  
Johnson (GA)  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)

Luijck, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)

Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Rice (NY)  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.

Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Lowe  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

NAYS—236

Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett

Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Massie  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers

McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Barton  
Brady (TX)  
Butterfield  
Conyers  
Fojt  
Goodlatte  
Green, Al  
Hastings  
Hinojosa  
Hoyer

Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jolly  
Marchant  
Marino  
McCarthy  
Nolan  
Pelosi

Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Massie  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney

Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin

NOT VOTING—28

Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jolly  
Marchant  
Marino  
McCarthy  
Nolan  
Pelosi

Barton  
Brady (TX)  
Butterfield  
Conyers  
Fojt  
Goodlatte  
Green, Al  
Hastings  
Hinojosa  
Hoyer

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker pro tempore. (During the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1618

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 415, I was unavoidably detained when there was a Capitol lockdown due to a potential shooter that prevented me from getting to the floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall 415, I was unavoidably detained due to a security lockdown that prevented me from leaving a meeting to vote on the floor. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.



The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 240, noes 171, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 416]

AYES—240

Abraham Graves (MO) Pearce  
 Aderholt Griffith Perry  
 Allen Grothman Peterson  
 Amash Guinta Pittenger  
 Amodei Guthrie Pitts  
 Babin Hanna Poliquin  
 Barletta Hardy Pompeo  
 Barr Harper Posey  
 Barton Harris Price, Tom  
 Benishek Hartzler Ratcliffe  
 Billirakis Heck (NV) Reed  
 Bishop (MI) Hensarling Reichert  
 Bishop (UT) Herrera Beutler Renacci  
 Black Hice, Jody B. Ribble  
 Blackburn Hill Rice (SC)  
 Blum Holding Rigell  
 Bost Hudson Roby  
 Boustany Huelskamp Roe (TN)  
 Brady (TX) Huizenga (MI) Rogers (AL)  
 Brat Hultgren Rogers (KY)  
 Bridenstine Hunter Rohrabacher  
 Brooks (AL) Hurd (TX) Rokita  
 Brooks (IN) Hurt (VA) Rooney (FL)  
 Buchanan Issa Ros-Lehtinen  
 Buck Jenkins (KS) Roskam  
 Bucshon Jenkins (WV) Ross  
 Burgess Johnson (OH) Rothfus  
 Byrne Johnson, Sam Rouzer  
 Calvert Jones Royce  
 Carter (GA) Jordan Russell  
 Carter (TX) Joyce Salmon  
 Chabot Katko Sanford  
 Chaffetz Kelly (MS) Scalise  
 Clawson (FL) Kelly (PA) Schweikert  
 Coffman King (IA) Scott, Austin  
 Cole King (NY) Scott, Justin  
 Collins (GA) Kinzinger (IL) Sessions  
 Collins (NY) Kline Shimkus  
 Comstock Knight Shuster  
 Conaway Labrador Simpson  
 Cook LaHood Smith (MO)  
 Costello (PA) LaMalfa Smith (NE)  
 Cramer Lamborn Smith (NJ)  
 Crawford Lance Smith (TX)  
 Crenshaw Latta Stefanik  
 Culberson LoBiondo Stewart  
 Curbelo (FL) Loudermilk Stivers  
 Davidson Love Stivers  
 Davis, Rodney Lucas Thompson (PA)  
 Denham Luetkemeyer Thornberry  
 Dent Lummis Tiberi  
 DeSantis MacArthur Tipton  
 DesJarlais Massie Trott  
 Diaz-Balart McCarthy Turner  
 Dold McCaul  
 Donovan McClintock Upton  
 Duffy McHenry Valadao  
 Duncan (SC) McKinley Wagner  
 Duncan (TN) McMorris Walberg  
 Ellmers (NC) Rodgers Walden  
 Emmer (MN) McSally Walker  
 Farenthold Meadows Walorski  
 Fincher Meehan Walters, Mimi  
 Fitzpatrick Messer Weber (TX)  
 Fleischmann Mica Webster (FL)  
 Fleming Miller (FL) Wenstrup  
 Flores Miller (MI) Westerman  
 Forbes Moolenaar Westmoreland  
 Fortenberry Mooney (WV) Whitfield  
 Franks (AZ) Mullin Williams  
 Frelinghuysen Mulvaney Wilson (SC)  
 Garrett Murphy (PA) Wittman  
 Gibbs Neugebauer Womack  
 Gibson Newhouse Woodall  
 Gohmert Noem Yoder  
 Goodlatte Nugent Yoho  
 Gosar Nunes Young (AK)  
 Gowdy Olson Young (IA)  
 Granger Palazzo Young (IN)  
 Graves (GA) Palmer Zeldin  
 Graves (LA) Paulsen Zinke

NOES—171

Adams Blumenauer Capps  
 Aguilar Bonamici Capuano  
 Ashford Boyle, Brendan Cárdenas  
 Bass F. Carney  
 Beatty Brady (PA) Carson (IN)  
 Becerra Brown (FL) Cartwright  
 Bera Brownley (CA) Castor (FL)  
 Beyer Bustos Castro (TX)  
 Bishop (GA) Butterfield Chu, Judy

Ciilline Clark (MA) Jeffries  
 Clarke (NY) Johnson (GA)  
 Clay Kaptur  
 Cleaver Keating  
 Clyburn Kelly (IL)  
 Cohen Kennedy  
 Connolly Kildee  
 Cooper Kilmer  
 Costa Kind  
 Courtney Kirkpatrick  
 Crowley Kuster  
 Cuellar Langevin  
 Cummings Larsen (WA)  
 Davis (CA) Larson (CT)  
 Davis, Danny Lawrence  
 DeFazio Lee  
 DeGette Levin  
 Delaney Lewis  
 DeLauro Lieu, Ted  
 DeBene Lipinski  
 DeSaulnier Loebbeck  
 Deutch Lofgren  
 Dingell Lowenthal  
 Doggett Lowey  
 Doyle, Michael Lujan Grisham  
 F. (NM)  
 Duckworth Luján, Ben Ray  
 Edwards (NM)  
 Ellison Lynch  
 Engel Maloney  
 Eshoo Carolyn  
 Esty Maloney, Sean  
 Farr Matsui  
 Foster McCollum  
 Frankel (FL) McDermott  
 Fudge McGovern  
 Gabbard McNerney  
 Gallego Meeks  
 Garamendi Meng  
 Graham Moore  
 Grayson Moulton  
 Green, Gene Murphy (FL)  
 Grijalva Nadler  
 Gutiérrez Neal  
 Hahn Norcross  
 Heck (WA) O'Rourke  
 Higgins Pallone  
 Himes Pascrell  
 Honda Payne  
 Huffman Perlmutter  
 Peters Peters

NOT VOTING—22

Conyers Johnson, E. B. Poe (TX)  
 Foxx Jolly Sanchez, Loretta  
 Green, Al Long Stutzman  
 Hastings Marchant Takai  
 Hinojosa Marino Torres  
 Hoyer Napolitano Veasey  
 Israel Nolan  
 Jackson Lee Pelosi

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The Speaker pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1630

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to clarify the nature of judicial review of agency interpretations of statutory and regulatory provisions."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today I missed the following votes: Motion to Adjourn. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this motion.

Motion to Adjourn. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this motion.

Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing consideration for H.R. 5538. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this motion.

H. Res. 820, Rule providing consideration of H.R. 5338. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this rule.

Motion on Ordering the Previous Question on the Rule providing consideration for H.R. 4992, H.R. 5119, and H.R. 5631. Had I been present I would have voted "no" on this motion.

H. Res. 819, Rule providing for Consideration of H.R. 4992. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this rule.

H.R. 5658, TALENT Act. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this bill.

Johnson (GA)/Conyers Amendment #1. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment.

Meeks Amendment. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment.

Johnson (GA) Amendment #4. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment.

Johnson (GA)/Ciilline Amendment #5. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this amendment.

Democratic Motion to Recommit H.R. 4768. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes" on this motion.

Final Passage of H.R. 4768, Separation of Powers Restoration Act of 2016. Had I been present, I would have voted "no" on this bill.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 5545

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Representative POLIS of Colorado be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 5545.

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

There was no objection.

SUPPORTING THE BID OF LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA, TO BRING THE 2024 SUMMER OLYMPIC GAMES BACK TO THE UNITED STATES AND PLEDGING THE COOPERATION OF CONGRESS WITH RESPECT TO THAT BID

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of House Concurrent Resolution 142, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 142

Whereas the International Olympic Committee will meet on September 13, 2017, in Lima, Peru, to consider a site for the Summer Olympic and Paralympic Games (in this preamble referred to as the "Games") in 2024;

Whereas the United States Olympic Committee has selected Los Angeles, California, as the candidate of the United States for the 2024 Games;

Whereas the Games further the cause of world peace and understanding;

Whereas the country that hosts the Games performs an act of international goodwill;

Whereas the Games have not been held in the United States since 1996;

Whereas many of the world-class venues to be used in Los Angeles' 2024 plan for the Games are already built or are planned as permanent facilities; and

Whereas Los Angeles is positioned to deliver an innovative, fiscally responsible, and sustainable Games: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That Congress—*

(1) advises the International Olympic Committee that the United States would welcome the holding of the 2024 Summer Olympic and Paralympic Games in Los Angeles, California, the site designated by the United States Olympic Committee;

(2) expresses the sincere hope that the United States will be selected as the site for the 2024 Summer Olympic and Paralympic Games and pledges cooperation and support toward the successful fulfillment of those Games in the highest sense of the Olympic tradition; and

(3) respectfully requests that the Secretary of the Senate transmit an enrolled copy of this resolution to the United States Olympic Committee and to the International Olympic Committee.

The concurrent resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### RECOGNIZING THE 50TH ANNIVERSARY OF SINGAPOREAN INDEPENDENCE AND REAFFIRMING SINGAPORE'S CLOSE PARTNERSHIP WITH THE UNITED STATES

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Foreign Affairs be discharged from further consideration of House Resolution 374, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

#### H. RES. 374

Whereas the Republic of Singapore became independent on August 9, 1965;

Whereas Singapore and the United States share founding principles, including belief in meritocracy and equality of opportunity;

Whereas Singapore has been an early and continued supporter of the United States engagement in Asia to safeguard the peace, stability, and prosperity of the region;

Whereas Singapore underwent rapid growth following independence, with approximate per capita Gross Domestic Product growing from approximately \$500 in 1965 to approximately \$56,000 in 2014;

Whereas the United States and Singapore concluded the United States-Singapore Free Trade Agreement in 2004, the first bilateral trade agreement between the United States and an Asian country;

Whereas Singapore has become a major United States trading partner, with \$65 billion in bilateral goods and services trade in 2013, as well as more than \$154.4 billion in United States Foreign Direct Investment in Singapore and \$20 billion of Singaporean Foreign Direct Investment in the United States;

Whereas Singapore was a founding member of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) in 1967 and remains a key partner with the United States in the East Asia Summit;

Whereas the United States and Singapore established the United States-Singapore Third Country Training Program in 2012 to provide technical and capacity-building assistance to recipient countries;

Whereas Singapore provided the United States access to its military facilities with the 1990 Memorandum of Understanding, to which an addendum was added in 1998, supporting the continued security presence of the United States in Southeast Asia;

Whereas the United States and Singapore concluded a Strategic Framework Agreement in 2005 which recognized Singapore as a "Major Security Cooperation Partner" of the United States;

Whereas Singapore facilitates the rotational deployment of Littoral Combat Ships from the United States at Changi Naval Base;

Whereas the United States currently hosts four Republic of Singapore Air Force training detachments, comprising the Republic of Singapore Air Force's F-15SG and F-16 fighter jets, as well as Apache and Chinook helicopters, at bases in Arizona, Idaho, and Texas;

Whereas the Singapore Armed Forces supported multinational reconstruction efforts in Iraq from 2003 to 2008, aided reconstruction and stabilization efforts in Afghanistan from 2007 to 2013, deployed alongside the United States as part of Combined Task Force 151 (CTF 151) since 2009, including taking command of CTF 151, to combat piracy in the Gulf of Aden and joined the Global Coalition to Counter ISIL in November 2014; and

Whereas Singapore will celebrate its 50th anniversary of independence in 2015 and commemorate 50 years of bilateral relations with the United States in 2016: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved, That the House of Representatives—*

(1) sends its warm congratulations to the people of Singapore as they celebrate 50 years of independence and nation-building; and

(2) reaffirms the close partnership between the United States and Singapore ahead of the 50th anniversary of the establishment of bilateral diplomatic relations.

#### AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the text of the resolution at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

That the House of Representatives—

(1) affirms the importance of the United States-Singapore strategic partnership in securing regional peace and stability, including through rotational basing and logistical support arrangements which enhance the United States presence in Southeast Asia;

(2) applauds the Republic of Singapore's leadership in counterterrorism, including the deployment of military assets as part of the anti-ISIL coalition and innovative counterterrorism efforts within the Asia-Pacific region;

(3) anticipates the deepening of the security relationship following the signing of an enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement in Washington on December 7, 2015, and welcomes further cooperation in areas such as cybersecurity, humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, and defense technology;

(4) recognizes the vitality of the United States-Singapore bilateral trade and investment relationship;

(5) supports continued close cooperation between the United States and Singapore,

through both bilateral initiatives such as the United States-Singapore Third Country Training Program, and multilateral initiatives such as United States-ASEAN Connect announced at the recent United States-ASEAN Summit in Sunnylands, to build capacity for commercial engagement, energy development, innovation, trade facilitation, and to achieve development goals in the Asia-Pacific region; and

(6) urges the Administration, to continue its support of multilateral institutions and fora such as the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation, East Asia Summit, ASEAN Regional Forum, and the ASEAN Defense Ministers' Meeting Plus, working in close cooperation with partners, such as the Republic of Singapore, who share a commitment to an inclusive, rules-based regional architecture.

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

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

#### AMENDMENT TO THE PREAMBLE OFFERED BY MR. ROYCE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment to the preamble at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike the preamble and insert the following:

Whereas the Republic of Singapore became independent on August 9, 1965, and the United States recognized Singapore's statehood in the same year;

Whereas Singapore and the United States established formal diplomatic relations in 1966;

Whereas under the leadership of its first Prime Minister Lee Kuan Yew, Singapore became an early and continued supporter of United States engagement in Asia to safeguard the peace, stability, and prosperity of the region;

Whereas the United States and Singapore implemented the United States-Singapore Free Trade Agreement, the first bilateral trade agreement between the United States and an Asian country, in 2004;

Whereas Singapore and the United States are major trading partners, with \$64 billion in bilateral goods and services trade in 2014 and a United States trade surplus in both goods and services;

Whereas Singapore provided the United States access to its military facilities with a 1990 Memorandum of Understanding, supporting the continued security presence of the United States in Southeast Asia;

Whereas the United States and Singapore concluded a Strategic Framework Agreement in 2005 which recognized Singapore as a "Major Security Cooperation Partner" of the United States;

Whereas the United States and Singapore signed an enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement in 2015, expanding dialogue and cooperation in areas such as humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, cyber defense, biosecurity, and public communications;

Whereas Singapore facilitates the rotational deployment of United States Navy Littoral Combat Ships at its Changi Naval Base;

Whereas the United States currently hosts four Republic of Singapore Air Force training detachments, comprising the Republic of

Singapore Air Force's F-15SG and F-16 fighter jets, as well as Apache and Chinook helicopters, at bases in Arizona, Idaho and Texas;

Whereas the United States-Singapore Third Country Training Program, established in 2012 and renewed in 2015, provides regional technical and capacity-building assistance in a wide variety of areas to assist recipient countries in reaching their development goals;

Whereas Singapore was a founding member of the Association of South East Asian Nations (ASEAN) in 1967 and remains a key partner of the United States in ASEAN-led mechanisms such as the East Asia Summit, ASEAN Regional Forum and the ASEAN Defense Ministers' Meeting Plus;

Whereas Singapore will be home to a United States-ASEAN Connect Center, an initiative announced at the United States-ASEAN summit in February 2016 to facilitate United States-ASEAN engagement and cooperation on energy, innovation, and entrepreneurship;

Whereas Singapore has played a critical role in enhancing shared maritime domain awareness in Southeast Asia through the establishment of the Republic of Singapore Navy's Information Fusion Center, to facilitate information-sharing and collaboration with partners including the United States against maritime security threats, and through the deployment of United States aircraft at Paya Lebar Air Base;

Whereas Singapore has been a cybersecurity leader in the ASEAN region, through the unified Cyber Security Agency, as the convener of the annual ASEAN CERT Incident Drill, and as host of the INTERPOL Global Complex for Innovation;

Whereas Singapore was the first Southeast Asian country to join the Global Coalition to Counter ISIL in November 2014 and has contributed an air refueling tanker, imagery analysis teams, and planning and liaison officers; and

Whereas Singapore has supported counterterrorism efforts, through the sharing of domestic practices, as well as participation in the White House Summit on Countering Violent Extremism in February 2015, and hosting the East Asia Summit Symposium on Religious Rehabilitation and Social Reintegration in April 2015: Now, therefore, be it

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

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

There was no objection.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The title of the resolution was amended so as to read: "A resolution reaffirming Singapore's strategic partnership with the United States, encompassing broad and robust economic, military-to-military, law enforcement, and counterterrorism cooperation."

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CLARIFYING AMENDMENT TO PROVIDE TERRORISM VICTIMS EQUITY ACT

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 3394) to amend the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 to allow for

the use of certain assets of foreign persons and entities to satisfy certain judgments against terrorist parties, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3394

*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 "Clarifying Amendment to Provide Terrorism Victims Equity Act" or the "CAPTIVE Act".*

#### SEC. 2. USE OF BLOCKED ASSETS TO SATISFY JUDGMENTS OF U.S. PERSONS AGAINST TERRORIST PARTIES.

*Section 201(d) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (28 U.S.C. 1610 note) is amended—*

*(1) in paragraph (2)—*  
*(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "means";*  
*(B) by amending paragraph (2)(A) to read as follows:*

*"(A) means any asset seized or frozen by the United States under section 5(b) of the Trading With the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. App. 5(b)), under sections 202 and 203 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701; 1702), or under section 805(b) of the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act (21 U.S.C. 1904(b)); and";*

*(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and*

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

*"(4) PERSON.—In subsection (a), the term 'person' means—*

*"(A) a natural person who, at the time the act of terrorism described in subsection (a) was committed upon which the judgment described in such subsection was obtained by that person, was either—*

*"(i) a national of the United States as defined in section 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22));*

*"(ii) a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; or*

*"(iii) otherwise an employee of the Government of the United States, or of an individual performing a contract awarded by the United States Government, acting within the scope of the employee's employment; or*

*"(B) if the person described in subparagraph (A) is deceased, the personal representative of the estate of that deceased person.".*

#### SEC. 3. APPLICABILITY.

*The amendments made by this Act apply to any judgment described in section 201(a) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (28 U.S.C. 1610 note) that is entered before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.*

AMENDMENT OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GOODLATTE:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the "Clarifying Amendment to Provide Terrorism Victims Equity Act" or the "CAPTIVE Act".*

#### SEC. 2. USE OF BLOCKED ASSETS TO SATISFY JUDGMENTS OF U.S. PERSONS AGAINST TERRORIST PARTIES.

*Section 201(d) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (28 U.S.C. 1610 note) is amended—*

*(1) in paragraph (2)—*

*(A) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking "means";*

*(B) by amending paragraph (2)(A) to read as follows:*

*"(A) means any asset seized or frozen by the United States under section 5(b) of the Trading With the Enemy Act (50 U.S.C. App. 5(b)), under sections 202 and 203 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701; 1702), or under section 805(b) of the Foreign Narcotics Kingpin Designation Act (21 U.S.C. 1904(b)); and";*

*(2) by redesignating paragraph (4) as paragraph (5); and*

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

*"(4) PERSON.—In subsection (a), the term 'person' means—*

*"(A) a natural person who, at the time the act of terrorism described in subsection (a) was committed upon which the judgment described in such subsection was obtained by that person, was either—*

*"(i) a national of the United States as defined in section 101(a)(22) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101(a)(22));*

*"(ii) a member of the Armed Forces of the United States; or*

*"(iii) otherwise an employee of the Government of the United States, or of an individual performing a contract awarded by the United States Government, acting within the scope of the employee's employment; or*

*"(B) if the person described in subparagraph (A) is deceased, the personal representative of the estate of that deceased person.".*

#### SEC. 3. APPLICABILITY.

*The amendments made by this Act apply to any judgment described in section 201(a) of the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 (28 U.S.C. 1610 note) that is entered before, on, or after the date of the enactment of this Act.*

Mr. GOODLATTE (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the reading be dispensed with.

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

There was no objection.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### PROTECTING OUR LIVES BY INITIATING COPS EXPANSION ACT OF 2016

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of the bill (S. 2840) to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize COPS grantees to use grant funds for active shooter training, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the bill is as follows:

S. 2840

*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 “Protecting Our Lives by Initiating COPS Expansion Act of 2016” or the “POLICE Act of 2016”.

**SEC. 2. ADDITIONAL AUTHORIZED USE OF COPS FUNDS.**

Section 1701(b) of title I of the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 (42 U.S.C. 3796dd(b)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (16), by striking “and” at the end;

(2) by redesignating paragraph (17) as paragraph (18);

(3) by inserting after paragraph (16) the following:

“(17) to participate in nationally recognized active shooter training programs that offer scenario-based, integrated response courses designed to counter active shooter threats or acts of terrorism against individuals or facilities; and”;

(4) in paragraph (18), as redesignated, by striking “(16)” and inserting “(17)”.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS  
ACT, 2017

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALVERT. 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. 5538, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 820 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. 5538.

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

□ 1637

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. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

The gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to bring to the floor H.R. 5538, the fiscal year 2017 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

As we begin, I want to personally thank Chairman ROGERS for his leadership and support. I also want to thank my good friend and our ranking member, Ms. MCCOLLUM, for her partnership and work on this bill and to say a very happy birthday. Finally, I want to thank each of our subcommittee members for their assistance and hard work on the legislation before us.

The fiscal year 2017 Interior and Environment bill is funded at \$32.095 billion, which is \$64 million below the FY 2016 enacted level and \$1 billion below the budget request.

The committee has provided robust wildland fire funding in this bill. Fire suppression accounts are again fully funded at the 10-year average level, which rose by \$133 million from last year. The committee also addressed concerns about forest health and active forest management, and provided a \$30 million increase for hazardous fuels.

This bill also makes critical investments in Indian Country. Overall, funding for the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Education is increased by \$72 million, or 3 percent, while funding for the Indian Health Service is increased by \$271 million, or 6 percent, from fiscal year 2016 levels. This is the largest increase in this bill.

The bill provides for \$2.9 billion for the National Park Service, including more than \$65 million in new funding to address the maintenance backlog and other priorities related to the Park Service centennial.

The bill provides \$480 million to fully fund payments in lieu of taxes, PILT, in year 2017.

We have also addressed a number of concerns within the Fish and Wildlife Service. The bill continues funding for popular cost-shared grant programs. It also provides additional funds to combat international wildlife trafficking, protects fish hatcheries from cuts and closures, continues fighting to fight invasive species, and reduces the backlog of species that are covered but not yet delisted.

The bill provides \$322 million for the Land and Water Conservation Fund programs that enjoy broad, bipartisan support.

Funding for EPA is reduced by \$164 million from fiscal year 2016 enacted levels. Again this year, there is a great deal of concern over the number of regulatory actions being pursued by EPA in the absence of legislation and without clear congressional direction. For

this reason, the bill includes a number of provisions to stop unnecessary and damaging regulatory overreach by the Agency.

Before closing, I would like to make an additional point about the challenges facing Flint, Michigan, and other communities across the country addressing lead in drinking water. This is an issue of great concern to the committee members. It is not a partisan issue.

What occurred in Flint has called greater attention to aging infrastructure and the need for prudent management and oversight of water systems. This bill provides targeted investments and prioritizes resources that will help the EPA and Michigan respond to Flint and help other States and communities address the needs of their water systems.

The bill provides an increase of \$207 million above the fiscal year 2016 enacted level for the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund. It also includes \$50 million for the new Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation, otherwise known as WIFIA, program, which may be leveraged through direct Federal loans or loan guarantees to fund up to \$3 billion to \$5 billion worth of water infrastructure projects nationwide.

In addition, the bill provides increases for State grants for improved State oversight and operations of drinking water systems and for communities to work on integrated plans for pipe replacement. The bill also directs the GAO to assess the number of lead service lines by State.

Lastly, the committee is taking an additional step to provide relief for communities like Flint by including bill language that allows States to use State revolving fund dollars to forgive a portion of a community's outstanding loans. This and other steps taken in this bill will have a real impact.

In closing, I want to thank the staff on both sides for their hard work on this bill. On the minority side, I would like to thank Rita Culp, Jocelyn Hunn, Joe Carlile, and Rebecca Taylor. Their work is very much appreciated.

On the majority side, I would like to thank our subcommittee staff: Kristin Richmond, Jackie Kilroy, Betsy Bina, Jason Gray, Darren Benjamin, and, of course, our chief clerk Dave LesStrang. I would also like to thank Ian Foley, Rebecca Keightley, Molly Lowe, and Tricia Evans on my personal staff, and my chief of staff, David Ramey.

Mr. Chairman, this is a good bill and it deserves Members' support.

I reserve the balance of my time.

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
-----					
TITLE I - DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR					
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT					
Management of Lands and Resources					
Land Resources:					
Soil, water and air management.....	43,609	45,378	43,609	---	-1,769
Rangeland management.....	79,000	62,832	79,000	---	+16,168
Grazing administration management.....	---	16,500	---	---	-16,500
Grazing administration management offsetting collections.....	---	-16,500	---	---	+16,500
Forestry management.....	9,980	10,076	10,076	+96	---
Riparian management.....	21,321	22,920	21,321	---	-1,599
Cultural resources management.....	16,131	17,328	16,131	---	-1,197
Wild horse and burro management.....	80,555	80,108	80,555	---	+447
Subtotal.....	250,596	238,642	250,692	+96	+12,050
-----					
Wildlife and Fisheries:					
Wildlife management.....	89,381	108,691	102,131	+12,750	-6,560
Fisheries management.....	12,530	12,628	12,530	---	-98
Subtotal.....	101,911	121,319	114,661	+12,750	-6,658
-----					
Threatened and endangered species.....	21,567	21,698	21,567	---	-131
-----					
Recreation Management:					
Wilderness management.....	18,264	18,392	18,264	---	-128
Recreation resources management.....	51,197	53,465	51,197	---	-2,268
Subtotal.....	69,461	71,857	69,461	---	-2,396
-----					
Energy and Minerals:					
Oil and gas management.....	59,671	80,574	59,671	---	-20,903
Oil and gas permit processing.....	7,125	6,365	6,365	-760	---
Oil and gas inspection and enforcement.....	48,000	48,000	48,000	---	---
Subtotal, Oil and gas.....	114,796	134,939	114,036	-760	-20,903
-----					
Oil and gas permit processing fees.....	---	-48,000	---	---	+48,000
Subtotal, offsetting collections.....	---	-48,000	---	---	+48,000
-----					
Coal management.....	10,868	10,962	10,868	---	-94
Other mineral resources.....	11,879	10,978	10,978	-901	---
Renewable energy.....	29,061	29,189	29,061	---	-128
Subtotal, Energy and Minerals.....	166,604	138,068	164,943	-1,661	+26,875
-----					
Realty and Ownership Management:					
Alaska conveyance.....	22,000	17,327	22,000	---	+4,673
Cadastral, lands, and realty management.....	51,252	51,480	51,252	---	-228
Subtotal.....	73,252	68,807	73,252	---	+4,445
-----					
Resource Protection and Maintenance:					
Resource management planning.....	48,125	65,203	48,125	---	-17,078
Abandoned mine lands.....	19,946	20,036	19,946	---	-90
Resource protection and law enforcement.....	25,495	25,616	26,616	+1,121	+1,000
Hazardous materials management.....	15,612	15,463	15,463	-149	---
Subtotal.....	109,178	126,318	110,150	+972	-16,168
-----					
Transportation and Facilities Maintenance:					
Annual maintenance.....	38,942	39,125	39,125	+183	---
Deferred maintenance.....	31,387	29,201	31,387	---	+2,186
Subtotal.....	70,329	68,326	70,512	+183	+2,186

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Workforce and Organizational Support:</b>					
Administrative support.....	50,942	51,139	51,139	+197	---
Bureauwide fixed costs.....	93,645	92,649	92,649	-996	---
Information technology management.....	25,958	26,077	26,077	+119	---
Subtotal.....	170,545	169,865	169,865	-680	---
Challenge cost share.....	2,413	---	---	-2,413	---
National landscape conservation system, base program..	36,819	50,645	36,819	---	-13,826
Communication site management.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Offsetting collections.....	-2,000	-2,000	-2,000	---	---
Subtotal, Management of lands and resources.....	1,072,675	1,075,545	1,081,922	+9,247	+6,377
<b>Mining Law Administration:</b>					
Administration.....	39,696	39,696	39,696	---	---
Offsetting collections.....	-56,000	-55,000	-55,000	+1,000	---
Subtotal, Mining Law Administration.....	-16,304	-15,304	-15,304	+1,000	---
Total, Management of Lands and Resources.....	1,056,371	1,060,241	1,066,618	+10,247	+6,377
<b>Land Acquisition</b>					
Land Acquisition.....	27,014	32,301	10,600	-16,414	-21,701
Emergencies, Hardships, and Inholdings.....	1,616	1,616	1,000	-616	-616
Acquisition Management.....	2,000	2,042	1,800	-200	-242
Recreational Access.....	8,000	8,000	6,000	-2,000	-2,000
Total, Land acquisition.....	38,630	43,959	19,400	-19,230	-24,559
<b>Oregon and California Grant Lands</b>					
Western Oregon resources management.....	95,255	94,445	94,445	-810	---
Western Oregon information and resource data systems..	1,786	1,798	1,798	+12	---
Western Oregon transportation & facilities maintenance	9,602	9,628	9,628	+26	---
Western Oregon construction and acquisition.....	324	335	335	+11	---
Western Oregon national monument.....	767	779	779	+12	---
Total, Oregon and California Grant Lands.....	107,734	106,985	106,985	-749	---
<b>Range Improvements</b>					
Current appropriations.....	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---
<b>Service Charges, Deposits, and Forfeitures</b>					
Service charges, deposits, and forfeitures.....	31,050	31,050	31,050	---	---
Offsetting fees.....	-31,050	-31,050	-31,050	---	---
Total, Service Charges, Deposits & Forfeitures..	---	---	---	---	---
<b>Miscellaneous Trust Funds and Permanent Operating Funds</b>					
Current appropriations.....	24,000	24,000	24,000	---	---
<b>TOTAL, BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT.....</b>					
(Mandatory).....	1,236,735	1,245,185	1,227,003	-9,732	-18,182
(Discretionary).....	(34,000)	(34,000)	(34,000)	---	---
	(1,202,735)	(1,211,185)	(1,193,003)	(-9,732)	(-18,182)

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE</b>					
<b>Resource Management</b>					
<b>Ecological Services:</b>					
Listing.....	20,515	22,901	14,411	-6,104	-8,490
Planning and consultation.....	99,079	105,650	103,650	+4,571	-2,000
Conservation and restoration.....	32,396	34,562	32,646	+250	-1,916
(National Wetlands Inventory).....	(3,471)	(4,671)	(3,471)	---	(-1,200)
(Coastal Barrier Resources Act).....	(1,390)	(1,390)	(1,640)	(+250)	(+250)
Recovery.....	82,016	89,180	86,198	+4,182	-2,982
Subtotal.....	234,006	252,293	236,905	+2,899	-15,388
<b>Habitat conservation:</b>					
Partners for fish and wildlife.....	51,776	54,047	52,026	+250	-2,021
Coastal programs.....	13,375	13,494	13,625	+250	+131
Subtotal.....	65,151	67,541	65,651	+500	-1,890
<b>National Wildlife Refuge System:</b>					
Wildlife and habitat management.....	230,343	240,389	230,593	+250	-9,796
Visitor services.....	73,319	80,380	73,569	+250	-6,811
Refuge law enforcement.....	38,054	40,712	38,054	---	-2,658
Conservation planning.....	2,523	2,544	2,773	+250	+229
Refuge maintenance.....	137,188	142,594	139,872	+2,684	-2,722
Subtotal.....	481,427	506,619	484,861	+3,434	-21,758
<b>Conservation and Enforcement:</b>					
Migratory bird management.....	47,480	49,961	48,605	+1,125	-1,356
Law enforcement.....	74,725	75,053	75,053	+328	---
International affairs.....	14,696	15,816	15,196	+500	-620
Subtotal.....	136,901	140,830	138,854	+1,953	-1,976
<b>Fish and Aquatic Conservation:</b>					
National fish hatchery system operations.....	53,418	53,759	55,418	+2,000	+1,659
Maintenance and equipment.....	19,920	22,920	22,920	+3,000	---
Aquatic habitat and species conservation.....	74,918	76,150	74,918	---	-1,232
Subtotal.....	148,256	152,829	153,256	+5,000	+427
Cooperative landscape conservation.....	12,988	17,789	12,988	---	-4,801
<b>Science Support:</b>					
Adaptive science.....	10,517	11,522	10,517	---	-1,005
Service science.....	6,468	9,057	6,468	---	-2,589
Subtotal.....	16,985	20,579	16,985	---	-3,594
<b>General Operations:</b>					
Central office operations.....	40,722	42,149	40,569	-153	-1,580
Regional office operations.....	37,722	41,354	37,722	---	-3,632
Service-wide bill paying.....	35,177	35,778	35,177	---	-601
National Fish and Wildlife Foundation.....	7,022	7,022	7,022	---	---
National Conservation Training Center.....	22,414	25,129	25,014	+2,600	-115
Subtotal.....	143,057	151,432	145,504	+2,447	-5,928
Total, Resource Management.....	1,238,771	1,309,912	1,255,004	+16,233	-54,908
<b>Construction</b>					
<b>Construction and rehabilitation:</b>					
Line item construction projects.....	14,554	14,554	5,704	-8,850	-8,850
Bridge and dam safety programs.....	1,972	1,972	1,972	---	---
Nationwide engineering service.....	7,161	7,214	7,161	---	-53
Total, Construction.....	23,687	23,740	14,837	-8,850	-8,903

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Land Acquisition</b>					
Acquisitions.....	35,911	35,884	23,800	-12,111	-12,084
Emergencies, Hardships, and Inholdings.....	5,351	5,351	4,500	-851	-851
Exchanges.....	1,500	1,500	1,000	-500	-500
Acquisition Management.....	12,773	12,955	10,000	-2,773	-2,955
Highlands Conservation Act Grants.....	10,000	---	10,000	---	+10,000
Recreational Access.....	2,500	2,500	1,000	-1,500	-1,500
Land Protection Planning.....	465	465	---	-465	-465
<b>Total, Land Acquisition.....</b>	<b>68,500</b>	<b>58,655</b>	<b>50,300</b>	<b>-18,200</b>	<b>-8,355</b>
<b>Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund</b>					
<b>Grants and administration:</b>					
Conservation grants.....	10,508	12,603	12,603	+2,095	---
HCP assistance grants.....	9,485	7,390	9,485	---	+2,095
Administration.....	2,702	2,702	2,702	---	---
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>22,695</b>	<b>22,695</b>	<b>24,790</b>	<b>+2,095</b>	<b>+2,095</b>
<b>Land acquisition:</b>					
Species recovery land acquisition.....	11,162	11,162	11,162	---	---
HCP land acquisition grants to states.....	19,638	19,638	19,638	---	---
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>30,800</b>	<b>30,800</b>	<b>30,800</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Total, Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund.....</b>	<b>53,495</b>	<b>53,495</b>	<b>55,590</b>	<b>+2,095</b>	<b>+2,095</b>
<b>National Wildlife Refuge Fund</b>					
Payments in lieu of taxes.....	13,228	---	---	-13,228	---
<b>North American Wetlands Conservation Fund</b>					
North American Wetlands Conservation Fund.....	35,145	35,145	37,645	+2,500	+2,500
<b>Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation</b>					
Migratory bird grants.....	3,910	3,910	3,910	---	---
<b>Multinational Species Conservation Fund</b>					
African elephant conservation fund.....	2,582	2,582	2,582	---	---
Rhinoceros and tiger conservation fund.....	3,440	3,440	3,440	---	---
Asian elephant conservation fund.....	1,557	1,557	1,557	---	---
Great ape conservation fund.....	1,975	1,975	1,975	---	---
Marine turtle conservation fund.....	1,507	1,507	1,507	---	---
<b>Total, Multinational Species Conservation Fund..</b>	<b>11,061</b>	<b>11,061</b>	<b>11,061</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>State and Tribal Wildlife Grants</b>					
State wildlife grants (formula).....	51,000	51,000	51,000	---	---
State wildlife grants (competitive).....	5,487	9,981	7,237	+1,750	-2,744
Tribal wildlife grants.....	4,084	6,000	4,334	+250	-1,666
<b>Total, State and tribal wildlife grants.....</b>	<b>60,571</b>	<b>66,981</b>	<b>62,571</b>	<b>+2,000</b>	<b>-4,410</b>
<b>TOTAL, U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE.....</b>	<b>1,508,368</b>	<b>1,562,899</b>	<b>1,490,918</b>	<b>-17,450</b>	<b>-71,981</b>



DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>NATIONAL PARK SERVICE</b>					
<b>Operation of the National Park System</b>					
<b>Park Management:</b>					
Resource stewardship.....	328,216	340,352	329,078	+862	-11,274
Visitor services.....	253,010	276,206	258,516	+5,506	-17,690
Park protection.....	355,683	362,082	358,672	+2,989	-3,410
Facility operations and maintenance.....	740,468	842,453	792,721	+52,253	-49,732
Park support.....	511,616	522,537	515,457	+3,841	-7,080
Subtotal.....	2,188,993	2,343,630	2,254,444	+65,451	-89,186
External administrative costs.....	180,603	180,732	180,603	---	-129
Total, Operation of the National Park System.....	2,369,596	2,524,362	2,435,047	+65,451	-89,315
<b>National Recreation and Preservation</b>					
Recreation programs.....	589	853	589	---	-264
Natural programs.....	13,575	13,659	13,575	---	-84
Cultural programs.....	24,562	26,262	24,562	---	-1,700
International park affairs.....	1,648	1,656	1,648	---	-8
Environmental and compliance review.....	433	436	433	---	-3
Grant administration.....	2,004	2,079	2,004	---	-75
Heritage Partnership Programs.....	19,821	9,447	19,821	---	+10,374
Total, National Recreation and Preservation.....	62,632	54,392	62,632	---	+8,240
<b>Historic Preservation Fund</b>					
State historic preservation offices.....	46,925	46,925	46,925	---	---
Tribal grants.....	9,985	11,985	11,985	+2,000	---
Competitive grants.....	8,500	25,500	11,500	+3,000	-14,000
Save America's Treasures grants.....	---	---	5,000	+5,000	+5,000
Grants to Historically Black Colleges and Universities.....	---	3,000	3,000	+3,000	---
Total, Historic Preservation Fund.....	65,410	87,410	78,410	+13,000	-9,000
<b>Construction</b>					
<b>General Program:</b>					
Line item construction and maintenance.....	116,276	153,344	129,501	+13,225	-23,843
Emergency and unscheduled.....	3,855	3,855	3,855	---	---
Housing.....	2,200	2,203	2,200	---	-3
Dam safety.....	1,248	1,249	1,248	---	-1
Equipment replacement.....	13,500	17,545	17,545	+4,045	---
Planning, construction.....	7,266	15,518	9,516	+2,250	-6,002
Construction program management.....	36,771	46,431	40,021	+3,250	-6,410
General management plans.....	11,821	11,893	11,821	---	-72
Total, Construction.....	192,937	252,038	215,707	+22,770	-36,331
Land and Water Conservation Fund (rescission of contract authority).....	-28,000	-30,000	-28,000	---	+2,000
<b>Land Acquisition and State Assistance</b>					
<b>Assistance to States:</b>					
State conservation grants (formula).....	94,839	94,000	71,839	-23,000	-22,161
State conservation grants (competitive).....	12,000	12,000	5,000	-7,000	-7,000
Administrative expenses.....	3,161	4,006	3,161	---	-845
Subtotal.....	110,000	110,006	80,000	-30,000	-30,006

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>National Park Service:</b>					
Acquisitions.....	33,135	37,314	22,500	-10,635	-14,814
Recreational Access.....	2,000	2,000	1,000	-1,000	-1,000
American Battlefield Protection Program.....	10,000	10,000	10,000	---	---
Emergencies, Hardships, Relocations, and Deficiencies.....	3,928	3,928	2,500	-1,428	-1,428
Acquisition Management.....	9,679	10,000	8,752	-927	-1,248
Inholdings, Donations, and Exchanges.....	4,928	5,000	4,000	-928	-1,000
Subtotal.....	63,670	68,242	48,752	-14,918	-19,490
Total, Land Acquisition and State Assistance....	173,670	178,248	128,752	-44,918	-49,496
Centennial Challenge.....	15,000	35,000	30,000	+15,000	-5,000
TOTAL, NATIONAL PARK SERVICE.....	2,851,245	3,101,450	2,922,548	+71,303	-178,902
<b>UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY</b>					
<b>Surveys, Investigations, and Research</b>					
<b>Ecosystems:</b>					
Status and trends.....	20,473	22,267	20,473	---	-1,794
Fisheries: Aquatic and endangered resources.....	20,886	24,083	21,136	+250	-2,947
Wildlife: Terrestrial and endangered resources.....	45,757	46,125	45,757	---	-368
Terrestrial, Freshwater and marine environments.....	36,224	43,352	38,415	+2,191	-4,937
Invasive species.....	17,330	19,877	17,580	+250	-2,297
Cooperative research units.....	17,371	18,234	17,371	---	-863
Total, Ecosystems.....	158,041	173,938	160,732	+2,691	-13,206
<b>Climate and Land Use Change:</b>					
<b>Climate variability:</b>					
Climate science centers.....	26,435	30,908	26,435	---	-4,473
Climate research and development.....	21,495	22,714	21,495	---	-1,219
Carbon sequestration.....	9,359	9,381	9,359	---	-22
Subtotal.....	57,289	63,003	57,289	---	-5,714
<b>Land Use Change:</b>					
Land remote sensing.....	72,194	96,506	78,194	+6,000	-18,312
Land change science.....	10,492	11,935	10,492	---	-1,443
Subtotal.....	82,686	108,441	88,686	+6,000	-19,755
Total, Climate and Land Use Change.....	139,975	171,444	145,975	+6,000	-25,469
<b>Energy, Minerals, and Environmental Health:</b>					
<b>Mineral and Energy Resources:</b>					
Minerals resources.....	48,371	48,695	48,371	---	-324
Energy resources.....	24,695	26,228	24,695	---	-1,533
Subtotal.....	73,066	74,923	73,066	---	-1,857
<b>Environmental Health:</b>					
Contaminant biology.....	10,197	11,465	10,197	---	-1,268
Toxic substances hydrology.....	11,248	13,095	11,248	---	-1,847
Subtotal.....	21,445	24,560	21,445	---	-3,115
Total, Energy, Minerals, and Environmental Health.....	94,511	99,483	94,511	---	-4,972
<b>Natural Hazards:</b>					
Earthquake hazards.....	60,503	62,196	63,303	+2,800	+1,107
Volcano hazards.....	26,121	26,238	26,121	---	-117

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Landslide hazards.....	3,538	4,054	3,538	---	-516
Global seismographic network.....	6,453	7,322	6,653	+200	-669
Geomagnetism.....	1,888	3,598	1,888	---	-1,710
Coastal and marine geology.....	40,336	46,293	41,360	+1,024	-4,933
<b>Total, Natural Hazards.....</b>	<b>138,839</b>	<b>149,701</b>	<b>142,863</b>	<b>+4,024</b>	<b>-6,838</b>
<b>Water Resources:</b>					
Water Availability and Use Science Program.....	42,226	54,388	43,802	+1,576	-10,586
Groundwater and Streamflow Information Program.....	71,535	72,957	72,957	+1,422	---
National Water Quality Program.....	92,791	94,147	92,801	+10	-1,346
Water Resources Research Act Program.....	6,500	6,500	6,500	---	---
<b>Total, Water Resources.....</b>	<b>213,052</b>	<b>227,992</b>	<b>216,060</b>	<b>+3,008</b>	<b>-11,932</b>
<b>Core Science Systems:</b>					
Science, synthesis, analysis, and research.....	24,299	24,930	24,299	---	-631
National cooperative geological mapping.....	24,397	24,486	24,486	+89	---
National Geospatial Program.....	62,854	68,979	65,048	+2,194	-3,931
<b>Total, Core Science Systems.....</b>	<b>111,550</b>	<b>118,395</b>	<b>113,833</b>	<b>+2,283</b>	<b>-4,562</b>
<b>Science Support:</b>					
Administration and Management.....	84,192	86,319	81,981	-2,211	-4,338
Information Services.....	21,419	24,273	23,630	+2,211	-643
<b>Total, Science Support.....</b>	<b>105,611</b>	<b>110,592</b>	<b>105,611</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>-4,981</b>
<b>Facilities:</b>					
Rental payments and operations & maintenance.....	93,141	109,978	93,141	---	-16,837
Deferred maintenance and capital improvement.....	7,280	7,280	7,280	---	---
<b>Total, Facilities.....</b>	<b>100,421</b>	<b>117,258</b>	<b>100,421</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>-16,837</b>
<b>TOTAL, UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY.....</b>	<b>1,062,000</b>	<b>1,168,803</b>	<b>1,080,006</b>	<b>+18,006</b>	<b>-88,797</b>
<b>BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT</b>					
<b>Ocean Energy Management</b>					
Renewable energy.....	24,278	23,887	23,393	-885	-494
Conventional energy.....	59,869	64,156	59,869	---	-4,287
Environmental assessment.....	68,045	68,399	68,045	---	-354
Executive direction.....	18,665	18,696	17,999	-666	-697
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>170,857</b>	<b>175,138</b>	<b>169,306</b>	<b>-1,551</b>	<b>-5,832</b>
Offsetting rental receipts.....	-92,961	-88,487	-88,487	+4,474	---
Cost recovery fees.....	-3,661	-6,457	-6,457	-2,796	---
<b>Subtotal, offsetting collections.....</b>	<b>-96,622</b>	<b>-94,944</b>	<b>-94,944</b>	<b>+1,678</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>TOTAL, BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT.....</b>	<b>74,235</b>	<b>80,194</b>	<b>74,362</b>	<b>+127</b>	<b>-5,832</b>
<b>BUREAU OF SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT</b>					
<b>Offshore Safety and Environmental Enforcement</b>					
Environmental enforcement.....	8,314	8,314	8,314	---	---
Operations, safety and regulation.....	144,954	145,150	145,150	+196	---
Administrative operations.....	18,268	18,268	18,268	---	---
Executive direction.....	18,236	18,236	18,236	---	---
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>189,772</b>	<b>189,968</b>	<b>189,968</b>	<b>+196</b>	<b>---</b>

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Offsetting rental receipts.....	-49,399	-37,922	-37,922	+11,477	---
Inspection fees.....	-59,000	-65,000	-53,000	+6,000	+12,000
Cost recovery fees.....	-7,808	-5,608	-5,608	+2,200	---
Subtotal, offsetting collections.....	-116,207	-108,530	-96,530	+19,677	+12,000
Rescission.....	---	---	-20,000	-20,000	-20,000
Total, Offshore Safety and Environmental Enforcement.....	73,565	81,438	73,438	-127	-8,000
Oil Spill Research					
Oil spill research.....	14,899	14,899	14,899	---	---
TOTAL, BUREAU OF SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT.....	88,464	96,337	88,337	-127	-8,000
OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT					
Regulation and Technology					
Environmental protection.....	91,832	90,138	89,450	-2,382	-688
Permit fees.....	40	1,900	40	---	-1,860
Offsetting collections.....	-40	-1,900	-40	---	+1,860
Technology development and transfer.....	15,205	21,485	15,205	---	-6,280
Financial management.....	505	713	505	---	-208
Executive direction.....	15,711	15,214	14,140	-1,571	-1,074
Civil penalties (indefinite).....	100	100	100	---	---
Subtotal.....	123,353	127,650	119,400	-3,953	-8,250
Civil penalties (offsetting collections).....	-100	-100	-100	---	---
Total, Regulation and Technology.....	123,253	127,550	119,300	-3,953	-8,250
Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund					
Environmental restoration.....	9,480	9,825	9,480	---	-345
Technology development and transfer.....	3,544	6,367	3,544	---	-2,823
Financial management.....	6,396	6,440	6,396	---	-44
Executive direction.....	7,883	7,743	7,883	---	+140
State grants.....	90,000	---	90,000	---	+90,000
Total, Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund.....	117,303	30,375	117,303	---	+86,928
TOTAL, OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT.....	240,556	157,925	236,603	-3,953	+78,678
BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION					
Operation of Indian Programs					
Tribal Budget System					
Tribal Government:					
Aid to tribal government.....	24,833	27,118	27,118	+2,285	---
Consolidated tribal government program.....	77,088	75,429	75,429	-1,659	---
Self governance compacts.....	162,321	162,346	162,346	+25	---
New tribes.....	464	---	---	-464	---

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Small and needy tribes.....	1,845	3,095	1,845	---	-1,250
Road maintenance.....	26,693	26,783	30,000	+3,307	+3,217
Tribal government program oversight.....	8,273	12,377	8,377	+104	-4,000
Subtotal.....	301,517	307,148	305,115	+3,598	-2,033
Human Services:					
Social services.....	45,179	57,343	55,500	+10,321	-1,843
Welfare assistance.....	74,791	74,773	74,773	-18	---
Indian child welfare act.....	15,641	18,946	18,509	+2,868	-437
Housing improvement program.....	8,021	9,708	9,708	+1,687	---
Human services tribal design.....	246	254	254	+8	---
Human services program oversight.....	3,126	3,137	3,137	+11	---
Subtotal.....	147,004	164,161	161,881	+14,877	-2,280
Trust - Natural Resources Management:					
Natural resources, general.....	5,168	7,953	4,953	-215	-3,000
Irrigation operations and maintenance.....	11,398	12,905	11,405	+7	-1,500
Rights protection implementation.....	37,638	40,161	40,161	+2,523	---
Tribal management/development program.....	9,263	14,266	9,266	+3	-5,000
Endangered species.....	2,684	3,685	2,685	+1	-1,000
Cooperative landscape conservation.....	9,955	13,056	9,956	+1	-3,100
Integrated resource information program.....	2,996	3,996	2,996	---	-1,000
Agriculture and range.....	30,751	30,769	30,769	+18	---
Forestry.....	51,914	52,155	52,155	+241	---
Water resources.....	10,367	15,000	10,450	+83	-4,550
Fish, wildlife and parks.....	13,646	15,658	14,414	+768	-1,244
Resource management program oversight.....	6,066	5,993	5,993	-73	---
Subtotal.....	191,846	215,597	195,203	+3,357	-20,394
Trust - Real Estate Services.....	127,486	136,192	121,192	-6,294	-15,000
Education:					
Elementary and secondary programs (forward funded)..	553,458	574,075	575,075	+21,617	+1,000
(Tribal grant support costs).....	(73,276)	(75,335)	(75,335)	(+2,059)	---
Post secondary programs (forward funded).....	74,893	77,207	77,207	+2,314	---
Subtotal, forward funded education.....	628,351	651,282	652,282	+23,931	+1,000
Elementary and secondary programs.....	134,263	144,295	140,540	+6,277	-3,755
Post secondary programs.....	64,602	66,841	66,841	+2,239	---
Education management.....	25,151	50,012	33,223	+8,072	-16,789
Subtotal, Education.....	852,367	912,430	892,886	+40,519	-19,544
Public Safety and Justice:					
Law enforcement.....	347,976	341,281	352,551	+4,575	+11,270
Tribal courts.....	28,173	30,753	30,753	+2,580	---
Fire protection.....	1,274	1,426	1,426	+152	---
Subtotal.....	377,423	373,460	384,730	+7,307	+11,270
Community and economic development.....	40,619	42,844	42,844	+2,225	---
Executive direction and administrative services.....	229,662	243,954	231,784	+2,122	-12,170
(Amounts available until expended, account-wide).....	(43,813)	(47,848)	(48,815)	(+5,002)	(+967)
Total, Operation of Indian Programs.....	2,267,924	2,395,786	2,335,635	+67,711	-60,151
Contract Support Costs					
Contract support costs.....	272,000	273,000	273,000	+1,000	---
Indian self-determination fund.....	5,000	5,000	5,000	---	---
Total, Contract Support Costs.....	277,000	278,000	278,000	+1,000	---

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Construction</b>					
Education.....	138,245	138,257	138,257	+12	---
Public safety and justice.....	11,306	11,306	11,306	---	---
Resources management.....	34,488	36,513	36,513	+2,025	---
General administration.....	9,934	10,941	10,941	+1,007	---
<b>Total, Construction.....</b>	<b>193,973</b>	<b>197,017</b>	<b>197,017</b>	<b>+3,044</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Indian Land and Water Claim Settlements and Miscellaneous Payments to Indians</b>					
Settlements and Miscellaneous Payments to Indians.....	49,475	55,155	49,025	-450	-6,130
<b>Indian Guaranteed Loan Program Account</b>					
Indian guaranteed loan program account.....	7,748	7,757	8,757	+1,009	+1,000
<b>TOTAL, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND INDIAN EDUCATION.....</b>	<b>2,796,120</b>	<b>2,933,715</b>	<b>2,868,434</b>	<b>+72,314</b>	<b>-65,281</b>
<b>DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES</b>					
<b>Office of the Secretary</b>					
Leadership and administration.....	122,885	127,394	123,110	+225	-4,284
Management services.....	21,365	21,676	19,825	-1,540	-1,851
Office of Natural Resources Revenue.....	125,519	129,306	126,487	+968	-2,819
Payments in Lieu of Taxes (PILT).....	452,000	---	480,000	+28,000	+480,000
<b>Total, Office of the Secretary.....</b>	<b>721,769</b>	<b>278,376</b>	<b>749,422</b>	<b>+27,653</b>	<b>+471,046</b>
<b>Insular Affairs</b>					
<b>Assistance to Territories</b>					
<b>Territorial Assistance</b>					
Office of Insular Affairs.....	9,448	9,863	9,448	---	-415
Technical assistance.....	15,504	21,064	15,504	---	-5,560
Maintenance assistance fund.....	1,081	5,000	1,081	---	-3,919
Brown tree snake.....	3,500	3,000	3,500	---	+500
Coral reef initiative.....	1,000	2,000	1,000	---	-1,000
Empowering Insular Communities.....	2,971	5,000	2,971	---	-2,029
Compact impact.....	3,000	3,000	3,000	---	---
<b>Subtotal, Territorial Assistance.....</b>	<b>36,504</b>	<b>48,927</b>	<b>36,504</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>-12,423</b>
American Samoa operations grants.....	22,752	22,752	22,752	---	---
Northern Marianas covenant grants.....	27,720	27,720	27,720	---	---
<b>Total, Assistance to Territories.....</b>	<b>86,976</b>	<b>99,399</b>	<b>86,976</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>-12,423</b>
(discretionary).....	(59,256)	(71,679)	(59,256)	---	(-12,423)
(mandatory).....	(27,720)	(27,720)	(27,720)	---	---
<b>Compact of Free Association</b>					
Compact of Free Association - Federal services.....	2,818	2,818	2,818	---	---
Enwetak support.....	500	500	500	---	---
<b>Subtotal, Compact of Free Association.....</b>	<b>3,318</b>	<b>3,318</b>	<b>3,318</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>---</b>
Compact payments, Palau (Title I, General Provision).....	13,147	---	---	-13,147	---
<b>Total, Compact of Free Association.....</b>	<b>16,465</b>	<b>3,318</b>	<b>3,318</b>	<b>-13,147</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Total, Insular Affairs.....</b>	<b>103,441</b>	<b>102,717</b>	<b>90,294</b>	<b>-13,147</b>	<b>-12,423</b>
(discretionary).....	(75,721)	(74,997)	(62,574)	(-13,147)	(-12,423)
(mandatory).....	(27,720)	(27,720)	(27,720)	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Office of the Solicitor</b>					
Legal services.....	59,091	62,781	59,091	---	-3,690
General administration.....	4,971	4,940	4,971	---	+31
Ethics.....	1,738	1,727	1,738	---	+11
<b>Total, Office of the Solicitor.....</b>	<b>65,800</b>	<b>69,448</b>	<b>65,800</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>-3,648</b>
<b>Office of Inspector General</b>					
Audit and investigations.....	37,538	43,263	37,538	---	-5,725
Administrative services and information management.....	12,509	12,648	12,509	---	-139
<b>Total, Office of Inspector General.....</b>	<b>50,047</b>	<b>55,911</b>	<b>50,047</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>-5,864</b>
<b>Office of Special Trustee for American Indians</b>					
<b>Federal Trust Programs</b>					
Program operations, support, and improvements.....	136,998	138,335	136,998	---	-1,337
(Office of Historical Accounting).....	(22,120)	(19,629)	(18,688)	(-3,432)	(-941)
Executive direction.....	2,031	2,044	2,031	---	-13
<b>Total, Office of Special Trustee for American Indians.....</b>	<b>139,029</b>	<b>140,379</b>	<b>139,029</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>-1,350</b>
<b>TOTAL, DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES.....</b>	<b>1,080,086</b>	<b>646,831</b>	<b>1,094,592</b>	<b>+14,506</b>	<b>+447,761</b>
(Discretionary).....	(1,052,366)	(619,111)	(1,066,872)	(+14,506)	(+447,761)
(Mandatory).....	(27,720)	(27,720)	(27,720)	---	---
<b>DEPARTMENT-WIDE PROGRAMS</b>					
<b>Wildland Fire Management</b>					
<b>Fire Operations:</b>					
Preparedness.....	323,685	332,784	332,784	+9,099	---
Fire suppression.....	291,673	276,291	302,701	+11,028	+26,410
<b>Subtotal, Fire operations.....</b>	<b>615,358</b>	<b>609,075</b>	<b>635,485</b>	<b>+20,127</b>	<b>+26,410</b>
<b>Other Operations:</b>					
Fuels Management.....	170,000	149,089	180,000	+10,000	+30,911
Resilient Landscapes.....	---	30,000	---	---	-30,000
Burned area rehabilitation.....	18,970	20,470	20,470	+1,500	---
Fire facilities.....	6,427	10,000	10,000	+3,573	---
Joint fire science.....	5,990	5,990	5,990	---	---
<b>Subtotal, Other operations.....</b>	<b>201,387</b>	<b>215,549</b>	<b>216,460</b>	<b>+15,073</b>	<b>+911</b>
<b>Subtotal, Wildland fire management.....</b>	<b>816,745</b>	<b>824,624</b>	<b>851,945</b>	<b>+35,200</b>	<b>+27,321</b>
<b>Total, Wildland fire management.....</b>	<b>816,745</b>	<b>824,624</b>	<b>851,945</b>	<b>+35,200</b>	<b>+27,321</b>
<b>FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Account</b>					
FLAME wildfire suppression reserve account.....	177,000	---	92,000	-85,000	+92,000
<b>Total, all wildland fire accounts.....</b>	<b>993,745</b>	<b>824,624</b>	<b>943,945</b>	<b>-49,800</b>	<b>+119,321</b>
Suppression Cap Adjustment.....	---	290,000	---	---	-290,000
<b>Total, Wildland Fire Management with cap adjustment.....</b>	<b>993,745</b>	<b>1,114,624</b>	<b>943,945</b>	<b>-49,800</b>	<b>-170,679</b>

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Central Hazardous Materials Fund</b>					
Central hazardous materials fund.....	10,010	13,513	10,010	---	-3,503
<b>Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund</b>					
Damage assessments.....	2,500	2,071	2,000	-500	-71
Program management.....	2,192	2,438	2,192	---	-246
Restoration support.....	2,075	3,619	2,575	+500	-1,044
Oil Spill Preparedness.....	1,000	1,101	1,000	---	-101
Total, Natural Resource Damage Assessment Fund..	7,767	9,229	7,767	---	-1,462
Working Capital Fund.....	67,100	111,524	67,100	---	-44,424
<b>TOTAL, DEPARTMENT-WIDE PROGRAMS.....</b>	<b>1,078,622</b>	<b>1,248,890</b>	<b>1,028,822</b>	<b>-49,800</b>	<b>-220,068</b>
Appropriations.....	(1,078,622)	(958,890)	(1,028,822)	(-49,800)	(+69,932)
Disaster Relief cap adjustment.....	---	(290,000)	---	---	(-290,000)
<b>TOTAL, TITLE I, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR.....</b>	<b>12,016,431</b>	<b>12,242,229</b>	<b>12,111,625</b>	<b>+95,194</b>	<b>-130,604</b>
Appropriations.....	(12,044,431)	(12,272,229)	(12,159,625)	(+115,194)	(-112,604)
Rescissions.....	---	---	(-20,000)	(-20,000)	(-20,000)
Rescissions of contract authority.....	(-28,000)	(-30,000)	(-28,000)	---	(+2,000)
(Mandatory).....	(61,720)	(61,720)	(61,720)	---	---
(Discretionary without cap adjustment).....	(11,954,711)	(11,890,509)	(12,049,905)	(+95,194)	(+159,396)
(Disaster Relief cap adjustment).....	---	(290,000)	---	---	(-290,000)
<b>TITLE II - ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY</b>					
<b>Science and Technology</b>					
Clean Air and Climate.....	116,541	128,154	110,880	-5,661	-17,274
(Climate protection program).....	(8,018)	(8,127)	(8,018)	---	(-109)
Enforcement.....	13,669	14,608	13,125	-544	-1,483
Homeland security.....	37,122	37,205	37,122	---	-83
Indoor air and Radiation.....	5,997	7,510	5,997	---	-1,513
IT / Data management / Security.....	3,089	3,092	3,089	---	-3
Operations and administration.....	68,339	78,447	68,339	---	-10,108
Pesticide licensing.....	6,027	5,289	5,289	-738	---
Research: Air, climate and energy.....	91,906	101,151	88,282	-3,624	-12,869
Research: Chemical safety and sustainability.....	126,930	134,221	132,265	+5,335	-1,956
(Research: Computational toxicology).....	(21,409)	(25,744)	(25,744)	(+4,335)	---
(Research: Endocrine disruptor).....	(16,253)	(15,381)	(16,253)	---	(+872)
Research: National priorities.....	14,100	---	10,000	-4,100	+10,000
Research: Safe and sustainable water resources.....	107,434	106,257	107,434	---	+1,177
Research: Sustainable and healthy communities.....	139,975	134,327	134,327	-5,648	---
Water: Human health protection.....	3,519	3,923	3,923	+404	---
Total, Science and Technology.....	734,648	754,184	720,072	-14,576	-34,112
(by transfer from Superfund).....	(18,850)	(15,496)	(15,496)	(-3,354)	---
<b>Environmental Programs and Management</b>					
Brownfields.....	25,593	25,906	25,593	---	-313
Clean air and climate.....	273,108	340,974	248,108	-25,000	-92,866
(Climate protection program).....	(95,436)	(107,761)	(80,436)	(-15,000)	(-27,325)
Compliance.....	101,665	111,270	100,048	-1,617	-11,222
Enforcement.....	240,637	268,118	226,741	-13,896	-41,377
(Environmental justice).....	(6,737)	(15,291)	(6,737)	---	(-8,554)



DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Environmental protection: National priorities.....	12,700	---	15,000	+2,300	+15,000
Geographic programs:					
Great Lakes Restoration Initiative.....	300,000	250,000	300,000	---	+50,000
Chesapeake Bay.....	73,000	70,000	60,000	-13,000	-10,000
San Francisco Bay.....	4,819	4,040	4,040	-779	---
Puget Sound.....	28,000	30,034	28,000	---	-2,034
Long Island Sound.....	3,940	2,893	10,000	+6,060	+7,107
Gulf of Mexico.....	4,482	3,983	3,983	-499	---
South Florida.....	1,704	1,339	1,339	-365	---
Lake Champlain.....	4,399	1,399	1,399	-3,000	---
Lake Pontchartrain.....	948	948	948	---	---
Southern New England Estuaries.....	5,000	5,000	---	-5,000	-5,000
Other geographic activities.....	1,445	965	---	-1,445	-965
Subtotal.....	427,737	370,601	409,709	-18,028	+39,108
Homeland security.....	10,195	11,518	10,195	---	-1,323
Indoor air and radiation.....	27,637	29,908	29,148	+1,511	-760
Information exchange / Outreach.....	126,538	152,445	115,440	-11,098	-37,005
(Children and other sensitive populations:					
Agency coordination).....	(6,548)	(7,842)	(6,548)	---	(-1,294)
(Environmental education).....	(8,702)	(11,157)	---	(-8,702)	(-11,157)
International programs.....	15,400	18,099	13,100	-2,300	-4,999
IT / Data management / Security.....	90,536	126,974	90,536	---	-36,438
Legal/science/regulatory/economic review.....	111,414	145,683	89,234	-22,160	-56,449
Operations and administration.....	482,751	520,316	482,751	---	-37,565
Pesticide licensing.....	102,363	110,896	102,363	---	-8,533
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).....	104,877	110,708	104,877	---	-5,831
Toxics risk review and prevention.....	92,521	99,043	92,521	---	-6,522
(Endocrine disruptors).....	(7,553)	(4,329)	(7,553)	---	(+3,224)
Underground storage tanks (LUST / UST).....	11,295	11,612	11,295	---	-317
Water: Ecosystems:					
National estuary program / Coastal waterways.....	26,723	27,191	26,723	---	-468
Wetlands.....	21,065	23,668	21,065	---	-2,603
Subtotal.....	47,788	50,859	47,788	---	-3,071
Water: Human health protection.....	98,507	109,437	100,507	+2,000	-8,930
Water quality protection.....	210,417	238,526	212,516	+2,099	-26,010
Total, Environmental Programs and Management....	2,613,679	2,852,893	2,527,470	-86,209	-325,423
Hazardous Waste Electronic Manifest System Fund					
E-Manifest System Fund.....	3,674	7,433	3,178	-496	-4,255
Office of Inspector General					
Audits, evaluations, and investigations.....	41,489	51,527	41,489	---	-10,038
(by transfer from Superfund).....	(9,939)	(8,778)	(8,778)	(-1,161)	---
Buildings and Facilities					
Homeland security: Protection of EPA personnel					
and infrastructure.....	6,676	7,875	6,676	---	-1,199
Operations and administration.....	35,641	44,203	27,791	-7,850	-16,412
Total, Buildings and Facilities.....	42,317	52,078	34,467	-7,850	-17,611
Hazardous Substance Superfund					
Audits, evaluations, and investigations.....	9,939	8,778	8,778	-1,161	---
Compliance.....	995	1,099	995	---	-104
Enforcement.....	166,375	175,657	160,375	-6,000	-15,282
Homeland security.....	36,362	32,616	32,616	-3,746	---
Indoor air and radiation.....	1,985	2,182	1,985	---	-197

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Information exchange / Outreach.....	1,328	1,366	1,328	---	-38
IT /data management/security.....	14,485	20,141	14,485	---	-5,656
Legal/science/regulatory/economic review.....	1,253	1,278	1,253	---	-25
Operations and administration.....	128,105	130,608	128,105	---	-2,503
Research: Chemical safety and sustainability.....	2,843	2,824	2,824	-19	---
Research: Sustainable communities.....	14,032	11,463	11,463	-2,569	---
<b>Superfund cleanup:</b>					
Superfund: Emergency response and removal.....	181,306	185,233	185,233	+3,927	---
Superfund: Emergency preparedness.....	7,636	7,931	7,931	+295	---
Superfund: Federal facilities.....	21,125	26,770	21,125	---	-5,645
Superfund: Remedial.....	501,000	521,043	537,433	+36,433	+16,390
Subtotal.....	711,067	740,977	751,722	+40,655	+10,745
Total, Hazardous Substance Superfund.....	1,088,769	1,128,989	1,115,929	+27,160	-13,060
(transfer out to Inspector General).....	(-9,939)	(-8,778)	(-8,778)	(+1,161)	---
(transfer out to Science and Technology).....	(-18,850)	(-15,496)	(-15,496)	(+3,354)	---
<b>Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund (LUST)</b>					
Enforcement.....	620	668	620	---	-48
Operations and administration.....	1,352	1,669	1,352	---	-317
Research: Sustainable communities.....	320	365	320	---	-45
Underground storage tanks (LUST / UST).....	89,649	91,583	92,313	+2,664	+730
(LUST/UST).....	(9,240)	(9,322)	(9,322)	(+82)	---
(LUST cooperative agreements).....	(55,040)	(54,402)	(56,402)	(+1,362)	(+2,000)
(Energy Policy Act grants).....	(25,369)	(27,859)	(26,589)	(+1,220)	(-1,270)
Total, Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund.....	91,941	94,285	94,605	+2,664	+320
<b>Inland Oil Spill Program</b>					
Compliance.....	139	160	139	---	-21
Enforcement.....	2,413	2,492	2,413	---	-79
Oil.....	14,409	20,461	14,409	---	-6,052
Operations and administration.....	584	1,763	584	---	-1,179
Research: Sustainable communities.....	664	534	534	-130	---
Total, Inland Oil Spill Program.....	18,209	25,410	18,079	-130	-7,331
<b>State and Tribal Assistance Grants (STAG)</b>					
Alaska Native villages.....	20,000	17,000	17,000	-3,000	---
Brownfields projects.....	80,000	90,000	80,000	---	-10,000
Clean water state revolving fund (SRF).....	1,393,887	979,500	1,000,000	-393,887	+20,500
Diesel emissions grants.....	50,000	10,000	100,000	+50,000	+90,000
Drinking water state revolving fund (SRF).....	863,233	1,020,500	1,070,500	+207,267	+50,000
Mexico border.....	10,000	5,000	5,000	-5,000	---
Targeted airshed grants.....	20,000	---	40,000	+20,000	+40,000
Subtotal, Infrastructure assistance grants.....	2,437,120	2,122,000	2,312,500	-124,620	+190,500
<b>Categorical grants:</b>					
Beaches protection.....	9,549	---	---	-9,549	---
Brownfields.....	47,745	49,500	47,745	---	-1,755
Environmental information.....	9,646	25,346	9,646	---	-15,700
Hazardous waste financial assistance.....	99,693	99,693	99,693	---	---
Lead.....	14,049	14,049	14,049	---	---
Nonpoint source (Sec. 319).....	164,915	164,915	164,915	---	---
Pesticides enforcement.....	18,050	18,050	18,050	---	---
Pesticides program implementation.....	12,701	13,201	12,701	---	-500
Pollution control (Sec. 106).....	230,806	246,184	230,806	---	-15,358
(Water quality monitoring).....	(17,848)	(17,848)	(17,848)	---	---
Pollution prevention.....	4,765	4,765	4,765	---	---
Public water system supervision.....	101,963	109,700	109,700	+7,737	---
Radon.....	8,051	---	8,051	---	+8,051
State and local air quality management.....	228,219	268,229	228,219	---	-40,010
Toxics substances compliance.....	4,919	4,919	4,919	---	---

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Tribal air quality management.....	12,829	12,829	12,829	---	---
Tribal general assistance program.....	65,476	96,375	65,476	---	-30,899
Underground injection control (UIC).....	10,506	10,506	10,506	---	---
Underground storage tanks.....	1,498	2,498	1,498	---	-1,000
Wetlands program development.....	14,661	17,661	14,661	---	-3,000
Multipurpose grants.....	21,000	---	---	-21,000	---
Subtotal, Categorical grants.....	1,081,041	1,158,400	1,058,229	-22,812	-100,171
Total, State and Tribal Assistance Grants.....	3,518,161	3,280,400	3,370,729	-147,432	+90,329
Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Program Administrative Expenses.....	---	5,000	5,000	+5,000	---
Direct Loan Subsidy.....	---	15,000	45,000	+45,000	+30,000
Total, Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Program.....	---	20,000	50,000	+50,000	+30,000
Administrative Provisions					
Cybersecurity.....	27,000	---	---	-27,000	---
Rescission.....	-40,000	---	---	+40,000	---
=====					
TOTAL, TITLE II, ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY	8,139,887	8,267,199	7,976,018	-163,869	-291,181
Appropriations.....	(8,179,887)	(8,267,199)	(7,976,018)	(-203,869)	(-291,181)
Rescissions.....	(-40,000)	---	---	(+40,000)	---
(By transfer).....	(28,789)	(24,274)	(24,274)	(-4,515)	---
(Transfer out).....	(-28,789)	(-24,274)	(-24,274)	(+4,515)	---
=====					
TITLE III - RELATED AGENCIES					
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE					
FOREST SERVICE					
Forest and Rangeland Research					
Forest inventory and analysis.....	75,000	77,000	77,000	+2,000	---
Research and development programs.....	216,000	214,982	214,982	-1,018	---
Total, Forest and rangeland research.....	291,000	291,982	291,982	+982	---
State and Private Forestry					
Landscape scale restoration.....	14,000	23,513	14,000	---	-9,513
Forest Health Management:					
Federal lands forest health management.....	58,922	51,382	68,922	+10,000	+17,540
Cooperative lands forest health management.....	40,678	40,678	45,678	+5,000	+5,000
Subtotal.....	99,600	92,060	114,600	+15,000	+22,540
Cooperative Forestry:					
Forest stewardship.....	23,036	22,398	22,398	-638	---
Forest legacy.....	62,347	62,347	55,000	-7,347	-7,347
Community forest and open space conservation.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
Urban and community forestry.....	28,040	23,686	28,040	---	+4,354
Subtotal, Cooperative Forestry.....	115,423	110,431	107,438	-7,985	-2,993
International forestry.....	8,000	8,000	8,000	---	---
Total, State and Private Forestry.....	237,023	234,004	244,038	+7,015	+10,034

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>National Forest System</b>					
Land management planning.....	36,998	---	36,998	---	+36,998
Inventory and monitoring.....	147,998	---	147,998	---	+147,998
Land management planning, assessment and monitoring...	---	183,928	---	---	-183,928
Recreation, heritage and wilderness.....	261,719	263,942	263,942	+2,223	---
Grazing management.....	56,856	50,000	56,856	---	+6,856
Grazing administration management.....	---	15,000	---	---	-15,000
Grazing administration management offsetting collections.....	---	-15,000	---	---	+15,000
Forest products.....	359,805	359,805	384,805	+25,000	+25,000
Vegetation and watershed management.....	184,716	184,716	184,716	---	---
Wildlife and fish habitat management.....	140,466	140,466	140,466	---	---
Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Fund.....	40,000	40,000	40,000	---	---
Minerals and geology management.....	76,423	75,069	75,069	-1,354	---
Landownership management.....	77,730	71,440	71,440	-6,290	---
Law enforcement operations.....	126,653	131,630	129,153	+2,500	-2,477
<b>Total, National Forest System.....</b>	<b>1,509,364</b>	<b>1,500,996</b>	<b>1,531,443</b>	<b>+22,079</b>	<b>+30,447</b>
<b>Capital Improvement and Maintenance</b>					
<b>Facilities:</b>					
Maintenance.....	55,369	55,369	55,369	---	---
Construction.....	16,021	16,231	16,021	---	-210
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>71,390</b>	<b>71,600</b>	<b>71,390</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>-210</b>
<b>Roads:</b>					
Maintenance.....	145,454	126,840	145,454	---	+18,614
Construction.....	26,640	23,160	26,640	---	+3,480
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>172,094</b>	<b>150,000</b>	<b>172,094</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>+22,094</b>
<b>Trails:</b>					
Maintenance.....	69,777	70,597	69,777	---	-820
Construction.....	7,753	7,933	7,753	---	-180
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>77,530</b>	<b>78,530</b>	<b>77,530</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>-1,000</b>
Deferred maintenance.....	3,150	3,150	3,150	---	---
Legacy road and trail remediation.....	40,000	40,000	40,000	---	---
<b>Subtotal, Capital improvement and maintenance...</b>	<b>364,164</b>	<b>343,280</b>	<b>364,164</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>+20,884</b>
Deferral of road and trail fund payment.....	-16,000	-17,000	-16,000	---	+1,000
<b>Total, Capital improvement and maintenance.....</b>	<b>348,164</b>	<b>326,280</b>	<b>348,164</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>+21,884</b>
<b>Land Acquisition</b>					
Acquisitions.....	44,685	49,703	13,330	-31,355	-36,373
Acquisition Management.....	8,500	8,500	7,000	-1,500	-1,500
Cash Equalization.....	250	750	250	---	-500
Recreational Access.....	8,000	4,700	4,700	-3,300	---
Critical Inholdings/Wilderness.....	2,000	2,000	2,000	---	---
<b>Total, Land Acquisition.....</b>	<b>63,435</b>	<b>65,653</b>	<b>27,280</b>	<b>-36,155</b>	<b>-38,373</b>
Acquisition of land for national forests, special acts	950	950	950	---	---
Acquisition of lands to complete land exchanges.....	216	216	216	---	---
Range betterment fund.....	2,320	2,320	2,320	---	---
Gifts, donations and bequests for forest and rangeland research.....	45	45	45	---	---
Management of national forest lands for subsistence uses.....	2,500	2,441	2,500	---	+59

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Wildland Fire Management</b>					
<b>Fire operations:</b>					
Wildland fire preparedness.....	1,082,620	1,082,620	1,147,620	+65,000	+65,000
Wildland fire suppression operations.....	811,000	873,904	933,434	+122,434	+59,530
Subtotal, Fire operations.....	1,893,620	1,956,524	2,081,054	+187,434	+124,530
<b>Other operations:</b>					
Hazardous fuels.....	375,000	384,126	395,000	+20,000	+10,874
(Hazardous Fuels Base Program).....	(360,000)	(396,126)	(390,000)	(+30,000)	(-6,126)
(Biomass Grants).....	(15,000)	(15,000)	(5,000)	(-10,000)	(-10,000)
Fire plan research and development.....	19,795	19,795	19,795	---	---
Joint fire sciences program.....	6,914	---	6,914	---	+6,914
State fire assistance.....	78,000	78,000	78,000	---	---
Volunteer fire assistance.....	13,000	13,000	13,000	---	---
Subtotal, Other operations.....	492,709	494,921	512,709	+20,000	+17,788
Subtotal, Wildland Fire Management.....	2,386,329	2,451,445	2,593,763	+207,434	+142,318
Appropriations.....	(2,386,329)	(2,451,445)	(2,593,763)	(+207,434)	(+142,318)
<b>FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Account</b>					
FLAME wildfire suppression reserve account.....	823,000	---	315,000	-508,000	+315,000
Total, all wildland fire accounts.....	3,209,329	2,451,445	2,908,763	-300,566	+457,318
Suppression cap adjustment.....	---	864,096	---	---	-864,096
Total, Wildland Fire Management with cap adjustment.....	3,209,329	3,315,541	2,908,763	-300,566	-406,778
Total, Forest Service without Wildland Fire Management.....	2,455,017	2,424,887	2,448,938	-6,079	+24,051
TOTAL, FOREST SERVICE.....	5,664,346	5,740,428	5,357,701	-306,645	-382,727
Appropriations.....	(5,664,346)	(4,876,332)	(5,357,701)	(-306,645)	(+481,369)
Disaster Relief cap adjustment.....	---	(864,096)	---	---	(-864,096)
<b>DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES</b>					
<b>INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE</b>					
<b>Indian Health Services</b>					
<b>Clinical Services:</b>					
Hospital and health clinics.....	1,857,225	1,979,998	1,928,879	+71,654	-51,119
Dental health.....	178,286	186,829	186,029	+7,743	-800
Mental health.....	82,100	111,143	86,143	+4,043	-25,000
Alcohol and substance abuse.....	205,305	233,286	216,486	+11,181	-16,800
Purchased/referred care.....	914,139	962,331	960,831	+46,692	-1,500
Subtotal.....	3,237,055	3,473,587	3,378,368	+141,313	-95,219
<b>Preventive Health:</b>					
Public health nursing.....	76,623	82,040	82,040	+5,417	---
Health education.....	18,255	19,545	19,545	+1,290	---
Community health representatives.....	58,906	62,428	62,428	+3,522	---
Immunization (Alaska).....	1,950	2,062	2,062	+112	---
Subtotal.....	155,734	166,075	166,075	+10,341	---

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>Other services:</b>					
Urban Indian health.....	44,741	48,157	48,157	+3,416	---
Indian health professions.....	48,342	49,345	49,345	+1,003	---
Tribal management grant program.....	2,442	2,488	2,488	+46	---
Direct operations.....	72,338	69,620	70,420	-1,918	+800
Self-governance.....	5,735	5,837	5,837	+102	---
Subtotal.....	173,598	175,447	176,247	+2,649	+800
Total, Indian Health Services.....	3,566,387	3,815,109	3,720,690	+154,303	-94,419
<b>Contract Support Costs</b>					
Contract support.....	717,970	800,000	800,000	+82,030	---
<b>Indian Health Facilities</b>					
Maintenance and improvement.....	73,614	76,981	76,464	+2,850	-517
Sanitation facilities construction.....	99,423	103,036	103,036	+3,613	---
Health care facilities construction.....	105,048	132,377	120,934	+15,886	-11,443
Facilities and environmental health support.....	222,610	233,858	233,858	+11,248	---
Equipment.....	22,537	23,654	23,654	+1,117	---
Total, Indian Health Facilities.....	523,232	569,906	557,946	+34,714	-11,960
TOTAL, INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE.....	4,807,589	5,185,015	5,078,636	+271,047	-106,379
<b>NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH</b>					
National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences...	77,349	77,349	77,349	---	---
<b>AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY</b>					
Toxic substances and environmental public health.....	74,691	74,691	74,691	---	---
TOTAL, DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES...	4,959,629	5,337,055	5,230,676	+271,047	-106,379
<b>OTHER RELATED AGENCIES</b>					
<b>EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT</b>					
Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality.....	3,000	3,015	3,000	---	-15
<b>CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	11,000	12,436	11,000	---	-1,436
<b>OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	15,000	15,431	15,431	+431	---
<b>INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT</b>					
Payment to the Institute.....	11,619	11,835	11,619	---	-216
<b>SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION</b>					
<b>Salaries and Expenses</b>					
<b>Museum and Research Institutes:</b>					
National Air and Space Museum.....	18,937	19,853	19,187	+250	-666
Smithsonian Astrophysical Observatory.....	24,141	24,393	24,141	---	-252
Major scientific instrumentation.....	4,118	6,118	4,118	---	-2,000

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Universe Center.....	184	184	184	---	---
National Museum of Natural History.....	48,503	49,205	48,503	---	-702
National Zoological Park.....	26,382	27,252	26,882	+500	-370
Smithsonian Environmental Research Center.....	3,956	4,171	3,956	---	-215
Smithsonian Tropical Research Institute.....	14,166	14,344	14,166	---	-178
Biodiversity Center.....	1,523	4,230	1,523	---	-2,707
Arthur M. Sackler Gallery/Freer Gallery of Art.....	6,111	6,197	6,111	---	-86
Center for Folklife and Cultural Heritage.....	2,581	3,122	2,581	---	-541
Cooper-Hewitt, National Design Museum.....	4,810	5,105	4,946	+136	-159
Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden.....	4,414	4,913	4,564	+150	-349
National Museum of African Art.....	4,283	4,576	4,343	+80	-233
World Cultures Center.....	284	792	792	+508	---
Anacostia Community Museum.....	2,116	2,329	2,116	---	-213
Archives of American Art.....	1,880	2,005	1,880	---	-125
National Museum of African American History and Culture.....	41,347	41,564	41,564	+217	---
National Museum of American History.....	23,122	26,142	24,528	+1,406	-1,614
National Museum of the American Indian.....	31,726	32,341	31,950	+224	-391
National Portrait Gallery.....	6,064	6,460	6,185	+121	-275
Smithsonian American Art Museum.....	9,587	10,115	9,782	+195	-333
American Experience Center.....	595	596	595	---	-1
Subtotal, Museums and Research Institutes.....	280,810	296,007	284,597	+3,787	-11,410
Mission enabling: Program support and outreach:					
Outreach.....	9,229	9,214	9,229	---	+15
Communications.....	2,594	2,632	2,594	---	-38
Institution-wide programs.....	14,784	14,984	14,784	---	-200
Office of Exhibits Central.....	3,009	3,057	3,009	---	-48
Museum Support Center.....	1,866	1,890	1,866	---	-24
Museum Conservation Institute.....	3,277	3,320	3,277	---	-43
Smithsonian Institution Archives.....	2,203	2,316	2,203	---	-113
Smithsonian Institution Libraries.....	10,654	11,275	10,654	---	-621
Subtotal, Program support and outreach.....	47,616	48,688	47,616	---	-1,072
Office of Chief Information Officer.....	50,400	54,641	50,400	---	-4,241
Administration.....	34,554	37,526	35,069	+515	-2,457
Inspector General.....	3,451	3,499	3,451	---	-48
Facilities services:					
Facilities maintenance.....	73,985	89,227	75,585	+1,600	-13,642
Facilities operations, security and support.....	205,229	229,636	215,769	+10,540	-13,867
Subtotal, Facilities services.....	279,214	318,863	291,354	+12,140	-27,509
Subtotal, Mission enabling.....	415,235	463,217	427,890	+12,655	-35,327
Total, Salaries and expenses.....	696,045	759,224	712,487	+16,442	-46,737
Facilities Capital					
Revitalization.....	92,788	83,650	80,560	-12,228	-3,090
Facilities planning and design.....	51,410	29,350	20,300	-31,110	-9,050
Construction.....	---	50,000	50,000	+50,000	---
Total, Facilities Capital.....	144,198	163,000	150,860	+6,662	-12,140
TOTAL, SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION.....	840,243	922,224	863,347	+23,104	-58,877

DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
<b>NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART</b>					
Salaries and Expenses					
Care and utilization of art collections.....	41,581	45,418	44,653	+3,072	-765
Operation and maintenance of buildings and grounds....	33,858	35,011	35,011	+1,153	---
Protection of buildings, grounds and contents.....	22,643	24,231	24,231	+1,588	---
General administration.....	26,906	31,141	26,906	---	-4,235
<b>Total, Salaries and Expenses.....</b>	<b>124,988</b>	<b>135,801</b>	<b>130,801</b>	<b>+5,813</b>	<b>-5,000</b>
Repair, Restoration and Renovation of Buildings					
Base program.....	22,564	22,600	22,564	---	-36
<b>TOTAL, NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART.....</b>	<b>147,552</b>	<b>158,401</b>	<b>153,365</b>	<b>+5,813</b>	<b>-5,036</b>
<b>JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS</b>					
Operations and maintenance.....	21,660	22,260	22,260	+600	---
Capital repair and restoration.....	14,740	13,000	14,140	-600	+1,140
<b>TOTAL, JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS.....</b>	<b>36,400</b>	<b>35,260</b>	<b>36,400</b>	<b>---</b>	<b>+1,140</b>
<b>WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS</b>					
Salaries and expenses.....	10,500	10,400	10,500	---	+100
<b>NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES</b>					
National Endowment for the Arts					
Grants and Administration					
Grants:					
Direct grants.....	63,420	63,906	63,906	+486	---
Challenge America grants.....	7,600	7,600	7,600	---	---
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>71,020</b>	<b>71,506</b>	<b>71,506</b>	<b>+486</b>	<b>---</b>
State partnerships:					
State and regional.....	37,262	37,517	37,517	+255	---
Underserved set-aside.....	10,084	10,154	10,154	+70	---
<b>Subtotal.....</b>	<b>47,346</b>	<b>47,671</b>	<b>47,671</b>	<b>+325</b>	<b>---</b>
<b>Subtotal, Grants.....</b>	<b>118,366</b>	<b>119,177</b>	<b>119,177</b>	<b>+811</b>	<b>---</b>
Program support.....	1,780	1,950	1,950	+170	---
Administration.....	27,803	28,722	28,722	+919	---
<b>Total, Arts.....</b>	<b>147,949</b>	<b>149,849</b>	<b>149,849</b>	<b>+1,900</b>	<b>---</b>
National Endowment for the Humanities					
Grants and Administration					
Grants:					
Special Initiative: The Common Good.....	5,500	10,190	7,230	+1,730	-2,960
Federal/State partnership.....	43,040	43,040	46,000	+2,960	+2,960
Preservation and access.....	15,200	14,385	14,385	-815	---
Public programs.....	13,454	12,730	12,730	-724	---
Research programs.....	14,536	13,755	13,755	-781	---
Education programs.....	13,040	12,000	12,000	-1,040	---
Program development.....	500	500	500	---	---



DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS BILL, 2017 (H.R. 5538)  
(Amounts in thousands)

	FY 2016 Enacted	FY 2017 Request	Bill	Bill vs. Enacted	Bill vs. Request
Digital humanities initiatives.....	4,480	4,600	4,600	+120	---
Subtotal, Grants.....	109,750	111,200	111,200	+1,450	---
Matching Grants:					
Treasury funds.....	2,400	2,200	2,200	-200	---
Challenge grants.....	8,500	8,500	8,500	---	---
Subtotal, Matching grants.....	10,900	10,700	10,700	-200	---
Administration.....	27,292	27,948	27,948	+656	---
Total, Humanities.....	147,942	149,848	149,848	+1,906	---
=====					
TOTAL, NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES.....	295,891	299,697	299,697	+3,806	---
=====					
COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS					
Salaries and expenses.....	2,653	2,762	2,762	+109	---
NATIONAL CAPITAL ARTS AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS					
Grants.....	2,000	1,400	2,000	---	+600
ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION					
Salaries and expenses.....	6,080	6,493	6,480	+400	-13
NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	8,348	8,099	8,099	-249	---
UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM					
Holocaust Memorial Museum.....	54,000	57,000	57,000	+3,000	---
DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION					
Salaries and expenses.....	1,000	1,800	---	-1,000	-1,800
Construction.....	---	43,000	---	---	-43,000
=====					
Total, DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER MEMORIAL COMMISSION.....	1,000	44,800	---	-1,000	-44,800
=====					
TOTAL, TITLE III, RELATED AGENCIES.....	12,069,261	12,666,736	12,069,077	-184	-597,659
Appropriations.....	(12,069,261)	(11,802,640)	(12,069,077)	(-184)	(+266,437)
(Disaster Relief cap adjustment).....	---	(864,096)	---	---	(-864,096)
=====					
GRAND TOTAL.....	32,225,579	33,176,164	32,156,720	-68,859	-1,019,444
Appropriations.....	(32,293,579)	(32,052,068)	(32,204,720)	(-88,859)	(+152,652)
Rescissions.....	(-40,000)	---	(-20,000)	(+20,000)	(-20,000)
Rescissions of contract authority.....	(-28,000)	(-30,000)	(-28,000)	---	(+2,000)
Disaster Relief cap adjustment.....	---	(1,154,096)	---	---	(-1,154,096)
(By transfer).....	(28,789)	(24,274)	(24,274)	(-4,515)	---
(Transfer out).....	(-28,789)	(-24,274)	(-24,274)	(+4,515)	---
(Discretionary total - less disaster relief category adjustment).....	(32,158,859)	(31,960,348)	(32,095,000)	(-63,859)	(+134,652)

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I would like to thank Chairman CALVERT for the warm birthday wishes. But I would also like to thank the chairman and his staff for their open and collaborative approach, and the wonderful staff on the Democratic side who will be helping me this evening.

This subcommittee has had a challenging portfolio of issues, and I commend the chairman's effort to find solutions in another yet difficult budget year.

This year's subcommittee held 14 budget hearings, 4 which involved Native American Indians and Alaska Natives.

□ 1645

The testimony provided by the 209 witnesses clearly articulated the serious need for programs and services under this subcommittee's jurisdiction. Unfortunately, the FY 2017 subcommittee allocation is \$64 million less than last year's enacted level. This means the needs of many important programs that are vital to protecting our Nation's natural and cultural resources will not be met as they far outpace a stagnant allocation. Within this constrained top line number, difficult choices had to be made, and, sadly, the majority cut important programs that protect the American public and conserve our natural resources.

The most significant programmatic cut is to the Environmental Protection Agency, which is slashed by \$164 million. This cut will impact the Agency's ability to protect human health and the health of our environment and to ensure clean air and clean water for our families and future generations.

This year, the critical need for the EPA was unmistakable as our Nation watched a tragedy unfold in Flint, Michigan, by which children were poisoned by lead in their drinking water. So I find it difficult to reconcile the cuts recommended in this bill with the public health challenges that are faced by this country. Flint is a culmination of years of weakening the EPA through budget cuts and an overreliance on State agencies to manage Federal environmental laws. All of our communities deserve and expect their government to provide clean water and basic public health protections.

Especially in light of Flint, I must strongly object to the majority's decision to reduce funding for clean water by \$394 million, which is 28 percent below the 2016 enacted level. Clean water and safe drinking water go hand in hand. You cannot have one without the other.

The residents of Flint were betrayed by their State government, and, to this day, they still do not have safe drinking water available from their taps. The levels provided in this bill for the State Revolving Funds are inadequate to deal with the decaying infrastructure in our Nation, no less the emergency in Flint, Michigan.

In addition to the irresponsible cuts to the EPA, I am also troubled by the 30 percent reduction for the Endangered Species Listing. Reducing funding for this program opens the door for litigation, and it delays protecting and recovering vulnerable species.

The bill also shortchanges the Land and Water Conservation Fund, which, since its inception, has protected conservation and recreation land in every State and has supported tens of thousands of State and local projects. Yet, despite its merits, this bill slashes the Land and Water Conservation Fund program by a third.

Despite this bill's shortcomings in the environmental protection and resource conservation areas, I do, however, want to express how very proud I am of this subcommittee's nonpartisan approach in addressing the issues that are facing our Native American brothers and sisters. I am pleased that this bill recommends an increase of \$343 million for programs that are critical to Indian Country.

However, I would be remiss if I did not point out, even with this increase, the funding for Native American programs is still \$172 million less than the administration's request. Native American and Alaska Native populations face substantial hardships, and when compared to the total population, they have poorer health, lower earnings, and higher rates of poverty.

So we must continue to work together in our efforts to support these communities. That is why I applaud this bill for maintaining our commitment to provide Native American students with safe schools that are conducive to learning and for fully funding contract support costs so that tribes are not penalized for exercising their self-determination rights.

Another bright spot in this bill is the continued support for the National Parks Centennial Initiative. The bill recommends \$80 million for the Centennial, which will strengthen the foundation for visitor services and make essential infrastructure investments.

I am also pleased that an additional \$3 million is provided for the Civil Rights Initiative grant program and that funding is included for grants-in-aid to Historically Black Colleges and Universities.

I especially would like to thank the chairman for working with me to resurrect the Save America's Treasures program. This program funds and preserves nationally significant sites, structures, and artifacts. I am very proud that, in working together, we were able to restart this program, and I will work diligently with the chairman to make sure it is included in the final bill. Unfortunately, this bill neglects to act on many other opportunities to wisely invest taxpayers' dollars.

I am frustrated that the majority has, effectively, left \$1.2 billion on the table by not adopting the common-sense reforms that are championed in Chairman SIMPSON's wildfire disaster

funding bill. Every member of the Subcommittee on the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies is a cosponsor of that bill—Democrat and Republican alike. Yet, once again, the majority has balked and cites committee jurisdiction. However, those jurisdictional issues did not hinder the majority's including dozens of harmful legislative riders. I must express my concern and disappointment with the 38 partisan riders in this bill. The number is outrageous, and, to me, the nature of the riders that are included panders to special interests at the expense of the public good.

For example, the bill contains a provision that would reverse the safety improvements that were developed following the Deepwater Horizon tragedy. Eleven lives were lost in that explosion. I must express my clear dismay that this bill puts the profits of big oil companies ahead of worker safety. The veto-bait provisions that seek to turn back protections for endangered species, to restrict control of greenhouse gas emissions, and to undermine clean water and clean air protections do not belong in this bill.

I acknowledge and I appreciate the efforts that have been made to accommodate Democratic priorities in this bill. However, I still cannot support this bill as it is drafted. Despite my current opposition, it is my clear intention to continue working with Chairman CALVERT through this year's appropriations process to produce a responsible bill that both parties can support. The gentleman has my word on that.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this 5th of the 12 bills to be considered on the floor. This morning, the committee marked up the 11th of the 12 bills, and, tomorrow, the Committee on Appropriations will mark up the 12th bill so that those bills are ready for floor action. We would have been well on the way to completing all of these bills on the floor but for the abbreviated legislative year in which we have found ourselves because of the conventions and other legislation.

This bill provides nearly \$32.1 billion for agencies that are charged with managing and protecting our natural resources and our Federal lands as well as Native American programs and other independent agencies.

Within this total, \$3.9 billion is dedicated to fighting devastating wildfires—fully funding the 10-year average and increasing funding for programs that help prevent fires from happening in the first place.

The bill increases funding for our commitments to American Indians and

Alaska Natives, addressing public safety, health, and education, among other important services.

For rural communities that have nontaxable Federal lands and, as a result, face huge budget shortfalls that would hurt local government functions, the bill provides full funding for the payments in lieu of taxes program.

This legislation also makes good use of the congressional power of the purse by cutting the EPA by \$164 million and slashing its regulatory programs to help stop this administration's heavy handed, onerous regulatory agenda.

Communities across the country rely on coal and other energy production for good jobs, and hardworking Americans expect reasonable energy bills to take care of their families. Relief from the EPA's job-killing regulations is paramount to the economic growth that our country desperately needs right now; so I am proud that the bill takes the necessary steps to cut this red tape.

This includes prohibiting funds to change the definition of "waters" under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act or to enforce the proposed Stream Buffer Zone Rule. The legislation also bars the EPA from implementing new greenhouse gas regulations on power plants, and it provides flexibility for States to implement new ozone standards.

In all, Mr. Chairman, this is a balanced bill. It invests taxpayer dollars in the right priorities and protects against the administration's harmful regulatory policies, which helps to ensure a brighter future for our Nation.

I congratulate and thank the chairman of the subcommittee. Mr. CALVERT has done a wonderful job, I think, on constructing this bill. It is a good bill that deserves all of our support, and I urge an "aye" vote.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of the full Committee on Appropriations.

Mrs. LOWEY. I thank Chairman CALVERT, Ranking Member MCCOLLUM, and Chairman ROGERS for their work on this bill.

Mr. Chairman, the bill before us would provide \$32.095 billion for the Department of the Interior and the Environmental Protection Agency, which is a decrease of \$64 million from the enacted level and a staggering \$1 billion below the President's request. As a result, the bill contains serious shortcomings. The drastic underfunding of the EPA, which is the agency tasked with protecting public health and safety, with a cut of \$164 million from already inadequate funding levels, would decimate its operating budget.

The crisis in Flint is a horrifying reminder that we cannot afford to starve the EPA. Eight thousand children under the age of 6 have likely been exposed to lead contamination. The long-term impacts of that exposure are severe and will not end when the water is

clean. Decades or even a lifetime of difficulty may plague those affected. Considering the severity of the Flint water crisis, I am shocked that this bill would cut the Clean Water State Revolving Funds. If the tragedy in Flint has shown us anything, it is that we must invest in our Nation's infrastructure.

Perhaps of greatest concern is the inclusion of partisan and dangerous policy riders. Yet again this year, these controversial riders imperil the appropriations process. These include blocking the administration's efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions; stopping the EPA from implementing its lead renovation, repair, and painting rule, preventing the EPA from protecting millions of at-risk children from increased exposure to lead; and, once again, attacking the Endangered Species Act, putting politics above science and jeopardizing the protection of precious species. Neither Democrats in Congress nor President Obama will agree to poison pill riders that cause harm to our environment and public health.

I concede there are a few positive elements in the bill, namely an \$80 million increase for the National Parks Centennial Initiative and for the competitive historic preservation grant programs for Historically Black Colleges and Universities. Unfortunately, these are not enough to redeem the entire bill, and I must urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the chairman of the full Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, this is not an easy budget area. In fact, it is a very complex one, but this subcommittee has worked to produce what, I believe, is one of the best bills we have seen in years in this particular area.

Is it perfect?

Of course not, but it does move the ball forward. It moves us forward.

□ 1700

I appreciate the efforts on the part of Chairman CALVERT, especially to work with us in the authorizing committee to try and see if we can coordinate as many of these programs that are in here. Because it is important to realize that this appropriation bill is not just about programs of the government.

Every one of these programs affects people. And if we are not moving it forward so that the people are helped instead of harmed, then we are doing something that is very myopic, and we put blinders on us, and we don't see where we are actually trying to go.

That is why I appreciate this particular bill. This is an effort to move us forward so we are actually doing programs that assist and help people. I want the committee, the appropriators here, to realize I do appreciate their effort to work with us on the authorizing side so that we can work together for a

common goal. I am happy to be able to support this particular effort.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. KILMER), a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for the work that went into this bill. I knew a lot of difficult decisions had to be made, given our current fiscal situation, and this bill manages to do some good.

I am pleased with the strong investments made to address the needs across Indian Country, for example. We have taken some real steps to bolster Indian health and education, not to mention providing some assistance to tribes facing the very real threat of rising sea levels.

I am also glad that the committee secured strong investments in the USGS budget for the West Coast early earthquake warning system and the volcano hazard program. These systems are critical to monitoring and detecting seismic and volcanic activity and giving Washingtonians and folks on the entire West Coast a few crucial seconds to get out of harm's way.

The bill we are debating today makes some real progress in these areas, but unfortunately it doesn't measure up in others, particularly when it comes to investing in the environment. This legislation is supposed to provide critical funding for our most treasured natural resources, and it fails to live up to what the folks we represent demand.

For one thing, the funding is inadequate. Among the agencies hardest hit is the Environmental Protection Agency, whose budget was cut by more than \$164 million and, judging by the list of amendments we will be considering, I expect it will lose even more. That doesn't leave enough for the agency to do what it does best, like clean up polluted sites, protect our natural treasures, like Puget Sound, and make progress on fighting climate change. Not to mention, we don't provide any new funds to communities like Flint that are struggling to provide clean and safe water for their citizens.

Unfortunately, a number of important priorities for States like mine are left on the chopping block in the current bill.

In the Pacific Northwest, for example, Puget Sound is a gift, an iconic body of water that benefits our entire Nation. We have a plan in place to meet important restoration goals for it, but funds for the Puget Sound geographic program and the natural estuary program are not where they should be. These funds provide essential resources to empower Federal, State, local, and tribal agencies to mount a coordinated strategy to recover this iconic resource that is an economic driver for our region.

This really matters. It matters to tribes that have lived on the Sound

since time immemorial. It matters to the overall health and viability of our waterways and the livelihoods that depend on them.

We are passionate about the outdoors in Washington State, and that is why I am also disappointed to see this bill made serious cuts in the Land and Water Conservation Fund. In fact, it chops the funding 30 percent from last year. If we approve this approach, many shovel-ready projects will be forever lost. That is a shame because the Land and Water Conservation Fund is a key tool that builds public-private partnerships and ensures real on-the-ground work gets done. It is what we call a win-win. It is a vital tool for communities to invest in assets for local residents and for tourists who can enjoy our natural treasures and then spend some money at our local shops and restaurants.

We have seen hundreds of projects in Washington State as a result of this critical program, and that is why local leaders from across my State and others have been advocates for a permanent reauthorization of this important program. They recognize how valuable the Land and Water Conservation Fund is, not only for our environment and to recreation, but also to our ability to attract tourists and bolster our economy.

For all these reasons, as well as those highlighted by Ranking Member MCCOLLUM and others, I will not be able to support this legislation, but, again, I appreciate the hard work on it.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman, the ranking member, and the staff for all their hard work on this legislation.

This bill is notable for what it funds and also for what it doesn't fund. West Virginians love our clean water. We love our clean air. We love our mountains and our forests.

We worked hard on this bill to ensure West Virginia's priorities were maintained and addressed. We included full funding, \$480 million, for a program that provides important resources for local schools and counties like Pocahontas, Greenbrier, Nicholas, Webster, and Fayette in my district.

We have also provided an additional \$90 million for the abandoned mine lands pilot program. This will continue to restore these sites in West Virginia and return them to productive economic use; agriculture, manufacturing, tourism, and much, much more.

What West Virginians do not love in this President's war on coal is its impact. West Virginians' jobs and our families' livelihoods are on the line. Once again, the President requested hundreds of millions of dollars to spend on regulations, programs, and lawyers to make it harder for West Virginians and our Nation to mine and use coal.

Our State has lost more than 10,000 coal jobs over the last 5 years, due to

this administration's policies. Our counties are being devastated, losing revenue from the coal severance tax that funds schools, hospitals, emergency services, and so much more.

Our coal miners live with uncertainty, wondering if this is the day they will get a pink slip when they come out of the mines. The President's war on coal is bankrupting the health and retirement of seniors and widows, jeopardizing their financial security. Today, we say "no" to funding the war on coal and "no" to regulatory overreach.

In this bill, we hold the line on the EPA. We cut their regulatory budget. We maintain the lowest agency staffing level since 1989. We halt the harmful, job-killing rules at EPA and Office of Surface Mining, rules that would make electricity more expensive, rules like the stream buffer zone rule that would shut down even more mines, rules that would expand the EPA's reach and impose unrealistic standards on our communities.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. I urge our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to recognize the devastating impact these rules are already having. Please support our efforts.

I encourage support of this excellent measure.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE), a member of the Appropriations Subcommittee on Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to this bill, but want to take a moment to recognize the hard work our subcommittee has put into this legislation. I do appreciate the work of Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM on this bill.

This bill is critical to our country, and there are so many programs in it that are vital to my constituents in Maine. Programs like the National Park Service, the Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Land and Water Conservation Fund, are all funded in this bill and all provide vital programs, resources, and research to my State and to the Nation as a whole.

Although we worked in a bipartisan fashion to create this bill, at the end of the day, the funding levels are still too low. The bill provides \$64 million below the FY 2016 enacted level and \$1 billion below the President's budget request.

Although I am very glad to see programs for our local arts communities, such as the NEA and NEH, are increased and that programs for our local infrastructure, such as the Clean Water Fund are funded slightly above the President's request, there is not enough money in the bill for our national needs. In particular, the EPA overall is not funded to the levels that we need as a Nation.

Back home in Maine, one of the most often cited needs of our communities is for more infrastructure resources. In some towns, that means transportation infrastructure, and in others, it means water and sewer infrastructure. In the past decade where there have been never-ending Federal, State, and local budget cuts, ensuring our communities have clean water is not an easy task. The tragedy in Flint, Michigan, reminded us all of that fact.

This year, the State revolving funds programs get an increase in the chairman's bill, and I want to thank him for that. But it is still too much lost time that needs to be made up for in these accounts.

The riders in the bill regarding the EPA are an even bigger concern, and would hinder the EPA's ability to regulate things from lead paint, to carbon pollution, to the cleanup of mines.

Again, we can do better. Our Nation deserves a better bill.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time remains?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 17 minutes remaining, and the gentlewoman from Minnesota has 14 minutes remaining.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES) for a colloquy.

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Chairman CALVERT for the opportunity to dialogue for a moment and for his work and the subcommittee's work on this bill.

I want to just take a moment to highlight an important issue to many of my constituents that was addressed in the report accompanying last year's Interior appropriations bill. Since that time, the EPA has been working to provide the guidance called for in that report through a study now underway through their agency and through several other agencies dealing with the health impacts of recycled rubber infill that is on synthetic playing fields.

Now of particular concern, however, is that the research protocol to test these fields does not provide control for sources of possible contamination, which could be done by simply sampling nearby natural fields as well.

Now, since there has been much research done on this subject, I expect the EPA to consider available research and report its results in a way that relates it to established health-based guidelines that are currently in place.

Mr. Chairman, finally, it is important that the research is conducted in a timely manner, most importantly, during the first half of this next fiscal year to remove the uncertainty that continues to surround this issue and cause undue concern among parents, athletes, and field users alike.

I would like to thank Chairman CALVERT, again, for his work to address these issues, and I look forward to continuing to work with him and the subcommittee as we go forward.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I thank the Congressman from Georgia (Mr. GRAVES), a member of our committee who has been closely tracking this. I appreciate his attention to the issue and the update regarding EPA's activities to implement the direction in fiscal year 2016 report. I look forward to working with him to address this as we move forward with the fiscal year 2017 process.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. MICA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding and appreciate his tireless leadership in leading this appropriation subcommittee's work and ensuring our Nation's lands and parks are funded and protected.

I rise today, Mr. Chairman, under concern for a true national treasure that is in St. Augustine, Florida. It is the Castillo de San Marcos National Monument. In fact, actually 14 years ago, work began on a project to create a visitors center at the Castillo, which doesn't really have any facilities for more than 1.4 million visitors each year to that location. In fact, in Florida, it is the second highest visited National Park location, second only to the Everglades National Park.

They have been struggling over the years to keep pace and make the visit meaningful and educational for those who visit. We also know that at Fort Sumter and also at Fort McHenry, which actually fewer numbers of visitors, we have new visitors centers; but we don't have one in this location.

Since the passage of this law some 12 years ago, the Department of the Interior and National Park Service have completed extensive and necessary studies. I think we have probably spent \$1 million. I brought one of the drafts and some of the other reports.

I am hopeful, through the Centennial Challenge Project or other National Park Service programs, that our many years of hard work to renovate the Castillo and also provide a visitors center can come to fruition through the project lead the gentleman has taken with the centennial fund. So that is the reason I rise. I ask your support as we move forward on this project.

□ 1715

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CALVERT. I appreciate the gentleman raising this issue. I recognize your longstanding history of work on this effort, and I look forward to continuing to work with you on this important issue.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. GIBBS).

Mr. GIBBS. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 5538, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations bill for fiscal year 2017. This bill responsibly ensures that EPA's regulatory overreach is checked by Congress. Key provisions in this legislation will stop the EPA's most burdensome and damaging regulations, including the waters of the United States rule.

WOTUS is nothing more than a power grab that will expand the Federal Clean Water Act jurisdiction. This rule would force farmers, ranchers, manufacturers, local governments, and property owners to seek permission from Federal bureaucrats before beginning any activity remotely related to water, and this must be stopped.

I am also pleased to see the committee supports fully funding an integrated planning approach to help communities affordably manage and meet their regulatory obligations under the Clean Water Act. Communities face enormous financial pressure to provide quality drinking and wastewater for their residents. Integrated planning will allow communities to work with the EPA to determine investments that ensure the greatest water quality benefit.

Lastly, this bill provides new funding for the Water Infrastructure Finance Innovation Act, otherwise known as WIFIA, that was authorized in WRRDA 2014. This loan and loan guarantee program works as a complement to the Clean Water SRF to provide communities with options and flexibility for their water infrastructure projects.

With each WIFIA dollar loaned able to leverage \$10, I look forward to the EPA making the first WIFIA loans in FY 2017 and monitoring the program's success. I thank Chairman CALVERT for recognizing the importance of these provisions and for putting together a bill that sets appropriate levels for the agencies and programs.

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

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

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5538, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act for FY2017. Whatever constructive provisions it may contain are far outweighed by those that will do real damage if enacted. H.R. 5538 is a bill that is riddled with anti-environment riders, among other harmful provisions, which are intended to diminish the ability of the Department of Interior and the Environmental Protection Agency to protect public health and the environment.

As Ranking Member of the Science Committee, I am certainly familiar with the anti-EPA rhetoric emanating from too many on the Majority side. Fortunately, their attempts to override the growing chorus of American voices demanding action on climate change is failing, and communities across the Nation are showing strong support for EPA's efforts to re-

duce harmful greenhouse gas emissions, implement tighter ozone standards, and protect public health.

Unfortunately, there are those in this House who apparently have turned a deaf ear to the American people, and instead provide a forum for those who seek to undermine EPA's work, seemingly at every turn. This bill is another vehicle for implementing those obstructive views.

There is no greater evidence of this reality than the blanket prohibition found in this bill on any EPA action "to address methane emissions" from the oil and gas industry. While the people in California are still reeling from the largest methane leak in U.S. history, it seems unconscionable to me that we would prohibit EPA from taking any action on issues related to methane emissions.

In addition, some of my Republican colleagues have grown fond of insisting that EPA should only rely on publically available scientific information to support their rules and actions. While the goal of a transparent government is laudable, the consequence of their insistence is not a more transparent EPA, but an EPA that would be limited as to what science they may consider. As my colleagues and I have said before, we cannot support a bill and accompanying report that limits, or prohibits, EPA from using the best and most relevant science.

Moreover, in response to perceived delays in providing documents requested by Congress, the authors of this legislation would seemingly punish the hardworking men and women of EPA's Congressional affairs office by reducing their budget request by 4 million dollars. If my colleagues really want to address EPA's inability to provide timely responses to an ever increasing amount of Congressional document requests, they would not cut the budget of the office tasked with providing those responses. It may feel good to those proposing the cut, but it is a self-defeating approach to addressing the ostensible problem.

Finally, I would note that a number of amendments have been made in order that, if adopted, will only make a bad bill worse. I intended to oppose them when they come up for votes.

In closing, I cannot support an appropriations bill that, among its defects, would diminish the ability of EPA to protect public health and the environment, and would prohibit EPA from using the best and most relevant science. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 5538.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, first, let me thank Ranking Member MCCOLLUM, for her tremendous leadership on this subcommittee and all environmental issues.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to H.R. 5538, the Fiscal Year 2017 Interior and Environment Appropriations Bill. This bill dangerously cuts spending by \$64 million cut from FY16 and is \$1 billion less than the President's FY2017 request.

And this is yet another spending bill filled with ideologically driven riders from House Republicans.

While there are few positives in this bill, like restoration of Historically Black Colleges and Universities (HBCU) grants under the Historic Preservation Fund and an increase in the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund and Water Infrastructure program, there are too

many poison riders and cuts to critical programs.

For instance, this bill still falls short of providing all of the necessary funding to address the Flint water crisis and fix our decaying water infrastructure.

As I've mentioned before, I was part of a Congressional Delegation that recently traveled to Flint, Michigan to listen to the residents of Flint regarding the horrendous impact of these government decisions that lead to the poisoning of those of children and families. The environmental injustice in Flint is an example of how many low-income communities of color are treated differently than affluent communities around the country.

That is why full funding for the EPA is more important than ever. Yet this bill cuts the EPA by \$164 million from FY16 levels.

That is downright wrong.

This dramatic cut will harm our nation's ability to protect the health of our communities, our environment and to ensure clean water for our children.

Mr. Chair, as I said before, the numerous dangerous and offensive policy riders included in this bill—just to name a few—would block the EPA's Clean Power Plan and the Office of Surface Mining's stream protection rule, both of which help curtail dirty and harmful U.S. coal mining.

These appalling riders would roll back years of progress; undermine the Administration's ability to protect endangered species, and to keep our land, water, and air clean.

I hope my colleagues will join me in opposition to this bill until Republican appropriators stop the political gamesmanship and get serious about funding our government to meet our Nation's vital needs.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered read through page 184, line 21.

The text of the bill through page 184, line 21, is as follows:

H.R. 5538

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,* That the following sums are appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, namely:

#### TITLE I

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

#### BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

#### MANAGEMENT OF LANDS AND RESOURCES

For necessary expenses for protection, use, improvement, development, disposal, cadastral surveying, classification, acquisition of easements and other interests in lands, and performance of other functions, including maintenance of facilities, as authorized by law, in the management of lands and their resources under the jurisdiction of the Bureau of Land Management, including the general administration of the Bureau, and assessment of mineral potential of public lands pursuant to section 1010(a) of Public Law 96-487 (16 U.S.C. 3150(a)), \$1,081,922,000, to remain available until expended, including all such amounts as are collected from permit processing fees, as authorized but made subject to future appropriation by section

35(d)(3)(A)(i) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191), except that amounts from permit processing fees may be used for any bureau-related expenses associated with the processing of oil and gas applications for permits to drill and related use of authorizations; of which \$3,000,000 shall be available in fiscal year 2017 subject to a match by at least an equal amount by the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation for cost-shared projects supporting conservation of Bureau lands; and such funds shall be advanced to the Foundation as a lump-sum grant without regard to when expenses are incurred.

In addition, \$39,696,000 is for Mining Law Administration program operations, including the cost of administering the mining claim fee program, to remain available until expended, to be reduced by amounts collected by the Bureau and credited to this appropriation from mining claim maintenance fees and location fees that are hereby authorized for fiscal year 2017, so as to result in a final appropriation estimated at not more than \$1,081,922,000, and \$2,000,000, to remain available until expended, from communication site rental fees established by the Bureau for the cost of administering communication site activities.

#### LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out sections 205, 206, and 318(d) of Public Law 94-579, including administrative expenses and acquisition of lands or waters, or interests therein, \$19,400,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended.

#### OREGON AND CALIFORNIA GRANT LANDS

For expenses necessary for management, protection, and development of resources and for construction, operation, and maintenance of access roads, reforestation, and other improvements on the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands, on other Federal lands in the Oregon and California land-grant counties of Oregon, and on adjacent rights-of-way; and acquisition of lands or interests therein, including existing connecting roads on or adjacent to such grant lands; \$106,985,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That 25 percent of the aggregate of all receipts during the current fiscal year from the revested Oregon and California Railroad grant lands is hereby made a charge against the Oregon and California land-grant fund and shall be transferred to the General Fund in the Treasury in accordance with the second paragraph of subsection (b) of title II of the Act of August 28, 1937 (43 U.S.C. 1181f).

#### RANGE IMPROVEMENTS

For rehabilitation, protection, and acquisition of lands and interests therein, and improvement of Federal rangelands pursuant to section 401 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1751), notwithstanding any other Act, sums equal to 50 percent of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year under sections 3 and 15 of the Taylor Grazing Act (43 U.S.C. 315b, 315m) and the amount designated for range improvements from grazing fees and mineral leasing receipts from Bankhead-Jones lands transferred to the Department of the Interior pursuant to law, but not less than \$10,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$600,000 shall be available for administrative expenses.

#### SERVICE CHARGES, DEPOSITS, AND FORFEITURES

For administrative expenses and other costs related to processing application documents and other authorizations for use and disposal of public lands and resources, for costs of providing copies of official public land documents, for monitoring construc-

tion, operation, and termination of facilities in conjunction with use authorizations, and for rehabilitation of damaged property, such amounts as may be collected under Public Law 94-579 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), and under section 28 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 185), to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any provision to the contrary of section 305(a) of Public Law 94-579 (43 U.S.C. 1735(a)), any moneys that have been or will be received pursuant to that section, whether as a result of forfeiture, compromise, or settlement, if not appropriate for refund pursuant to section 305(c) of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1735(c)), shall be available and may be expended under the authority of this Act by the Secretary to improve, protect, or rehabilitate any public lands administered through the Bureau of Land Management which have been damaged by the action of a resource developer, purchaser, permittee, or any unauthorized person, without regard to whether all moneys collected from each such action are used on the exact lands damaged which led to the action: *Provided further*, That any such moneys that are in excess of amounts needed to repair damage to the exact land for which funds were collected may be used to repair other damaged public lands.

#### MISCELLANEOUS TRUST FUNDS

In addition to amounts authorized to be expended under existing laws, there is hereby appropriated such amounts as may be contributed under section 307 of Public Law 94-579 (43 U.S.C. 1737), and such amounts as may be advanced for administrative costs, surveys, appraisals, and costs of making conveyances of omitted lands under section 211(b) of that Act (43 U.S.C. 1721(b)), to remain available until expended.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The Bureau of Land Management may carry out the operations funded under this Act by direct expenditure, contracts, grants, cooperative agreements and reimbursable agreements with public and private entities, including with States. Appropriations for the Bureau shall be available for purchase, erection, and dismantlement of temporary structures, and alteration and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities to which the United States has title; up to \$100,000 for payments, at the discretion of the Secretary, for information or evidence concerning violations of laws administered by the Bureau; miscellaneous and emergency expenses of enforcement activities authorized or approved by the Secretary and to be accounted for solely on the Secretary's certificate, not to exceed \$10,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding Public Law 90-620 (44 U.S.C. 501), the Bureau may, under cooperative cost-sharing and partnership arrangements authorized by law, procure printing services from cooperators in connection with jointly produced publications for which the cooperators share the cost of printing either in cash or in services, and the Bureau determines the cooperator is capable of meeting accepted quality standards: *Provided further*, That projects to be funded pursuant to a written commitment by a State government to provide an identified amount of money in support of the project may be carried out by the Bureau on a reimbursable basis. Appropriations herein made shall not be available for the destruction of healthy, unadopted, wild horses and burros in the care of the Bureau or its contractors or for the sale of wild horses and burros that results in their destruction for processing into commercial products: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall approve any use of a right-of-way granted pursuant to the General Railroad Right-of-Way Act of 1875 (43 U.S.C. 934-939) if authorization of the use would have

been considered under Department policy to be within the scope of a railroad's authority as of the day before the effective date of the Department's Solicitor's Opinion M-37025, issued on November 4, 2011.

UNITED STATES FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE  
RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

For necessary expenses of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, as authorized by law, and for scientific and economic studies, general administration, and for the performance of other authorized functions related to such resources, \$1,255,004,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$14,411,000 shall be used for implementing subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533) (except for processing petitions, developing and issuing proposed and final regulations, and taking any other steps to implement actions described in subsection (c)(2)(A), (c)(2)(B)(i), or (c)(2)(B)(ii)), of which not to exceed \$1,501,000 shall be used for any activity regarding the designation of critical habitat, pursuant to subsection (a)(3), excluding litigation support, for species listed pursuant to subsection (a)(1) prior to October 1, 2015; of which not to exceed \$1,501,000 shall be used for any activity regarding petitions for species that are indigenous to the United States pursuant to subsections (b)(3)(A) and (b)(3)(B); and, of which not to exceed \$1,504,000 shall be used for implementing subsections (a), (b), (c), and (e) of section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533) for species that are not indigenous to the United States.

CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvement, acquisition, or removal of buildings and other facilities required in the conservation, management, investigation, protection, and utilization of fish and wildlife resources, and the acquisition of lands and interests therein; \$14,837,000, to remain available until expended.

LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, \$50,300,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended, of which, notwithstanding section 200306 of title 54, United States Code, not more than \$10,000,000 shall be for land conservation partnerships authorized by the Highlands Conservation Act of 2004, including not to exceed \$320,000 for administrative expenses: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated for specific land acquisition projects may be used to pay for any administrative overhead, planning or other management costs.

COOPERATIVE ENDANGERED SPECIES  
CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out section 6 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1535), \$55,590,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$24,790,000 is to be derived from the Cooperative Endangered Species Conservation Fund; and of which \$30,800,000 is to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund.

NORTH AMERICAN WETLANDS CONSERVATION  
FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of the North American Wetlands Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4401 et seq.), \$37,645,000, to remain available until expended.

NEOTROPICAL MIGRATORY BIRD CONSERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out the Neotropical Migratory Bird Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 6101 et seq.), \$3,910,000, to remain available until expended.

MULTINATIONAL SPECIES CONSERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary to carry out the African Elephant Conservation Act (16 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.), the Asian Elephant Conservation Act of 1997 (16 U.S.C. 4261 et seq.), the Rhinoceros and Tiger Conservation Act of 1994 (16 U.S.C. 5301 et seq.), the Great Ape Conservation Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 6301 et seq.), and the Marine Turtle Conservation Act of 2004 (16 U.S.C. 6601 et seq.), \$11,061,000, to remain available until expended.

STATE AND TRIBAL WILDLIFE GRANTS

For wildlife conservation grants to States and to the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam, the United States Virgin Islands, the Northern Mariana Islands, American Samoa, and Indian tribes under the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, for the development and implementation of programs for the benefit of wildlife and their habitat, including species that are not hunted or fished, \$62,571,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That of the amount provided herein, \$4,334,000 is for a competitive grant program for Indian tribes not subject to the remaining provisions of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That \$7,237,000 is for a competitive grant program to implement approved plans for States, territories, and other jurisdictions and at the discretion of affected States, the regional Associations of fish and wildlife agencies, not subject to the remaining provisions of this appropriation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall, after deducting \$11,571,000 and administrative expenses, apportion the amount provided herein in the following manner: (1) to the District of Columbia and to the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, each a sum equal to not more than one-half of 1 percent thereof; and (2) to Guam, American Samoa, the United States Virgin Islands, and the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, each a sum equal to not more than one-fourth of 1 percent thereof: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall apportion the remaining amount in the following manner: (1) one-third of which is based on the ratio to which the land area of such State bears to the total land area of all such States; and (2) two-thirds of which is based on the ratio to which the population of such State bears to the total population of all such States: *Provided further*, That the amounts apportioned under this paragraph shall be adjusted equitably so that no State shall be apportioned a sum which is less than 1 percent of the amount available for apportionment under this paragraph for any fiscal year or more than 5 percent of such amount: *Provided further*, That the Federal share of planning grants shall not exceed 75 percent of the total costs of such projects and the Federal share of implementation grants shall not exceed 65 percent of the total costs of such projects: *Provided further*, That the non-Federal share of such projects may not be derived from Federal grant programs: *Provided further*, That any amount apportioned in 2017 to any State, territory, or other jurisdiction that remains unobligated as of September 30, 2018, shall be reapportioned, together with funds appropriated in 2019, in the manner provided herein.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service may carry out the operations of Service programs by direct expenditure, contracts, grants, cooperative agreements and reimbursable agreements with public and private

entities. Appropriations and funds available to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall be available for repair of damage to public roads within and adjacent to reservation areas caused by operations of the Service; options for the purchase of land at not to exceed \$1 for each option; facilities incident to such public recreational uses on conservation areas as are consistent with their primary purpose; and the maintenance and improvement of aquaria, buildings, and other facilities under the jurisdiction of the Service and to which the United States has title, and which are used pursuant to law in connection with management, and investigation of fish and wildlife resources: *Provided*, That notwithstanding 44 U.S.C. 501, the Service may, under cooperative cost sharing and partnership arrangements authorized by law, procure printing services from cooperators in connection with jointly produced publications for which the cooperators share at least one-half the cost of printing either in cash or services and the Service determines the cooperator is capable of meeting accepted quality standards: *Provided further*, That the Service may accept donated aircraft as replacements for existing aircraft: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 3302, all fees collected for non-toxic shot review and approval shall be deposited under the heading "United States Fish and Wildlife Service—Resource Management" and shall be available to the Secretary, without further appropriation, to be used for expenses of processing of such non-toxic shot type or coating applications and revising regulations as necessary, and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, that none of the funds made available to the Service by this Act may be used to close or otherwise terminate operations of any of the 90 units of the National Fish Hatchery System.

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

OPERATION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEM

For expenses necessary for the management, operation, and maintenance of areas and facilities administered by the National Park Service and for the general administration of the National Park Service, \$2,435,047,000, of which \$10,032,000 for planning and interagency coordination in support of Everglades restoration and \$134,461,000 for maintenance, repair, or rehabilitation projects for constructed assets shall remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading in this Act are available for the purposes of section 5 of Public Law 95-348.

NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION

For expenses necessary to carry out recreation programs, natural programs, cultural programs, heritage partnership programs, environmental compliance and review, international park affairs, and grant administration, not otherwise provided for, \$62,632,000.

HISTORIC PRESERVATION FUND

For expenses necessary in carrying out the National Historic Preservation Act (division A of subtitle III of title 54, United States Code), \$78,410,000, to be derived from the Historic Preservation Fund and to remain available until September 30, 2018, of which \$5,000,000 shall be for Save America's Treasures grants for preservation of national significant sites, structures, and artifacts as authorized by section 7303 of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (54 U.S.C. 3089): *Provided*, That an individual Save America's Treasures grant shall be matched by non-Federal funds: *Provided further*, That individual projects shall only be eligible for one grant: *Provided further*, That all projects to be funded shall be approved by the Secretary of the Interior in consultation with the House and Senate Committees on

Appropriations: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided for the Historic Preservation Fund, \$500,000 is for competitive grants for the survey and nomination of properties to the National Register of Historic Places and as National Historic Landmarks associated with communities currently underrepresented, as determined by the Secretary, \$11,000,000 is for competitive grants to preserve the sites and stories of the Civil Rights movement, and \$3,000,000 is for grants to Historically Black Colleges and Universities: *Provided further*, That such competitive grants shall be made without imposing the matching requirements in section 302902(b)(3) of title 54, United States Code to States and Indian tribes as defined in chapter 3003 of such title, Native Hawaiian organizations, local governments, including Certified Local Governments, and nonprofit organizations.

#### CONSTRUCTION

For construction, improvements, repair, or replacement of physical facilities, and compliance and planning for programs and areas administered by the National Park Service, \$215,707,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, for any project initially funded in fiscal year 2017 with a future phase indicated in the National Park Service 5-Year Line Item Construction Plan, a single procurement may be issued which includes the full scope of the project: *Provided further*, That the solicitation and contract shall contain the clause availability of funds found at 48 CFR 52.232-18: *Provided further*, That National Park Service Donations, Park Concessions Franchise Fees, and Recreation Fees may be made available for the cost of adjustments and changes within the original scope of effort for projects funded by the National Park Service Construction appropriation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior shall consult with the Committees on Appropriations, in accordance with current reprogramming thresholds, prior to making any charges authorized by this section.

#### LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND (RESCISSION)

The contract authority provided for fiscal year 2017 by section 200308 of title 54, United States Code, is rescinded.

#### LAND ACQUISITION AND STATE ASSISTANCE

For expenses necessary to carry out chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of lands or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with the statutory authority applicable to the National Park Service, \$128,752,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended, of which \$80,000,000 is for the State assistance program and of which \$10,000,000 shall be for the American Battlefield Protection Program grants as authorized by chapter 3081 of title 54, United States Code.

#### CENTENNIAL CHALLENGE

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of section 101701 of title 54, United States Code, relating to challenge cost share agreements, \$30,000,000, to remain available until expended, for Centennial Challenge projects and programs: *Provided*, That not less than 50 percent of the total cost of each project or program shall be derived from non-Federal sources in the form of donated cash, assets, or a pledge of donation guaranteed by an irrevocable letter of credit.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

In addition to other uses set forth in section 101917(c)(2) of title 54, United States Code, franchise fees credited to a sub-ac-

count shall be available for expenditure by the Secretary, without further appropriation, for use at any unit within the National Park System to extinguish or reduce liability for Possessory Interest or leasehold surrender interest. Such funds may only be used for this purpose to the extent that the benefitting unit anticipated franchise fee receipts over the term of the contract at that unit exceed the amount of funds used to extinguish or reduce liability. Franchise fees at the benefitting unit shall be credited to the sub-account of the originating unit over a period not to exceed the term of a single contract at the benefitting unit, in the amount of funds so expended to extinguish or reduce liability.

For the costs of administration of the Land and Water Conservation Fund grants authorized by section 105(a)(2)(B) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (Public Law 109-432), the National Park Service may retain up to 3 percent of the amounts which are authorized to be disbursed under such section, such retained amounts to remain available until expended.

National Park Service funds may be transferred to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Department of Transportation, for purposes authorized under 23 U.S.C. 204. Transfers may include a reasonable amount for FHWA administrative support costs.

#### UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY SURVEYS, INVESTIGATIONS, AND RESEARCH

For expenses necessary for the United States Geological Survey to perform surveys, investigations, and research covering topography, geology, hydrology, biology, and the mineral and water resources of the United States, its territories and possessions, and other areas as authorized by 43 U.S.C. 31, 1332, and 1340; classify lands as to their mineral and water resources; give engineering supervision to power permittees and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission licensees; administer the minerals exploration program (30 U.S.C. 641); conduct inquiries into the economic conditions affecting mining and materials processing industries (30 U.S.C. 3, 21a, and 1603; 50 U.S.C. 98g(1)) and related purposes as authorized by law; and to publish and disseminate data relative to the foregoing activities; \$1,080,006,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018; of which \$63,637,189 shall remain available until expended for satellite operations; and of which \$7,280,000 shall be available until expended for deferred maintenance and capital improvement projects that exceed \$100,000 in cost: *Provided*, That none of the funds provided for the ecosystem research activity shall be used to conduct new surveys on private property, unless specifically authorized in writing by the property owner: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be used to pay more than one-half the cost of topographic mapping or water resources data collection and investigations carried on in cooperation with States and municipalities.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

From within the amount appropriated for activities of the United States Geological Survey such sums as are necessary shall be available for contracting for the furnishing of topographic maps and for the making of geophysical or other specialized surveys when it is administratively determined that such procedures are in the public interest; construction and maintenance of necessary buildings and appurtenant facilities; acquisition of lands for gauging stations and observation wells; expenses of the United States National Committee for Geological Sciences; and payment of compensation and expenses of persons employed by the Survey duly ap-

pointed to represent the United States in the negotiation and administration of interstate compacts: *Provided*, That activities funded by appropriations herein made may be accomplished through the use of contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements as defined in section 6302 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That the United States Geological Survey may enter into contracts or cooperative agreements directly with individuals or indirectly with institutions or nonprofit organizations, without regard to 41 U.S.C. 6101, for the temporary or intermittent services of students or recent graduates, who shall be considered employees for the purpose of chapters 57 and 81 of title 5, United States Code, relating to compensation for travel and work injuries, and chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code, relating to tort claims, but shall not be considered to be Federal employees for any other purposes.

#### BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT

For expenses necessary for granting leases, easements, rights-of-way and agreements for use for oil and gas, other minerals, energy, and marine-related purposes on the Outer Continental Shelf and approving operations related thereto, as authorized by law; for environmental studies, as authorized by law; for implementing other laws and to the extent provided by Presidential or Secretarial delegation; and for matching grants or cooperative agreements, \$169,306,000, of which \$74,362,000, is to remain available until September 30, 2018, and of which \$94,944,000 is to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this total appropriation shall be reduced by amounts collected by the Secretary and credited to this appropriation from additions to receipts resulting from increases to lease rental rates in effect on August 5, 1993, and from cost recovery fees from activities conducted by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, including studies, assessments, analysis, and miscellaneous administrative activities: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as such collections are received during the fiscal year, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2017 appropriation estimated at not more than \$74,362,000: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$3,000 shall be available for reasonable expenses related to promoting volunteer beach and marine cleanup activities.

#### BUREAU OF SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT OFFSHORE SAFETY AND ENVIRONMENTAL ENFORCEMENT (INCLUDING RESCISSION OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary for the regulation of operations related to leases, easements, rights-of-way and agreements for use for oil and gas, other minerals, energy, and marine-related purposes on the Outer Continental Shelf, as authorized by law; for enforcing and implementing laws and regulations as authorized by law and to the extent provided by Presidential or Secretarial delegation; and for matching grants or cooperative agreements, \$136,968,000, of which \$93,438,000 is to remain available until September 30, 2018, and of which \$43,530,000 is to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That this total appropriation shall be reduced by amounts collected by the Secretary and credited to this appropriation from additions to receipts resulting from increases to lease rental rates in effect on August 5, 1993, and from cost recovery fees from activities conducted by the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act, including studies, assessments, analysis, and miscellaneous



administrative activities: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated shall be reduced as such collections are received during the fiscal year, so as to result in a final fiscal year 2017 appropriation estimated at not more than \$93,438,000.

For an additional amount, \$53,000,000, to remain available until expended, to be reduced by amounts collected by the Secretary and credited to this appropriation, which shall be derived from non-refundable inspection fees collected in fiscal year 2017, as provided in this Act: *Provided*, That to the extent that amounts realized from such inspection fees exceed \$53,000,000, the amounts realized in excess of \$53,000,000 shall be credited to this appropriation and remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2017, not less than 50 percent of the inspection fees expended by the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement will be used to fund personnel and mission-related costs to expand capacity and expedite the orderly development, subject to environmental safeguards, of the Outer Continental Shelf pursuant to the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.), including the review of applications for permits to drill.

Of the unobligated balances available for this account, \$20,000,000 are permanently rescinded.

#### OIL SPILL RESEARCH

For necessary expenses to carry out title I, section 1016, title IV, sections 4202 and 4303, title VII, and title VIII, section 8201 of the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, \$14,899,000, which shall be derived from the Oil Spill Liability Trust Fund, to remain available until expended.

#### OFFICE OF SURFACE MINING RECLAMATION AND ENFORCEMENT

##### REGULATION AND TECHNOLOGY

For necessary expenses to carry out the provisions of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95-87, \$119,300,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That appropriations for the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement may provide for the travel and per diem expenses of State and tribal personnel attending Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement sponsored training.

In addition, for costs to review, administer, and enforce permits issued by the Office pursuant to section 507 of Public Law 95-87 (30 U.S.C. 1257), \$40,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That fees assessed and collected by the Office pursuant to such section 507 shall be credited to this account as discretionary offsetting collections, to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That the sum herein appropriated from the general fund shall be reduced as collections are received during the fiscal year, so as to result in a fiscal year 2017 appropriation estimated at not more than \$119,300,000.

##### ABANDONED MINE RECLAMATION FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out title IV of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, Public Law 95-87, \$27,303,000, to be derived from receipts of the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund and to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That pursuant to Public Law 97-365, the Department of the Interior is authorized to use up to 20 percent from the recovery of the delinquent debt owed to the United States Government to pay for contracts to collect these debts: *Provided further*, That funds made available under title IV of Public Law 95-87 may be used for any required non-Federal share of the cost of projects funded by the Federal Government for the purpose of envi-

ronmental restoration related to treatment or abatement of acid mine drainage from abandoned mines: *Provided further*, That such projects must be consistent with the purposes and priorities of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act: *Provided further*, That amounts provided under this heading may be used for the travel and per diem expenses of State and tribal personnel attending Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement sponsored training.

In addition, \$90,000,000, to remain available until expended, for grants to States for reclamation of abandoned mine lands and other related activities in accordance with the terms and conditions in the report accompanying this Act: *Provided*, That such additional amount shall be used for economic and community development in conjunction with the priorities in section 403(a) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1233(a)): *Provided further*, That of such additional amount, \$75,000,000 shall be distributed in equal amounts to the 3 Appalachian States with the greatest amount of unfunded needs to meet the priorities described in paragraphs (1) and (2) of such section, and \$15,000,000 shall be distributed in equal amounts to the 3 Appalachian States with the subsequent greatest amount of unfunded needs to meet such priorities: *Provided further*, That such additional amount shall be allocated to States within 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act.

#### BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND BUREAU OF INDIAN EDUCATION

##### OPERATION OF INDIAN PROGRAMS (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For expenses necessary for the operation of Indian programs, as authorized by law, including the Snyder Act of November 2, 1921 (25 U.S.C. 13), the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.), the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2001-2019), and the Tribally Controlled Schools Act of 1988 (25 U.S.C. 2501 et seq.), \$2,335,635,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, except as otherwise provided herein; of which not to exceed \$8,500 may be for official reception and representation expenses; of which not to exceed \$74,773,000 shall be for welfare assistance payments: *Provided*, That in cases of designated Federal disasters, the Secretary may exceed such cap, from the amounts provided herein, to provide for disaster relief to Indian communities affected by the disaster: *Provided further*, That federally recognized Indian tribes and tribal organizations of federally recognized Indian tribes may use their tribal priority allocations for unmet welfare assistance costs: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$652,282,000 for school operations costs of Bureau-funded schools and other education programs shall become available on July 1, 2017, and shall remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$48,815,000 shall remain available until expended for housing improvement, road maintenance, attorney fees, litigation support, land records improvement, and the Navajo-Hopi Settlement Program: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, including but not limited to the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450f et seq.) and section 1128 of the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2008), not to exceed \$75,335,000 within and only from such amounts made available for school operations shall be available for administrative cost grants associated with grants approved prior to July 1, 2017: *Provided further*, That any forestry funds allocated to a federally recognized tribe which remain unobligated as of September 30, 2018, may be transferred during fiscal year 2019 to

an Indian forest land assistance account established for the benefit of the holder of the funds within the holder's trust fund account: *Provided further*, That any such unobligated balances not so transferred shall expire on September 30, 2019: *Provided further*, That in order to enhance the safety of Bureau field employees, the Bureau may use funds to purchase uniforms or other identifying articles of clothing for personnel.

##### CONTRACT SUPPORT COSTS

For payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract support costs associated with Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act agreements with the Bureau of Indian Affairs for fiscal year 2017, such sums as may be necessary, which shall be available for obligation through September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, no amounts made available under this heading shall be available for transfer to another budget account.

##### CONSTRUCTION

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For construction, repair, improvement, and maintenance of irrigation and power systems, buildings, utilities, and other facilities, including architectural and engineering services by contract; acquisition of lands, and interests in lands; and preparation of lands for farming, and for construction of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project pursuant to Public Law 87-483, \$197,017,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amounts as may be available for the construction of the Navajo Indian Irrigation Project may be transferred to the Bureau of Reclamation: *Provided further*, That not to exceed 6 percent of contract authority available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs from the Federal Highway Trust Fund may be used to cover the road program management costs of the Bureau: *Provided further*, That any funds provided for the Safety of Dams program pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 13 shall be made available on a nonreimbursable basis: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2017, in implementing new construction, replacement facilities construction, or facilities improvement and repair project grants in excess of \$100,000 that are provided to grant schools under Public Law 100-297, the Secretary of the Interior shall use the Administrative and Audit Requirements and Cost Principles for Assistance Programs contained in 43 CFR part 12 as the regulatory requirements: *Provided further*, That such grants shall not be subject to section 12.61 of 43 CFR; the Secretary and the grantee shall negotiate and determine a schedule of payments for the work to be performed: *Provided further*, That in considering grant applications, the Secretary shall consider whether such grantee would be deficient in assuring that the construction projects conform to applicable building standards and codes and Federal, tribal, or State health and safety standards as required by 25 U.S.C. 2005(b), with respect to organizational and financial management capabilities: *Provided further*, That if the Secretary declines a grant application, the Secretary shall follow the requirements contained in 25 U.S.C. 2504(f): *Provided further*, That any disputes between the Secretary and any grantee concerning a grant shall be subject to the disputes provision in 25 U.S.C. 2507(e): *Provided further*, That in order to ensure timely completion of construction projects, the Secretary may assume control of a project and all funds related to the project, if, within 18 months of the date of enactment of this Act, any grantee receiving funds appropriated in this Act or in any prior Act, has not completed the planning and design phase of the project and

commenced construction: *Provided further*, That this appropriation may be reimbursed from the Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians appropriation for the appropriate share of construction costs for space expansion needed in agency offices to meet trust reform implementation.

INDIAN LAND AND WATER CLAIM SETTLEMENTS  
AND MISCELLANEOUS PAYMENTS TO INDIANS

For payments and necessary administrative expenses for implementation of Indian land and water claim settlements pursuant to Public Laws 99-264, 100-580, 101-618, 111-11, and 111-291, and for implementation of other land and water rights settlements, \$49,025,000, to remain available until expended.

INDIAN GUARANTEED LOAN PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of guaranteed loans and insured loans, \$8,757,000, of which \$1,182,000 is for administrative expenses, as authorized by the Indian Financing Act of 1974: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize total loan principal, any part of which is to be guaranteed or insured, not to exceed \$120,050,595.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

The Bureau of Indian Affairs may carry out the operation of Indian programs by direct expenditure, contracts, cooperative agreements, compacts, and grants, either directly or in cooperation with States and other organizations.

Notwithstanding 25 U.S.C. 15, the Bureau of Indian Affairs may contract for services in support of the management, operation, and maintenance of the Power Division of the San Carlos Irrigation Project.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds available to the Bureau of Indian Affairs for central office oversight and Executive Direction and Administrative Services (except executive direction and administrative services funding for Tribal Priority Allocations, regional offices, and facilities operations and maintenance) shall be available for contracts, grants, compacts, or cooperative agreements with the Bureau of Indian Affairs under the provisions of the Indian Self-Determination Act or the Tribal Self-Governance Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-413).

In the event any tribe returns appropriations made available by this Act to the Bureau of Indian Affairs, this action shall not diminish the Federal Government's trust responsibility to that tribe, or the government-to-government relationship between the United States and that tribe, or that tribe's ability to access future appropriations.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds available to the Bureau of Indian Education, other than the amounts provided herein for assistance to public schools under 25 U.S.C. 452 et seq., shall be available to support the operation of any elementary or secondary school in the State of Alaska.

No funds available to the Bureau of Indian Education shall be used to support expanded grades for any school or dormitory beyond the grade structure in place or approved by the Secretary of the Interior at each school in the Bureau of Indian Education school system as of October 1, 1995, except that the Secretary of the Interior may waive this prohibition to support expansion of up to one additional grade when the Secretary determines such waiver is needed to support accomplishment of the mission of the Bureau of Indian Education. Appropriations made available in this or any prior Act for schools funded by the Bureau shall be available, in

accordance with the Bureau's funding formula, only to the schools in the Bureau school system as of September 1, 1996, and to any school or school program that was reinstated in fiscal year 2012. Funds made available under this Act may not be used to establish a charter school at a Bureau-funded school (as that term is defined in section 1141 of the Education Amendments of 1978 (25 U.S.C. 2021)), except that a charter school that is in existence on the date of the enactment of this Act and that has operated at a Bureau-funded school before September 1, 1999, may continue to operate during that period, but only if the charter school pays to the Bureau a pro rata share of funds to reimburse the Bureau for the use of the real and personal property (including buses and vans), the funds of the charter school are kept separate and apart from Bureau funds, and the Bureau does not assume any obligation for charter school programs of the State in which the school is located if the charter school loses such funding. Employees of Bureau-funded schools sharing a campus with a charter school and performing functions related to the charter school's operation and employees of a charter school shall not be treated as Federal employees for purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, including section 113 of title I of appendix C of Public Law 106-113, if in fiscal year 2003 or 2004 a grantee received indirect and administrative costs pursuant to a distribution formula based on section 5(f) of Public Law 101-301, the Secretary shall continue to distribute indirect and administrative cost funds to such grantee using the section 5(f) distribution formula.

Funds available under this Act may not be used to establish satellite locations of schools in the Bureau school system as of September 1, 1996, except that the Secretary may waive this prohibition in order for an Indian tribe to provide language and cultural immersion educational programs for non-public schools located within the jurisdictional area of the tribal government which exclusively serve tribal members, do not include grades beyond those currently served at the existing Bureau-funded school, provide an educational environment with educator presence and academic facilities comparable to the Bureau-funded school, comply with all applicable Tribal, Federal, or State health and safety standards, and the Americans with Disabilities Act, and demonstrate the benefits of establishing operations at a satellite location in lieu of incurring extraordinary costs, such as for transportation or other impacts to students such as those caused by busing students extended distances: *Provided*, That no funds available under this Act may be used to fund operations, maintenance, rehabilitation, construction or other facilities-related costs for such assets that are not owned by the Bureau: *Provided further*, That the term "satellite school" means a school location physically separated from the existing Bureau school by more than 50 miles but that forms part of the existing school in all other respects.

DEPARTMENTAL OFFICES  
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY  
DEPARTMENTAL OPERATIONS

For necessary expenses for management of the Department of the Interior, including the collection and disbursement of royalties, fees, and other mineral revenue proceeds, and for grants and cooperative agreements, as authorized by law, \$749,422,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018; of which not to exceed \$15,000 may be for official reception and representation expenses; and of which up to \$1,000,000 shall be available for

workers compensation payments and unemployment compensation payments associated with the orderly closure of the United States Bureau of Mines; and of which \$10,000,000 for the Office of Valuation Services is to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and shall remain available until expended; and of which \$38,300,000 shall remain available until expended for the purpose of mineral revenue management activities: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$15,000 under this heading shall be available for refunds of overpayments in connection with certain Indian leases in which the Secretary concurred with the claimed refund due, to pay amounts owed to Indian allottees or tribes, or to correct prior unrecoverable erroneous payments.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

For fiscal year 2017, up to \$400,000 of the payments authorized by the Act of October 20, 1976 (31 U.S.C. 6901-6907) may be retained for administrative expenses of the Payments in Lieu of Taxes Program: *Provided*, That no payment shall be made pursuant to that Act to otherwise eligible units of local government if the computed amount of the payment is less than \$100: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may reduce the payment authorized by 31 U.S.C. 6901-6907 for an individual county by the amount necessary to correct prior year overpayments to that county: *Provided further*, That the amount needed to correct a prior year underpayment to an individual county shall be paid from any reductions for overpayments to other counties and the amount necessary to cover any remaining underpayment is hereby appropriated and shall be paid to individual counties: *Provided further*, That of the total amount made available by this title for "Office of the Secretary—Departmental Operations", \$480,000,000 shall be available to the Secretary of the Interior for fiscal year 2017 for payments in lieu of taxes under chapter 69 of title 31, United States Code.

INSULAR AFFAIRS

ASSISTANCE TO TERRITORIES

For expenses necessary for assistance to territories under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior and other jurisdictions identified in section 104(e) of Public Law 108-188, \$86,976,000, of which: (1) \$77,528,000 shall remain available until expended for territorial assistance, including general technical assistance, maintenance assistance, disaster assistance, coral reef initiative activities, and brown tree snake control and research; grants to the judiciary in American Samoa for compensation and expenses, as authorized by law (48 U.S.C. 1661(c)); grants to the Government of American Samoa, in addition to current local revenues, for construction and support of governmental functions; grants to the Government of the Virgin Islands as authorized by law; grants to the Government of Guam, as authorized by law; and grants to the Government of the Northern Mariana Islands as authorized by law (Public Law 94-241; 90 Stat. 272); and (2) \$9,448,000 shall be available until September 30, 2018, for salaries and expenses of the Office of Insular Affairs: *Provided*, That all financial transactions of the territorial and local governments herein provided for, including such transactions of all agencies or instrumentalities established or used by such governments, may be audited by the Government Accountability Office, at its discretion, in accordance with chapter 35 of title 31, United States Code: *Provided further*, That Northern Mariana Islands Covenant grant funding shall be provided according to those terms of the Agreement of the Special Representatives on Future United States Financial Assistance for the Northern Mariana

Islands approved by Public Law 104-134: *Provided further*, That the funds for the program of operations and maintenance improvement are appropriated to institutionalize routine operations and maintenance improvement of capital infrastructure with territorial participation and cost sharing to be determined by the Secretary based on the grantee's commitment to timely maintenance of its capital assets: *Provided further*, That any appropriation for disaster assistance under this heading in this Act or previous appropriations Acts may be used as non-Federal matching funds for the purpose of hazard mitigation grants provided pursuant to section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (42 U.S.C. 5170c).

#### COMPACT OF FREE ASSOCIATION

For grants and necessary expenses, \$3,318,000, to remain available until expended, as provided for in sections 221(a)(2) and 233 of the Compact of Free Association for the Republic of Palau; and section 221(a)(2) of the Compacts of Free Association for the Government of the Republic of the Marshall Islands and the Federated States of Micronesia, as authorized by Public Law 99-658 and Public Law 108-188.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

At the request of the Governor of Guam, the Secretary may transfer discretionary funds or mandatory funds provided under section 104(e) of Public Law 108-188 and Public Law 104-134, that are allocated for Guam, to the Secretary of Agriculture for the subsidy cost of direct or guaranteed loans, plus not to exceed three percent of the amount of the subsidy transferred for the cost of loan administration, for the purposes authorized by the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 and section 306(a)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act for construction and repair projects in Guam, and such funds shall remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That such loans or loan guarantees may be made without regard to the population of the area, credit elsewhere requirements, and restrictions on the types of eligible entities under the Rural Electrification Act of 1936 and section 306(a)(1) of the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act: *Provided further*, That any funds transferred to the Secretary of Agriculture shall be in addition to funds otherwise made available to make or guarantee loans under such authorities.

#### OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of the Solicitor, \$65,800,000.

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

##### SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General, \$50,047,000.

#### OFFICE OF THE SPECIAL TRUSTEE FOR

##### AMERICAN INDIANS

#### FEDERAL TRUST PROGRAMS

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For the operation of trust programs for Indians by direct expenditure, contracts, cooperative agreements, compacts, and grants, \$139,029,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$18,688,000 from this or any other Act, may be available for historical accounting: *Provided*, That funds for trust management improvements and litigation support may, as needed, be transferred to or merged with the Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Edu-

cation, "Operation of Indian Programs" account; the Office of the Solicitor, "Salaries and Expenses" account; and the Office of the Secretary, "Departmental Operations" account: *Provided further*, That funds made available through contracts or grants obligated during fiscal year 2017, as authorized by the Indian Self-Determination Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.), shall remain available until expended by the contractor or grantee: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary shall not be required to provide a quarterly statement of performance for any Indian trust account that has not had activity for at least 15 months and has a balance of \$15 or less: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall issue an annual account statement and maintain a record of any such accounts and shall permit the balance in each such account to be withdrawn upon the express written request of the account holder: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$50,000 is available for the Secretary to make payments to correct administrative errors of either disbursements from or deposits to Individual Indian Money or Tribal accounts after September 30, 2002: *Provided further*, That erroneous payments that are recovered shall be credited to and remain available in this account for this purpose: *Provided further*, That the Secretary shall not be required to reconcile Special Deposit Accounts with a balance of less than \$500 unless the Office of the Special Trustee receives proof of ownership from a Special Deposit Accounts claimant: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 102 of the American Indian Trust Fund Management Reform Act of 1994 (Public Law 103-412) or any other provision of law, the Secretary may aggregate the trust accounts of individuals whose whereabouts are unknown for a continuous period of at least five years and shall not be required to generate periodic statements of performance for the individual accounts: *Provided further*, That with respect to the eighth proviso, the Secretary shall continue to maintain sufficient records to determine the balance of the individual accounts, including any accrued interest and income, and such funds shall remain available to the individual account holders.

#### DEPARTMENT-WIDE PROGRAMS

##### WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for fire preparedness, fire suppression operations, fire science and research, emergency rehabilitation, fuels management activities, and rural fire assistance by the Department of the Interior, \$851,945,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$10,000,000 shall be for the renovation or construction of fire facilities: *Provided*, That such funds are also available for repayment of advances to other appropriation accounts from which funds were previously transferred for such purposes: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided \$180,000,000 is for hazardous fuels management activities: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided \$20,470,000 is for burned area rehabilitation: *Provided further*, That persons hired pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 1469 may be furnished subsistence and lodging without cost from funds available from this appropriation: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding 42 U.S.C. 1856d, sums received by a bureau or office of the Department of the Interior for fire protection rendered pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1856 et seq., protection of United States property, may be credited to the appropriation from which funds were expended to provide that protection, and are available without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That using the amounts designated under this title of this Act, the Sec-

retary of the Interior may enter into procurement contracts, grants, or cooperative agreements, for fuels management and resilient landscapes activities, and for training and monitoring associated with such fuels management and resilient landscapes activities, on Federal land, or on adjacent non-Federal land for activities that benefit resources on Federal land: *Provided further*, That the costs of implementing any cooperative agreement between the Federal Government and any non-Federal entity may be shared, as mutually agreed on by the affected parties: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding requirements of the Competition in Contracting Act, the Secretary, for purposes of fuels management and resilient landscapes activities, may obtain maximum practicable competition among: (1) local private, nonprofit, or cooperative entities; (2) Youth Conservation Corps crews, Public Lands Corps (Public Law 109-154), or related partnerships with State, local, or nonprofit youth groups; (3) small or micro-businesses; or (4) other entities that will hire or train locally a significant percentage, defined as 50 percent or more, of the project workforce to complete such contracts: *Provided further*, That in implementing this section, the Secretary shall develop written guidance to field units to ensure accountability and consistent application of the authorities provided herein: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading may be used to reimburse the United States Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service for the costs of carrying out their responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) to consult and conference, as required by section 7 of such Act, in connection with wildland fire management activities: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior may use wildland fire appropriations to enter into leases of real property with local governments, at or below fair market value, to construct capitalized improvements for fire facilities on such leased properties, including but not limited to fire guard stations, retardant stations, and other initial attack and fire support facilities, and to make advance payments for any such lease or for construction activity associated with the lease: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the transfer of funds appropriated for wildland fire management, in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$50,000,000, between the Departments when such transfers would facilitate and expedite wildland fire management programs and projects: *Provided further*, That funds provided for wildfire suppression shall be available for support of Federal emergency response actions: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for assistance to or through the Department of State in connection with forest and rangeland research, technical information, and assistance in foreign countries, and, with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, shall be available to support forestry, wildland fire management, and related natural resource activities outside the United States and its territories and possessions, including technical assistance, education and training, and cooperation with United States and international organizations.

#### FLAME WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION RESERVE FUND

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for large fire suppression operations of the Department of the Interior and as a reserve fund for suppression and Federal emergency response activities, \$92,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amounts are

only available for transfer to the “Wildland Fire Management” account following a declaration by the Secretary in accordance with section 502 of the FLAME Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 1748a).

#### CENTRAL HAZARDOUS MATERIALS FUND

For necessary expenses of the Department of the Interior and any of its component offices and bureaus for the response action, including associated activities, performed pursuant to the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), \$10,010,000, to remain available until expended.

#### NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT AND RESTORATION

##### NATURAL RESOURCE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT FUND

To conduct natural resource damage assessment, restoration activities, and onshore oil spill preparedness by the Department of the Interior necessary to carry out the provisions of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.), the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.), the Oil Pollution Act of 1990 (33 U.S.C. 2701 et seq.), and subchapter II of chapter 1007 of title 54, United States Code, \$7,767,000, to remain available until expended.

#### WORKING CAPITAL FUND

For the operation and maintenance of a departmental financial and business management system, information technology improvements of general benefit to the Department, cybersecurity, and the consolidation of facilities and operations throughout the Department, \$67,100,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated in this Act or any other Act may be used to establish reserves in the Working Capital Fund account other than for accrued annual leave and depreciation of equipment without prior approval of the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may assess reasonable charges to State, local and tribal government employees for training services provided by the National Indian Program Training Center, other than training related to Public Law 93-638: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may lease or otherwise provide space and related facilities, equipment or professional services of the National Indian Program Training Center to State, local and tribal government employees or persons or organizations engaged in cultural, educational, or recreational activities (as defined in section 3306(a) of title 40, United States Code) at the prevailing rate for similar space, facilities, equipment, or services in the vicinity of the National Indian Program Training Center: *Provided further*, That all funds received pursuant to the two preceding provisos shall be credited to this account, shall be available until expended, and shall be used by the Secretary for necessary expenses of the National Indian Program Training Center: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may enter into grants and cooperative agreements to support the Office of Natural Resource Revenue's collection and disbursement of royalties, fees, and other mineral revenue proceeds, as authorized by law.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISION

There is hereby authorized for acquisition from available resources within the Working Capital Fund, aircraft which may be obtained by donation, purchase or through available excess surplus property: *Provided*, That existing aircraft being replaced may be sold, with proceeds derived or trade-in value used to offset the purchase price for the replacement aircraft.

#### GENERAL PROVISIONS, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS) EMERGENCY TRANSFER AUTHORITY—INTRA-BUREAU

SEC. 101. Appropriations made in this title shall be available for expenditure or transfer (within each bureau or office), with the approval of the Secretary, for the emergency reconstruction, replacement, or repair of aircraft, buildings, utilities, or other facilities or equipment damaged or destroyed by fire, flood, storm, or other unavoidable causes: *Provided*, That no funds shall be made available under this authority until funds specifically made available to the Department of the Interior for emergencies shall have been exhausted: *Provided further*, That all funds used pursuant to this section must be replenished by a supplemental appropriation, which must be requested as promptly as possible.

#### EMERGENCY TRANSFER AUTHORITY—DEPARTMENT-WIDE

SEC. 102. The Secretary may authorize the expenditure or transfer of any no year appropriation in this title, in addition to the amounts included in the budget programs of the several agencies, for the suppression or emergency prevention of wildland fires on or threatening lands under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior; for the emergency rehabilitation of burned-over lands under its jurisdiction; for emergency actions related to potential or actual earthquakes, floods, volcanoes, storms, or other unavoidable causes; for contingency planning subsequent to actual oil spills; for response and natural resource damage assessment activities related to actual oil spills or releases of hazardous substances into the environment; for the prevention, suppression, and control of actual or potential grasshopper and Mormon cricket outbreaks on lands under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, pursuant to the authority in section 417(b) of Public Law 106-224 (7 U.S.C. 7717(b)); for emergency reclamation projects under section 410 of Public Law 95-87; and shall transfer, from any no year funds available to the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement, such funds as may be necessary to permit assumption of regulatory authority in the event a primacy State is not carrying out the regulatory provisions of the Surface Mining Act: *Provided*, That appropriations made in this title for wildland fire operations shall be available for the payment of obligations incurred during the preceding fiscal year, and for reimbursement to other Federal agencies for destruction of vehicles, aircraft, or other equipment in connection with their use for wildland fire operations, such reimbursement to be credited to appropriations currently available at the time of receipt thereof: *Provided further*, That for wildland fire operations, no funds shall be made available under this authority until the Secretary determines that funds appropriated for “wildland fire operations” and “FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Fund” shall be exhausted within 30 days: *Provided further*, That all funds used pursuant to this section must be replenished by a supplemental appropriation, which must be requested as promptly as possible: *Provided further*, That such replenishment funds shall be used to reimburse, on a pro rata basis, accounts from which emergency funds were transferred.

#### AUTHORIZED USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 103. Appropriations made to the Department of the Interior in this title shall be available for services as authorized by section 3109 of title 5, United States Code, when authorized by the Secretary, in total amount not to exceed \$500,000; purchase and replace-

ment of motor vehicles, including specially equipped law enforcement vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; hire of passenger motor vehicles; purchase of reprints; payment for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; and the payment of dues, when authorized by the Secretary, for library membership in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members.

#### AUTHORIZED USE OF FUNDS, INDIAN TRUST MANAGEMENT

SEC. 104. Appropriations made in this Act under the headings Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education, and Office of the Special Trustee for American Indians and any unobligated balances from prior appropriations Acts made under the same headings shall be available for expenditure or transfer for Indian trust management and reform activities. Total funding for historical accounting activities shall not exceed amounts specifically designated in this Act for such purpose.

#### REDISTRIBUTION OF FUNDS, BUREAU OF INDIAN AFFAIRS

SEC. 105. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to redistribute any Tribal Priority Allocation funds, including tribal base funds, to alleviate tribal funding inequities by transferring funds to address identified, unmet needs, dual enrollment, overlapping service areas or inaccurate distribution methodologies. No tribe shall receive a reduction in Tribal Priority Allocation funds of more than 10 percent in fiscal year 2017. Under circumstances of dual enrollment, overlapping service areas or inaccurate distribution methodologies, the 10 percent limitation does not apply.

#### ELLIS, GOVERNORS, AND LIBERTY ISLANDS

SEC. 106. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire lands, waters, or interests therein including the use of all or part of any pier, dock, or landing within the State of New York and the State of New Jersey, for the purpose of operating and maintaining facilities in the support of transportation and accommodation of visitors to Ellis, Governors, and Liberty Islands, and of other program and administrative activities, by donation or with appropriated funds, including franchise fees (and other monetary consideration), or by exchange; and the Secretary is authorized to negotiate and enter into leases, subleases, concession contracts or other agreements for the use of such facilities on such terms and conditions as the Secretary may determine reasonable.

#### OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF INSPECTION FEES

SEC. 107. (a) In fiscal year 2017, the Secretary shall collect a nonrefundable inspection fee, which shall be deposited in the “Offshore Safety and Environmental Enforcement” account, from the designated operator for facilities subject to inspection under 43 U.S.C. 1348(c).

(b) Annual fees shall be collected for facilities that are above the waterline, excluding drilling rigs, and are in place at the start of the fiscal year. Fees for fiscal year 2017 shall be:

- (1) \$10,500 for facilities with no wells, but with processing equipment or gathering lines;
- (2) \$17,000 for facilities with 1 to 10 wells, with any combination of active or inactive wells; and
- (3) \$31,500 for facilities with more than 10 wells, with any combination of active or inactive wells.

(c) Fees for drilling rigs shall be assessed for all inspections completed in fiscal year 2017. Fees for fiscal year 2017 shall be:

- (1) \$30,500 per inspection for rigs operating in water depths of 500 feet or more; and
- (2) \$16,700 per inspection for rigs operating in water depths of less than 500 feet.

(d) The Secretary shall bill designated operators under subsection (b) within 60 days, with payment required within 30 days of billing. The Secretary shall bill designated operators under subsection (c) within 30 days of the end of the month in which the inspection occurred, with payment required within 30 days of billing.

#### BUREAU OF OCEAN ENERGY MANAGEMENT, REGULATION AND ENFORCEMENT REORGANIZATION

SEC. 108. The Secretary of the Interior, in order to implement a reorganization of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement, may transfer funds among and between the successor offices and bureaus affected by the reorganization only in conformance with the reprogramming guidelines described in this Act.

#### CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS FOR WILD HORSE AND BURRO HOLDING FACILITIES

SEC. 109. Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior may enter into multiyear cooperative agreements with nonprofit organizations and other appropriate entities, and may enter into multiyear contracts in accordance with the provisions of section 3903 of title 41, United States Code (except that the 5-year term restriction in subsection (a) shall not apply), for the long-term care and maintenance of excess wild free roaming horses and burros by such organizations or entities on private land. Such cooperative agreements and contracts may not exceed 10 years, subject to renewal at the discretion of the Secretary.

#### MASS MARKING OF SALMONIDS

SEC. 110. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service shall, in carrying out its responsibilities to protect threatened and endangered species of salmon, implement a system of mass marking of salmonid stocks, intended for harvest, that are released from federally operated or federally financed hatcheries including but not limited to fish releases of coho, chinook, and steelhead species. Marked fish must have a visible mark that can be readily identified by commercial and recreational fishers.

#### EXHAUSTION OF ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW

SEC. 111. Paragraph (1) of section 122(a) of division E of Public Law 112-74 (125 Stat. 1013) is amended by striking “fiscal years 2012 through 2018,” and inserting “fiscal year 2012 and each fiscal year thereafter.”.

#### WILD LANDS FUNDING PROHIBITION

SEC. 112. None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce Secretarial Order No. 3310 issued by the Secretary of the Interior on December 22, 2010.

#### CONTRACTS AND AGREEMENTS WITH INDIAN AFFAIRS

SEC. 113. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, during fiscal year 2017, in carrying out work involving cooperation with State, local, and tribal governments or any political subdivision thereof, Indian Affairs may record obligations against accounts receivable from any such entities, except that total obligations at the end of the fiscal year shall not exceed total budgetary resources available at the end of the fiscal year.

#### GREATER SAGE-GROUSE

SEC. 114. (a) None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used—

- (1) to review the status of or determine whether the greater sage-grouse is an endan-

gered species or a threatened species pursuant to section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533), or to issue a regulation with respect thereto that applies to any State with a State management plan;

- (2) to make, modify, or extend any withdrawal pursuant to section 204 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1714) within any Sagebrush Focal Area published in the Federal Register on September 24, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 57635 et seq.), in a manner inconsistent with a State management plan; or

- (3) to implement, amend, or otherwise modify any Federal resource management plan applicable to Federal land in a State with a State management plan, in a manner inconsistent with such State management plan.

(b) For the purposes of this section—

- (1) the term “Federal resource management plan” means—

- (A) a land use plan prepared by the Bureau of Land Management for public lands pursuant to section 202 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1712); or

- (B) a land and resource management plan prepared by the Forest Service for National Forest System lands pursuant to section 6 of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604);

- (2) the term “greater sage-grouse” means the species *Centrocercus urophasianus* or the Columbia Basin distinct population segment of greater sage-grouse; and

- (3) the term “State management plan” means a State-wide plan for the protection and recovery of greater sage-grouse that has been approved by the Governor of such State.

#### WATER CONVEYANCES

SEC. 115. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to review, require approval of, or withhold approval for use of a right-of-way granted pursuant to the General Railroad Right-of-Way Act of 1875 (43 U.S.C. 934-939) if authorization of the use would have been considered under Department policy to be within the scope of a railroad’s authority as of the day before the effective date of the Department’s Solicitor’s Opinion M-37025, issued on November 4, 2011.

#### INDIAN EDUCATION FUND

SEC. 116. Section 801 of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (25 U.S.C. 458ddd) is amended—

- (1) by striking “Foundation” each place it appears and inserting “Fund”;

- (2) in subsection (a), by striking “foundation” and inserting “fund”;

- (3) in subsection (a), by adding at the end the following: “The Fund shall be affiliated and may contract for services with a section 501(c)(3) national organization whose mission is to represent Native American students and educators for the improvement of schools and the education of Native children.”;

- (4) in subsection (e)(1), by inserting “or public” after “private”;

- (5) in subsection (e)—

- (A) in paragraph (2), by striking “and” at the end;

- (B) in paragraph (3), by striking the period and inserting a semicolon; and

- (C) by adding at the end the following:

- (4) to promote and facilitate public-private partnerships that maximize the involvement of the private sector, including nonprofit organizations and for-profit entities, in providing financial and in-kind support for the improvement or replacement of facilities and infrastructure and for the enhancement of telecommunications and tech-

nological capacity in Bureau-funded schools; and

- (5) to facilitate interagency agreements between the Department of the Interior and other Federal agencies in furtherance of the purposes of the Fund.”;

- (6) in subsection (f)(2), by striking all that follows after the heading and inserting the following: “The number of members of the Board, the manner of their selection (including the filling of vacancies), and their terms of office shall be as provided in the constitution and bylaws of the Fund. The Board shall have nine members, including the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary of the Interior for Indian Affairs who shall serve as ex officio nonvoting members and who shall appoint three voting members to staggered terms, and including the President and Executive Director of the 501(c)(3) national organization referenced in subsection (a) who shall serve as ex officio nonvoting members and who shall appoint two voting members to staggered terms.”;

- (7) in subsection (f)(3), by striking “are” and all that follows through “practicable,” and inserting “shall, to the extent practicable, be drawn from various disciplines related to the purposes of the Fund, and”;

- (8) in subsection (m)—

- (A) in the heading, by inserting “AND PROPERTY” after “FUNDS”;

- (B) by inserting “and property” after the first “funds” the first place it appears.

#### BLUE RIDGE NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA AND ERIE CANALWAY NATIONAL HERITAGE CORRIDOR

SEC. 117. (a) Section 140(i)(1) of Title I of P.L. 108-108, as amended (54 U.S.C. 320101 note), is further amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$12,000,000”;

- (b) Section 810(a)(1) of Title VIII of Division B of Appendix D of P.L. 106-554, as amended (54 U.S.C. 320101 note), is further amended by striking “\$10,000,000” and inserting “\$12,000,000”.

#### FISH HATCHERY PROGRAMS

SEC. 118. (a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than two years after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Director of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife, shall develop and implement the expanded use of conservation fish hatchery programs to enhance, supplement, and rebuild delta smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*) and other species listed as endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), under the biological opinion issued under that Act by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, dated December 15, 2008, on the effects of the coordinated operations of the Central Valley Project and the State Water Project in California.

- (b) PROGRAM DESIGN.—The conservation fish hatchery programs established under subsection (a) and their associated hatchery and genetic management plans shall be designed—

- (1) to benefit, enhance, support, and otherwise recover naturally spawning fish species to the point where the measures under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 are no longer necessary for such species;

- (2) to address the recommendations of the California Hatchery Scientific Review Group; and

- (3) to minimize adverse effects to operations of the Central Valley Project and State Water Project (as those terms are used in the Central Valley Project Improvement Act of 2002 (title XXXIV of Public Law 102-575)).

- (c) MISCELLANEOUS REQUIREMENTS.—In implementing this section, the Secretary—

- (1) shall give priority to existing and prospective hatchery programs and facilities

within the Sacramento-San Joaquin Delta and the riverine tributaries thereto; and

(2) may enter into cooperative agreements for the operation of conservation hatchery programs with the State of California, tribes, and other non-Governmental entities for the benefit, enhancement, and support of naturally spawning fish species.

#### REISSUANCE OF FINAL RULES

SEC. 119. Before the end of the 60-day period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Interior shall reissue the final rule published on December 28, 2011 (76 Fed. Reg. 81666 et seq.) and the final rule published on September 10, 2012 (77 Fed. Reg. 55530 et seq.), without regard to any other provision of statute or regulation that applies to issuance of such rules. Such reissuances (including this section) shall not be subject to judicial review.

#### STREAM BUFFER

SEC. 120. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary to (1) further develop, finalize, carry out, or implement the proposed rule entitled "Stream Protection Rule" signed by the Assistant Secretary for Land and Minerals Management of the Department of the Interior on July 7, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 44436), or (2) develop, carry out, or implement any guidance, policy, or directive to reinterpret or change the historic interpretation of "material damage to the hydrologic balance outside the permit area" in section 510(b)(3) of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977 (30 U.S.C. 1260(b)(3)), or 30 C.F.R. 816.57 or 30 C.F.R. 817.57, as promulgated on June 30, 1983 by the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement of the Department of the Interior (48 Fed. Reg. 30312).

#### BOTTLED WATER

SEC. 121. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Director of the National Park Service to implement, administer, or enforce Policy Memorandum 11-03 or to approve a request by a park superintendent to eliminate the sale in national parks of water in disposable, recyclable plastic bottles.

#### OIL AND GAS ROYALTIES

SEC. 122. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the Bureau of Land Management's proposed rule regarding Waste Prevention, Production Subject to Royalties, and Resource Conservation published February 8, 2016.

#### PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR CERTAIN HISTORIC DESIGNATION

SEC. 123. (a) IN GENERAL.—None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to take any action to designate a Federal property for inclusion on, or to add a Federal property to, the National Register of Historic Places, or to operate or maintain a property on that registry, if the managing agency of that Federal property objects to such designation or inclusion, including actions related to—

- (1) cooperative agreements;
- (2) general administration;
- (3) maintenance of records and agreements; and
- (4) any other functions necessary to designate, add, operate, or maintain such Federal property.

(b) EXCEPTION.—The prohibition in subsection (a) shall not apply to actions related to a managing agency request for expedited removal of Federal property from the National Register of Historic Places for reasons of national security.

#### DRILLING MARGINS

SEC. 124. None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act for any fiscal

year may be used to develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce any change to the regulations and guidance in effect on April 1, 2015, pertaining to drilling margins or static downhole mud weight (30 CFR 250.414(c)) including the provisions of the rules dated April 17, 2015, and April 29, 2016.

#### TRIBAL RECOGNITION

SEC. 125. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to implement, administer, or enforce the final rule entitled "Federal Acknowledgment of American Indian Tribes" published by the Department of the Interior in the Federal Register on July 1, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 37862 et seq.).

#### ECHINODERMS

SEC. 126. Section 14.92(a)(1) of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, is amended by inserting "including echinoderms commonly known as sea urchins and sea cucumbers," after "products".

#### LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR AIR QUALITY REGULATIONS

SEC. 127. (a) LIMITATION.—None of the funds made available by this Act or any other Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior (referred to in this section as the "Secretary") to issue, finalize, or implement any final regulations addressing any subject of the proposed rule entitled "Air Quality Control, Reporting, and Compliance", published April 5, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 19717), before the date on which the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management—

(1) completes the two air modeling studies entitled "Arctic Air Quality Impact Assessment Modeling (AK-13-01)" and "Air Quality Modeling in the Gulf of Mexico Region (GM-14-01)", and publishes the results of such studies and all supporting data and documentation in a form available to the public;

(2) concludes, following peer review of such studies, publication of public notice, and 120 days of opportunity for public comment on the studies, that the activities expressly authorized under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) are significantly affecting the air quality of any State for purposes of compliance with the national ambient air quality standards, pursuant to, as required by section 5(a)(8) of such Act (43 U.S.C. 1334(a)(8)); and

(3) consults with the affected coastal states (as that term is used in that Act) on the results of such studies and analyses, and any actions that may be taken including any incremental burdens on such coastal states that may result.

(b) REPROPOSAL OF REGULATIONS.—The Secretary shall—

(1) before issuing any such final regulations—

- (A) repropose the regulations; and
- (B) provide a period of at least 180 days for the submission of public comment on such reproposed regulations; and

(2) delay the effective date of such final regulations for at least 180 days after the date they are published.

#### TRUST LAND

SEC. 128. All land taken into trust by the United States under or pursuant to the Act of June 18, 1934 (25 U.S.C. 465) before February 24, 2009, for the benefit of an Indian tribe that was federally recognized on the date that the land was taken into trust is hereby reaffirmed as trust land.

#### TITLE II

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY

For science and technology, including research and development activities, which shall include research and development activities under the Comprehensive Environ-

mental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980; necessary expenses for personnel and related costs and travel expenses; procurement of laboratory equipment and supplies; and other operating expenses in support of research and development, \$720,072,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That of the funds included under this heading, \$10,000,000 shall be for Research: National Priorities as specified in the report accompanying this Act.

#### ENVIRONMENTAL PROGRAMS AND MANAGEMENT

For environmental programs and management, including necessary expenses, not otherwise provided for, for personnel and related costs and travel expenses; hire of passenger motor vehicles; hire, maintenance, and operation of aircraft; purchase of reprints; library memberships in societies or associations which issue publications to members only or at a price to members lower than to subscribers who are not members; administrative costs of the brownfields program under the Small Business Liability Relief and Brownfields Revitalization Act of 2002; and not to exceed \$9,000 for official reception and representation expenses, \$2,527,470,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That of the funds included under this heading, \$15,000,000 shall be for Environmental Protection: National Priorities as specified in the report accompanying this Act: *Provided further*, That of the funds included under this heading, \$409,709,000 shall be for Geographic Programs specified in the report accompanying this Act: *Provided further*, That the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized, in carrying out its responsibilities under section 2002(b) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6912(b)), to use appropriations made available under this heading to evaluate the effectiveness of States using State solid waste management plans to ensure the efficient and effective implementation of the final regulations on coal combustion residuals that took effect on October 19, 2015, and codified in parts 257 and 261 of title 40 of the Code of Federal Regulations: *Provided further*, That the Administrator shall provide to the Committee on Appropriations and the appropriate authorizing Committees a report on the effectiveness of States using such plans in implementing the requirements of final coal combustion residual regulations in an efficient and effective manner.

#### HAZARDOUS WASTE ELECTRONIC MANIFEST SYSTEM FUND

For necessary expenses to carry out section 3024 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6939g), including the development, operation, maintenance, and upgrading of the hazardous waste electronic manifest system established by such section, \$3,178,000, to remain available until September 30, 2019.

#### OFFICE OF INSPECTOR GENERAL

For necessary expenses of the Office of Inspector General in carrying out the provisions of the Inspector General Act of 1978, \$41,489,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018.

#### BUILDINGS AND FACILITIES

For construction, repair, improvement, extension, alteration, and purchase of fixed equipment or facilities of, or for use by, the Environmental Protection Agency, \$34,467,000, to remain available until expended.

#### HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCE SUPERFUND (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses to carry out the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), including sections 111(c)(3), (c)(5), (c)(6), and (e)(4) (42 U.S.C. 9611) \$1,115,929,000,

to remain available until expended, consisting of such sums as are available in the Trust Fund on September 30, 2016, as authorized by section 517(a) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986 (SARA) and up to \$1,115,929,000 as a payment from general revenues to the Hazardous Substance Superfund for purposes as authorized by section 517(b) of SARA: *Provided*, That funds appropriated under this heading may be allocated to other Federal agencies in accordance with section 111(a) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That of the funds appropriated under this heading, \$8,778,000 shall be paid to the "Office of Inspector General" appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2018, and \$15,496,000 shall be paid to the "Science and Technology" appropriation to remain available until September 30, 2018.

#### LEAKING UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANK TRUST FUND PROGRAM

For necessary expenses to carry out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by subtitle I of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, \$94,605,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$68,016,000 shall be for carrying out leaking underground storage tank cleanup activities authorized by section 9003(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act; \$26,589,000 shall be for carrying out the other provisions of the Solid Waste Disposal Act specified in section 9508(c) of the Internal Revenue Code: *Provided*, That the Administrator is authorized to use appropriations made available under this heading to implement section 9013 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act to provide financial assistance to federally recognized Indian tribes for the development and implementation of programs to manage underground storage tanks.

#### INLAND OIL SPILL PROGRAMS

For expenses necessary to carry out the Environmental Protection Agency's responsibilities under the Oil Pollution Act of 1990, \$18,079,000, to be derived from the Oil Spill Liability trust fund, to remain available until expended.

#### STATE AND TRIBAL ASSISTANCE GRANTS

For environmental programs and infrastructure assistance, including capitalization grants for State revolving funds and performance partnership grants, \$3,370,729,000, to remain available until expended, of which—

(1) \$1,000,000,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Clean Water State Revolving Funds under title VI of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act; and of which \$1,070,500,000 shall be for making capitalization grants for the Drinking Water State Revolving Funds under section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act: *Provided*, That for fiscal year 2017, funds made available under this title to each State for Clean Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants and for Drinking Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants may, at the discretion of each State, be used for projects to address green infrastructure, water or energy efficiency improvements, or other environmentally innovative activities: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding section 603(d)(7) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, the limitation on the amounts in a State water pollution control revolving fund that may be used by a State to administer the fund shall not apply to amounts included as principal in loans made by such fund in fiscal year 2017 and prior years where such amounts represent costs of administering the fund to the extent that such amounts are or were deemed reasonable by the Administrator, accounted for separately from other assets in the fund, and used for eligible pur-

poses of the fund, including administration: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2017, notwithstanding the provisions of sections 201(g)(1), (h), and (l) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, grants under Title II of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, the United States Virgin Islands, and the District of Columbia may also be made for the purpose of providing assistance: (1) solely for facility plans, design activities, or plans, specification, and estimates for any proposed project for the construction of treatment works; and (2) for the construction, repair, or replacement of privately owned treatment works serving one or more principal residences or small commercial establishments; *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2017, notwithstanding the provisions of 201(g)(1), (h), and (l) and section 518(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, funds reserved by the Administrator for grants under section 518(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act may also be used to provide assistance: (1) solely for facility plans, design activities, or plans, specifications, and estimates for any proposed project for the construction of treatment works; and (2) for the construction, repair, or replacement of privately owned treatment works serving one or more principal residences or small commercial establishments; Funds reserved under section 518(c) of such Act shall be available for grants only to Indian tribes, as defined in section 518(h) of such Act and former Indian reservations in Oklahoma (as defined by the Secretary of the Interior) and Native Villages (as defined in Public Law 92-203): *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2017, notwithstanding any provision of the Clean Water Act and regulations issued pursuant thereof, up to a total of \$2,000,000 of the funds reserved by the Administrator for grants under section 518(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act may also be used for grants for training, technical assistance, and educational programs relating to the operation and management of the treatment works specified in section 518(c) of such Act; Funds reserved under section 518(c) of such Act shall be available for grants only to Indian tribes, as defined in section 518(h) of such Act and former Indian reservations in Oklahoma (as determined by the Secretary of the Interior) and Native Villages (as defined in Public Law 92-203): *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2017, notwithstanding the limitation on amounts in section 518(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, up to a total of 2 percent of the funds appropriated, or \$30,000,000, whichever is greater, and notwithstanding the limitation on amounts in section 1452(i) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, up to a total of 2 percent of the funds appropriated, or \$20,000,000, whichever is greater, for State Revolving Funds under such Acts may be reserved by the Administrator for grants under section 518(c) and section 1452(i) of such Acts: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2017, notwithstanding the amounts specified in section 205(c) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, up to 1.5 percent of the aggregate funds appropriated for the Clean Water State Revolving Fund program under the Act less any sums reserved under section 518(c) of the Act, may be reserved by the Administrator for grants made under title II of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act for American Samoa, Guam, the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, and United States Virgin Islands: *Provided further*, That for fiscal year 2017, notwithstanding the limitations on amounts specified in section 1452(j) of the Safe Drinking Water Act, up to 1.5 percent of the funds appropriated for the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund programs under

the Safe Drinking Water Act may be reserved by the Administrator for grants made under section 1452(j) of the Safe Drinking Water Act: *Provided further*, That 10 percent of the funds made available under this title to each State for Clean Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants and 20 percent of the funds made available under this title to each State for Drinking Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants shall be used by the State to provide additional subsidy to eligible recipients in the form of forgiveness of principal, negative interest loans, or grants (or any combination of these), and shall be so used by the State only where such funds are provided as initial financing for an eligible recipient or to buy, refinance, or restructure the debt obligations of eligible recipients where such debt was incurred on or after the date of enactment of this Act, or where such debt was incurred prior to the date of enactment of this Act if the State, with concurrence from the Administrator, determines that such funds could be used to help address a threat to public health from heightened exposure to lead in drinking water;

(2) \$5,000,000 shall be for architectural, engineering, planning, design, construction and related activities in connection with the construction of high priority water and wastewater facilities in the area of the United States-Mexico Border, after consultation with the appropriate border commission; *Provided*, That no funds provided by this appropriations Act to address the water, wastewater and other critical infrastructure needs of the colonias in the United States along the United States-Mexico border shall be made available to a county or municipal government unless that government has established an enforceable local ordinance, or other zoning rule, which prevents in that jurisdiction the development or construction of any additional colonia areas, or the development within an existing colonia the construction of any new home, business, or other structure which lacks water, wastewater, or other necessary infrastructure;

(3) \$17,000,000 shall be for grants to the State of Alaska to address drinking water and wastewater infrastructure needs of rural and Alaska Native Villages: *Provided*, That of these funds: (A) the State of Alaska shall provide a match of 25 percent; (B) no more than 5 percent of the funds may be used for administrative and overhead expenses; and (C) the State of Alaska shall make awards consistent with the Statewide priority list established in conjunction with the Agency and the U.S. Department of Agriculture for all water, sewer, waste disposal, and similar projects carried out by the State of Alaska that are funded under section 221 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1301) or the Consolidated Farm and Rural Development Act (7 U.S.C. 1921 et seq.) which shall allocate not less than 25 percent of the funds provided for projects in regional hub communities;

(4) \$80,000,000 shall be to carry out section 104(k) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA), including grants, interagency agreements, and associated program support costs: *Provided*, That not more than 25 percent of the amount appropriated to carry out section 104(k) of CERCLA shall be used for site characterization, assessment, and remediation of facilities described in section 101(39)(D)(ii)(II) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That at least 10 percent shall be allocated for assistance in persistent poverty counties: *Provided further*, That for purposes of this section, the term "persistent poverty counties" means any county that has had 20 percent or more of its population living in poverty over the past 30 years, as measured

by the 1990 and 2000 decennial censuses and the most recent Small Area Income and Poverty Estimates;

(5) \$100,000,000 shall be for grants under title VII, subtitle G of the Energy Policy Act of 2005;

(6) \$40,000,000 shall be for targeted airshed grants in accordance with the terms and conditions of the report accompanying this Act; and

(7) \$1,058,229,000 shall be for grants, including associated program support costs, to States, federally recognized tribes, interstate agencies, tribal consortia, and air pollution control agencies for multi-media or single media pollution prevention, control and abatement and related activities, including activities pursuant to the provisions set forth under this heading in Public Law 104-134, and for making grants under section 103 of the Clean Air Act for particulate matter monitoring and data collection activities subject to terms and conditions specified by the Administrator, of which: \$47,745,000 shall be for carrying out section 128 of CERCLA; \$9,646,000 shall be for Environmental Information Exchange Network grants, including associated program support costs; \$1,498,000 shall be for grants to States under section 2007(f)(2) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, which shall be in addition to funds appropriated under the heading "Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund Program" to carry out the provisions of the Solid Waste Disposal Act specified in section 9508(c) of the Internal Revenue Code other than section 9003(h) of the Solid Waste Disposal Act; \$17,848,000 of the funds available for grants under section 106 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act shall be for State participation in national- and State-level statistical surveys of water resources and enhancements to State monitoring programs.

#### WATER INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCE AND INNOVATION PROGRAM ACCOUNT

For the cost of direct loans and for the cost of guaranteed loans, as authorized by the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014, \$45,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such costs, including the cost of modifying such loans, shall be as defined in section 502 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974: *Provided further*, That these funds are available to subsidize gross obligations for the principal amount of direct loans, including capitalized interest, and total loan principal, including capitalized interest, any part of which is to be guaranteed, not to exceed \$5,487,000,000.

In addition, fees authorized to be collected pursuant to sections 5029 and 5030 of the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014 shall be deposited in this account to remain available until expended.

In addition, for administrative expenses to carry out the direct and guaranteed loan programs, notwithstanding section 5033 of the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act of 2014, \$5,000,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS— ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For fiscal year 2017, notwithstanding 31 U.S.C. 6303(1) and 6305(1), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, in carrying out the Agency's function to implement directly Federal environmental programs required or authorized by law in the absence of an acceptable tribal program, may award cooperative agreements to federally recognized Indian tribes or Intertribal consortia, if authorized by their member tribes, to assist the Administrator in implementing Federal environmental programs

for Indian tribes required or authorized by law, except that no such cooperative agreements may be awarded from funds designated for State financial assistance agreements.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency is authorized to collect and obligate pesticide registration service fees in accordance with section 33 of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act, as amended by Public Law 112-177, the Pesticide Registration Improvement Extension Act of 2012.

Notwithstanding section 33(d)(2) of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA) (7 U.S.C. 136w-8(d)(2)), the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency may assess fees under section 33 of FIFRA (7 U.S.C. 136w-8) for fiscal year 2017.

The Administrator is authorized to transfer up to \$300,000,000 of the funds appropriated for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative under the heading "Environmental Programs and Management" to the head of any Federal department or agency, with the concurrence of such head, to carry out activities that would support the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement programs, projects, or activities; to enter into an inter-agency agreement with the head of such Federal department or agency to carry out these activities; and to make grants to governmental entities, nonprofit organizations, institutions, and individuals for planning, research, monitoring, outreach, and implementation in furtherance of the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement.

The Science and Technology, Environmental Programs and Management, Office of Inspector General, Hazardous Substance Superfund, and Leaking Underground Storage Tank Trust Fund Program Accounts, are available for the construction, alteration, repair, rehabilitation, and renovation of facilities provided that the cost does not exceed \$150,000 per project.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall base agency policies and actions regarding air emissions from forest biomass including, but not limited to, air emissions from facilities that combust forest biomass for energy, on the principle that forest biomass emissions do not increase overall carbon dioxide accumulations in the atmosphere when USDA Forest Inventory and Analysis data show that forest carbon stocks in the U.S. are stable or increasing on a national scale, or when forest biomass is derived from mill residuals, harvest residuals or forest management activities. Such policies and actions shall not pre-empt existing authorities of States to determine how to utilize biomass as a renewable energy source and shall not inhibit States' authority to apply the same policies to forest biomass as other renewable fuels in implementing Federal law.

The Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall apply the criteria and procedures in effect as of the date of enactment of this Act for aquifer exemptions under the underground injection control regulatory framework, in a collaborative manner with the States and regulated industries, to promptly review and make decisions on all aquifer exemption applications using the criteria for exempted aquifers set forth in section 146.4 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on April 1, 2016). The Administrator shall not use substantial program revisions for purposes of reviewing and making decisions on aquifer exemption applications involving underground injection authorized by permit, provided the injection is occurring into aquifers that meet the cri-

teria for an exemption under such section 146.4 and the recommendations of key State resource agencies are taken in account.

For fiscal year 2017, and notwithstanding section 518(f) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1377(f)), the Administrator is authorized to use the amounts appropriated for any fiscal year under section 319 of the Act to make grants to federally recognized Indian tribes pursuant to sections 319(h) and 518(e) of that Act.

#### TITLE III

#### RELATED AGENCIES

#### DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

#### FOREST SERVICE

#### FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For necessary expenses of forest and rangeland research as authorized by law, \$291,982,000, to remain available through September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That of the funds provided, \$77,000,000 is for the forest inventory and analysis program.

#### STATE AND PRIVATE FORESTRY

For necessary expenses of cooperating with and providing technical and financial assistance to States, territories, possessions, and others, and for forest health management, including treatments of pests, pathogens, and invasive or noxious plants and for restoring and rehabilitating forests damaged by pests or invasive plants, cooperative forestry, and education and land conservation activities and conducting an international program as authorized, \$244,038,000, to remain available through September 30, 2018, as authorized by law, of which \$55,000,000 is to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund to be used for the Forest Legacy Program, to remain available until expended.

#### NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM

#### (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, for management, protection, improvement, and utilization of the National Forest System, \$1,531,443,000, to remain available through September 30, 2018: *Provided*, That of the funds provided, \$40,000,000 shall be deposited in the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Fund for ecological restoration treatments as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 7303(f): *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, \$384,805,000 shall be for forest products: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, up to \$159,941,000 is for the Integrated Resource Restoration pilot program for Region 1, Region 2, Region 3, Region 4, and Region 5: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided for forest products, up to \$161,560,000 may be transferred to support the Integrated Resource Restoration pilot program in the preceding proviso: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of Agriculture may transfer to the Secretary of the Interior any unobligated funds appropriated in a previous fiscal year for operation of the Valles Caldera National Preserve.

#### CAPITAL IMPROVEMENT AND MAINTENANCE

#### (INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service, not otherwise provided for, \$364,164,000, to remain available through September 30, 2018, for construction, capital improvement, maintenance and acquisition of buildings and other facilities and infrastructure; and for construction, reconstruction, decommissioning of roads that are no longer needed, including unauthorized roads that are not part of the transportation system, and maintenance of forest roads and trails by the Forest Service as authorized by 16 U.S.C. 532-538 and 23 U.S.C. 101 and 205: *Provided*, That \$40,000,000 shall be designated for urgently



needed road decommissioning, road and trail repair and maintenance and associated activities, and removal of fish passage barriers, especially in areas where Forest Service roads may be contributing to water quality problems in streams and water bodies which support threatened, endangered, or sensitive species or community water sources: *Provided further*, That funds becoming available in fiscal year 2017 under the Act of March 4, 1913 (16 U.S.C. 501) shall be transferred to the General Fund of the Treasury and shall not be available for transfer or obligation for any other purpose unless the funds are appropriated: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided for decommissioning of roads, up to \$24,543,000 may be transferred to the "National Forest System" to support the Integrated Resource Restoration pilot program.

#### LAND ACQUISITION

For expenses necessary to carry out the provisions of chapter 2003 of title 54, United States Code, including administrative expenses, and for acquisition of land or waters, or interest therein, in accordance with statutory authority applicable to the Forest Service, \$27,280,000, to be derived from the Land and Water Conservation Fund and to remain available until expended.

#### ACQUISITION OF LANDS FOR NATIONAL FORESTS SPECIAL ACTS

For acquisition of lands within the exterior boundaries of the Cache, Uinta, and Wasatch National Forests, Utah; the Toiyabe National Forest, Nevada; and the Angeles, San Bernardino, Sequoia, and Cleveland National Forests, California, as authorized by law, \$950,000, to be derived from forest receipts.

#### ACQUISITION OF LANDS TO COMPLETE LAND EXCHANGES

For acquisition of lands, such sums, to be derived from funds deposited by State, county, or municipal governments, public school districts, or other public school authorities, and for authorized expenditures from funds deposited by non-Federal parties pursuant to Land Sale and Exchange Acts, pursuant to the Act of December 4, 1967 (16 U.S.C. 484a), to remain available through September 30, 2018, (16 U.S.C. 516-617a, 555a; Public Law 96-586; Public Law 76-589, 76-591; and Public Law 78-310).

#### RANGE BETTERMENT FUND

For necessary expenses of range rehabilitation, protection, and improvement, 50 percent of all moneys received during the prior fiscal year, as fees for grazing domestic livestock on lands in National Forests in the 16 Western States, pursuant to section 401(b)(1) of Public Law 94-579, to remain available through September 30, 2018, of which not to exceed 6 percent shall be available for administrative expenses associated with on-the-ground range rehabilitation, protection, and improvements.

#### GIFTS, DONATIONS AND BEQUESTS FOR FOREST AND RANGELAND RESEARCH

For expenses authorized by 16 U.S.C. 1643(b), \$45,000, to remain available through September 30, 2018, to be derived from the fund established pursuant to the above Act.

#### MANAGEMENT OF NATIONAL FOREST LANDS FOR SUBSISTENCE USES

For necessary expenses of the Forest Service to manage Federal lands in Alaska for subsistence uses under title VIII of the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (Public Law 96-487), \$2,500,000, to remain available through September 30, 2018.

#### WILDLAND FIRE MANAGEMENT

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for forest fire presuppression activities on National Forest

System lands, for emergency fire suppression on or adjacent to such lands or other lands under fire protection agreement, hazardous fuels management on or adjacent to such lands, emergency rehabilitation of burned-over National Forest System lands and water, and for State and volunteer fire assistance, \$2,593,763,000, to remain available through September 30, 2019: *Provided*, That such funds including unobligated balances under this heading, are available for repayment of advances from other appropriations accounts previously transferred for such purposes: *Provided further*, That such funds shall be available to reimburse State and other cooperating entities for services provided in response to wildfire and other emergencies or disasters to the extent such reimbursements by the Forest Service for non-fire emergencies are fully repaid by the responsible emergency management agency: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, \$6,914,000 of funds appropriated under this appropriation shall be available for the Forest Service in support of fire science research authorized by the Joint Fire Science Program, including all Forest Service authorities for the use of funds, such as contracts, grants, research joint venture agreements, and cooperative agreements: *Provided further*, That all authorities for the use of funds, including the use of contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements, available to execute the Forest and Rangeland Research appropriation, are also available in the utilization of these funds for Fire Science Research: *Provided further*, That funds provided shall be available for emergency rehabilitation and restoration, hazardous fuels management activities, support to Federal emergency response, and wildfire suppression activities of the Forest Service: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, \$395,000,000 is for hazardous fuels management activities, \$19,795,000 is for research activities and to make competitive research grants pursuant to the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Research Act, (16 U.S.C. 1641 et seq.), \$78,000,000 is for State fire assistance, and \$13,000,000 is for volunteer fire assistance under section 10 of the Cooperative Forestry Assistance Act of 1978 (16 U.S.C. 2106): *Provided further*, That amounts in this paragraph may be transferred to the "National Forest System", and "Forest and Rangeland Research" accounts to fund forest and rangeland research, the Joint Fire Science Program, vegetation and watershed management, heritage site rehabilitation, and wildlife and fish habitat management and restoration: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, \$65,000,000 shall be available for the purpose of acquiring aircraft for the next-generation airtanker fleet to enhance firefighting mobility, effectiveness, efficiency, and safety, and such aircraft shall be suitable for contractor operation over the terrain and forest ecosystems characteristic of National Forest System lands, as determined by the Chief of the Forest Service: *Provided further*, That the costs of implementing any cooperative agreement between the Federal Government and any non-Federal entity may be shared, as mutually agreed on by the affected parties: *Provided further*, That the funds provided herein may be used by the Secretary of Agriculture to enter into procurement contracts or cooperative agreements or to issue grants for hazardous fuels management activities and for training or monitoring associated with such hazardous fuels management activities on Federal land or on non-Federal land if the Secretary determines such activities benefit resources on Federal land: *Provided further*, That funds made available to implement the Community Forest Restoration Act, Public Law 106-393, title VI, shall be available for

use on non-Federal lands in accordance with authorities made available to the Forest Service under the "State and Private Forestry" appropriation: *Provided further*, That the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture may authorize the transfer of funds appropriated for wildland fire management, in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$50,000,000, between the Departments when such transfers would facilitate and expedite wildland fire management programs and projects: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided for hazardous fuels management, not to exceed \$5,000,000 may be used to make grants, using any authorities available to the Forest Service under the "State and Private Forestry" appropriation, for the purpose of creating incentives for increased use of biomass from National Forest System lands: *Provided further*, That funds designated for wildfire suppression, including funds transferred from the "FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Fund", shall be assessed for cost pools on the same basis as such assessments are calculated against other agency programs: *Provided further*, That of the funds for hazardous fuels management, up to \$46,653,000 may be transferred to the "National Forest System" to support the Integrated Resource Restoration pilot program.

#### FLAME WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION RESERVE FUND

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses for large fire suppression operations of the Department of Agriculture and as a reserve fund for suppression and Federal emergency response activities, \$315,000,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That such amounts are only available for transfer to the "Wildland Fire Management" account following a declaration by the Secretary in accordance with section 502 of the FLAME Act of 2009 (43 U.S.C. 1748a).

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—FOREST SERVICE

##### (INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

Appropriations to the Forest Service for the current fiscal year shall be available for: (1) purchase of passenger motor vehicles; acquisition of passenger motor vehicles from excess sources, and hire of such vehicles; purchase, lease, operation, maintenance, and acquisition of aircraft to maintain the operable fleet for use in Forest Service wildland fire programs and other Forest Service programs; notwithstanding other provisions of law, existing aircraft being replaced may be sold, with proceeds derived or trade-in value used to offset the purchase price for the replacement aircraft; (2) services pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 2225, and not to exceed \$100,000 for employment under 5 U.S.C. 3109; (3) purchase, erection, and alteration of buildings and other public improvements (7 U.S.C. 2250); (4) acquisition of land, waters, and interests therein pursuant to 7 U.S.C. 428a; (5) for expenses pursuant to the Volunteers in the National Forest Act of 1972 (16 U.S.C. 558a, 558d, and 558a note); (6) the cost of uniforms as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; and (7) for debt collection contracts in accordance with 31 U.S.C. 3718(c).

Any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service may be transferred to the Wildland Fire Management appropriation for forest firefighting, emergency rehabilitation of burned-over or damaged lands or waters under its jurisdiction, and fire preparedness due to severe burning conditions upon the Secretary's notification of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations that all fire suppression funds appropriated under the headings "Wildland Fire Management" and "FLAME Wildfire Suppression Reserve Fund" will be obligated within 30 days: *Provided*, That all funds used pursuant to this

paragraph must be replenished by a supplemental appropriation which must be requested as promptly as possible.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for assistance to or through the Agency for International Development in connection with forest and rangeland research, technical information, and assistance in foreign countries, and shall be available to support forestry and related natural resource activities outside the United States and its territories and possessions, including technical assistance, education and training, and cooperation with U.S., private, and international organizations. The Forest Service, acting for the International Program, may sign direct funding agreements with foreign governments and institutions as well as other domestic agencies (including the U.S. Agency for International Development, the Department of State, and the Millennium Challenge Corporation), U.S. private sector firms, institutions and organizations to provide technical assistance and training programs overseas on forestry and rangeland management.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for expenditure or transfer to the Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management, for removal, preparation, and adoption of excess wild horses and burros from National Forest System lands, and for the performance of cadastral surveys to designate the boundaries of such lands.

None of the funds made available to the Forest Service in this Act or any other Act with respect to any fiscal year shall be subject to transfer under the provisions of section 702(b) of the Department of Agriculture Organic Act of 1944 (7 U.S.C. 2257), section 442 of Public Law 106-224 (7 U.S.C. 7772), or section 10417(b) of Public Law 107-171 (7 U.S.C. 8316(b)).

None of the funds available to the Forest Service may be reprogrammed without the advance approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations in accordance with the reprogramming procedures contained in this Act.

Not more than \$82,000,000 of funds available to the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Working Capital Fund of the Department of Agriculture and not more than \$14,500,000 of funds available to the Forest Service shall be transferred to the Department of Agriculture for Department Reimbursable Programs, commonly referred to as Greenbook charges. Nothing in this paragraph shall prohibit or limit the use of reimbursable agreements requested by the Forest Service in order to obtain services from the Department of Agriculture's National Information Technology Center and the Department of Agriculture's International Technology Service.

Of the funds available to the Forest Service, up to \$5,000,000 shall be available for priority projects within the scope of the approved budget, which shall be carried out by the Youth Conservation Corps and shall be carried out under the authority of the Public Lands Corps Act of 1993, Public Law 103-82, as amended by Public Lands Corps Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2005, Public Law 109-154.

Of the funds available to the Forest Service, \$4,000 is available to the Chief of the Forest Service for official reception and representation expenses.

Pursuant to sections 405(b) and 410(b) of Public Law 101-593, of the funds available to the Forest Service, up to \$3,000,000 may be advanced in a lump sum to the National Forest Foundation to aid conservation partnership projects in support of the Forest Service mission, without regard to when the Foundation incurs expenses, for projects on or benefitting National Forest System lands or re-

lated to Forest Service programs: *Provided*, That of the Federal funds made available to the Foundation, no more than \$300,000 shall be available for administrative expenses: *Provided further*, That the Foundation shall obtain, by the end of the period of Federal financial assistance, private contributions to match on at least one-for-one basis funds made available by the Forest Service: *Provided further*, That the Foundation may transfer Federal funds to a Federal or a non-Federal recipient for a project at the same rate that the recipient has obtained the non-Federal matching funds.

Pursuant to section 2(b)(2) of Public Law 98-244, up to \$3,000,000 of the funds available to the Forest Service may be advanced to the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation in a lump sum to aid cost-share conservation projects, without regard to when expenses are incurred, on or benefitting National Forest System lands or related to Forest Service programs: *Provided*, That such funds shall be matched on at least a one-for-one basis by the Foundation or its sub-recipients: *Provided further*, That the Foundation may transfer Federal funds to a Federal or non-Federal recipient for a project at the same rate that the recipient has obtained the non-Federal matching funds.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for interactions with and providing technical assistance to rural communities and natural resource-based businesses for sustainable rural development purposes.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available for payments to counties within the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area, pursuant to section 14(c)(1) and (2), and section 16(a)(2) of Public Law 99-663.

Any funds appropriated to the Forest Service may be used to meet the non-Federal share requirement in section 502(c) of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056(c)(2)).

Funds available to the Forest Service, not to exceed \$65,000,000, shall be assessed for the purpose of performing fire, administrative and other facilities maintenance and decommissioning. Such assessments shall occur using a square foot rate charged on the same basis the agency uses to assess programs for payment of rent, utilities, and other support services.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, any appropriations or funds available to the Forest Service not to exceed \$500,000 may be used to reimburse the Office of the General Counsel (OGC), Department of Agriculture, for travel and related expenses incurred as a result of OGC assistance or participation requested by the Forest Service at meetings, training sessions, management reviews, land purchase negotiations and similar nonlitigation-related matters. Future budget justifications for both the Forest Service and the Department of Agriculture should clearly display the sums previously transferred and the requested funding transfers.

An eligible individual who is employed in any project funded under title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965 (42 U.S.C. 3056 et seq.) and administered by the Forest Service shall be considered to be a Federal employee for purposes of chapter 171 of title 28, United States Code.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, through the Office of Budget and Program Analysis, the Forest Service shall report no later than 30 business days following the close of each fiscal quarter all current and prior year unobligated balances, by fiscal year, budget line item and account, to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

Funds appropriated to the Forest Service shall be available to categorically exclude

from documentation in an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) a forest management activity on National Forest System lands when the primary purpose of the forest management activity is: (1) to address an insect or disease infestation; (2) to reduce hazardous fuel loads; (3) to protect a municipal water source; (4) to maintain, enhance, or modify critical habitat to protect it from catastrophic disturbances; (5) to increase water yield; or (6) any combination of these purposes: *Provided*, That the land on which the forest management activity is carried out may not exceed 3,000 acres.

#### DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

##### INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE INDIAN HEALTH SERVICES

For expenses necessary to carry out the Act of August 5, 1954 (68 Stat. 674), the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to the Indian Health Service, \$3,720,690,000, together with payments received during the fiscal year pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 238(b) and 238b, for services furnished by the Indian Health Service: *Provided*, That funds made available to tribes and tribal organizations through contracts, grant agreements, or any other agreements or compacts authorized by the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450), shall be deemed to be obligated at the time of the grant or contract award and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That \$960,831,000 for Purchased/Referred Care, including \$53,000,000 for the Indian Catastrophic Health Emergency Fund, shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, up to \$37,000,000 shall remain available until expended for implementation of the loan repayment program under section 108 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act: *Provided further*, That of the funds provided, \$2,000,000 shall be used to supplement funds available for operational costs at tribal clinics operated under an Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act compact or contract where health care is delivered in space acquired through a full service lease, which is not eligible for maintenance and improvement and equipment funds from the Indian Health Service, and \$6,000,000 shall be for accreditation emergencies: *Provided further*, That the amounts collected by the Federal Government as authorized by sections 104 and 108 of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1613a and 1616a) during the preceding fiscal year for breach of contracts shall be deposited to the Fund authorized by section 108A of the Act (25 U.S.C. 1616a-1) and shall remain available until expended and, notwithstanding section 108A(c) of the Act (25 U.S.C. 1616a-1(c)), funds shall be available to make new awards under the loan repayment and scholarship programs under sections 104 and 108 of the Act (25 U.S.C. 1613a and 1616a): *Provided further*, That the amounts made available within this account for the Substance Abuse and Suicide Prevention Program, for the Domestic Violence Prevention Program, for the Zero Suicide Initiative, for aftercare pilots at Youth Regional Treatment Centers, to improve collections from public and private insurance at Indian Health Service and tribally operated facilities, and for accreditation emergencies shall be allocated at the discretion of the Director of the Indian Health Service and shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That funds provided in this Act may

be used for annual contracts and grants that fall within 2 fiscal years, provided the total obligation is recorded in the year the funds are appropriated: *Provided further*, That the amounts collected by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under the authority of title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall remain available until expended for the purpose of achieving compliance with the applicable conditions and requirements of titles XVIII and XIX of the Social Security Act, except for those related to the planning, design, or construction of new facilities: *Provided further*, That funding contained herein for scholarship programs under the Indian Health Care Improvement Act (25 U.S.C. 1613) shall remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That amounts received by tribes and tribal organizations under title IV of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act shall be reported and accounted for and available to the receiving tribes and tribal organizations until expended: *Provided further*, That the Bureau of Indian Affairs may collect from the Indian Health Service, tribes and tribal organizations operating health facilities pursuant to Public Law 93-638, such individually identifiable health information relating to disabled children as may be necessary for the purpose of carrying out its functions under the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (20 U.S.C. 1400, et seq.): *Provided further*, That the Indian Health Care Improvement Fund may be used, as needed, to carry out activities typically funded under the Indian Health Facilities account.

#### CONTRACT SUPPORT COSTS

For payments to tribes and tribal organizations for contract support costs associated with Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act agreements with the Indian Health Service for fiscal year 2017, such sums as may be necessary: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, no amounts made available under this heading shall be available for transfer to another budget account.

#### INDIAN HEALTH FACILITIES

For construction, repair, maintenance, improvement, and equipment of health and related auxiliary facilities, including quarters for personnel; preparation of plans, specifications, and drawings; acquisition of sites, purchase and erection of modular buildings, and purchases of trailers; and for provision of domestic and community sanitation facilities for Indians, as authorized by section 7 of the Act of August 5, 1954 (42 U.S.C. 2004a), the Indian Self-Determination Act, and the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, and for expenses necessary to carry out such Acts and titles II and III of the Public Health Service Act with respect to environmental health and facilities support activities of the Indian Health Service, \$557,946,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds appropriated for the planning, design, construction, renovation or expansion of health facilities for the benefit of an Indian tribe or tribes may be used to purchase land on which such facilities will be located: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$500,000 may be used by the Indian Health Service to purchase TRANSAM equipment from the Department of Defense for distribution to the Indian Health Service and tribal facilities: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated to the Indian Health Service may be used for sanitation facilities construction for new homes funded with grants by the housing programs of the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$2,700,000 from this account and the "Indian Health Services" account may be used by the

Indian Health Service to obtain ambulances for the Indian Health Service and tribal facilities in conjunction with an existing interagency agreement between the Indian Health Service and the General Services Administration: *Provided further*, That not to exceed \$500,000 may be placed in a Demolition Fund, to remain available until expended, and be used by the Indian Health Service for the demolition of Federal buildings.

#### ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS—INDIAN HEALTH SERVICE

Appropriations provided in this Act to the Indian Health Service shall be available for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 at rates not to exceed the per diem rate equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior-level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376; hire of passenger motor vehicles and aircraft; purchase of medical equipment; purchase of reports; purchase, renovation and erection of modular buildings and renovation of existing facilities; payments for telephone service in private residences in the field, when authorized under regulations approved by the Secretary; uniforms or allowances therefor as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902; and for expenses of attendance at meetings that relate to the functions or activities of the Indian Health Service: *Provided*, That in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Health Care Improvement Act, non-Indian patients may be extended health care at all tribally administered or Indian Health Service facilities, subject to charges, and the proceeds along with funds recovered under the Federal Medical Care Recovery Act (42 U.S.C. 2651-2653) shall be credited to the account of the facility providing the service and shall be available without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other law or regulation, funds transferred from the Department of Housing and Urban Development to the Indian Health Service shall be administered under Public Law 86-121, the Indian Sanitation Facilities Act and Public Law 93-638: *Provided further*, That funds appropriated to the Indian Health Service in this Act, except those used for administrative and program direction purposes, shall not be subject to limitations directed at curtailing Federal travel and transportation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Indian Health Service in this Act shall be used for any assessments or charges by the Department of Health and Human Services unless identified in the budget justification and provided in this Act, or approved by the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations through the reprogramming process: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, funds previously or herein made available to a tribe or tribal organization through a contract, grant, or agreement authorized by title I or title V of the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act of 1975 (25 U.S.C. 450), may be deobligated and reobligated to a self-determination contract under title I, or a self-governance agreement under title V of such Act and thereafter shall remain available to the tribe or tribal organization without fiscal year limitation: *Provided further*, That none of the funds made available to the Indian Health Service in this Act shall be used to implement the final rule published in the Federal Register on September 16, 1987, by the Department of Health and Human Services, relating to the eligibility for the health care services of the Indian Health Service until the Indian Health Service has submitted a budget request reflecting the increased costs associated with the proposed final rule, and such request has been included in an appropriations Act and enacted into law: *Provided further*, That with

respect to functions transferred by the Indian Health Service to tribes or tribal organizations, the Indian Health Service is authorized to provide goods and services to those entities on a reimbursable basis, including payments in advance with subsequent adjustment, and the reimbursements received therefrom, along with the funds received from those entities pursuant to the Indian Self-Determination Act, may be credited to the same or subsequent appropriation account from which the funds were originally derived, with such amounts to remain available until expended: *Provided further*, That reimbursements for training, technical assistance, or services provided by the Indian Health Service will contain total costs, including direct, administrative, and overhead associated with the provision of goods, services, or technical assistance: *Provided further*, That the appropriation structure for the Indian Health Service may not be altered without advance notification to the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations.

#### NATIONAL INSTITUTES OF HEALTH

##### NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH SCIENCES

For necessary expenses for the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences in carrying out activities set forth in section 311(a) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9660(a)) and section 126(g) of the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, \$77,349,000.

##### AGENCY FOR TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND DISEASE REGISTRY

##### TOXIC SUBSTANCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL PUBLIC HEALTH

For necessary expenses for the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry (ATSDR) in carrying out activities set forth in sections 104(i) and 111(c)(4) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (CERCLA) and section 3019 of the Solid Waste Disposal Act, \$74,691,000, of which up to \$1,000 per eligible employee of the Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry shall remain available until expended for Individual Learning Accounts: *Provided*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, in lieu of performing a health assessment under section 104(i)(6) of CERCLA, the Administrator of ATSDR may conduct other appropriate health studies, evaluations, or activities, including, without limitation, biomedical testing, clinical evaluations, medical monitoring, and referral to accredited healthcare providers: *Provided further*, That in performing any such health assessment or health study, evaluation, or activity, the Administrator of ATSDR shall not be bound by the deadlines in section 104(i)(6)(A) of CERCLA: *Provided further*, That none of the funds appropriated under this heading shall be available for ATSDR to issue in excess of 40 toxicological profiles pursuant to section 104(i) of CERCLA during fiscal year 2017, and existing profiles may be updated as necessary.

#### OTHER RELATED AGENCIES

##### EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT COUNCIL ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY AND OFFICE OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

For necessary expenses to continue functions assigned to the Council on Environmental Quality and Office of Environmental Quality pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Environmental Quality Improvement Act of 1970, and Reorganization Plan No. 1 of 1977, and not to exceed \$750 for official reception and representation expenses, \$3,000,000: *Provided*, That notwithstanding section 202 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1970, the

Council shall consist of one member, appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, serving as chairman and exercising all powers, functions, and duties of the Council.

CHEMICAL SAFETY AND HAZARD INVESTIGATION BOARD

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses in carrying out activities pursuant to section 112(r)(6) of the Clean Air Act, including hire of passenger vehicles, uniforms or allowances therefor, as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 5901-5902, and for services authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109 but at rates for individuals not to exceed the per diem equivalent to the maximum rate payable for senior level positions under 5 U.S.C. 5376, \$11,000,000: *Provided*, That the Chemical Safety and Hazard Investigation Board (Board) shall have not more than three career Senior Executive Service positions: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the individual appointed to the position of Inspector General of the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) shall, by virtue of such appointment, also hold the position of Inspector General of the Board: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Inspector General of the Board shall utilize personnel of the Office of Inspector General of EPA in performing the duties of the Inspector General of the Board, and shall not appoint any individuals to positions within the Board.

OFFICE OF NAVAJO AND HOPI INDIAN RELOCATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

(INCLUDING TRANSFER OF FUNDS)

For necessary expenses of the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation as authorized by Public Law 93-531, \$15,431,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That funds provided in this or any other appropriations Act are to be used to relocate eligible individuals and groups including evictees from District 6, Hopi-partitioned lands residents, those in significantly substandard housing, and all others certified as eligible and not included in the preceding categories: *Provided further*, That none of the funds contained in this or any other Act may be used by the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation to evict any single Navajo or Navajo family who, as of November 30, 1985, was physically domiciled on the lands partitioned to the Hopi Tribe unless a new or replacement home is provided for such household: *Provided further*, That no relocatee will be provided with more than one new or replacement home: *Provided further*, That the Office shall relocate any certified eligible relocatees who have selected and received an approved homesite on the Navajo reservation or selected a replacement residence off the Navajo reservation or on the land acquired pursuant to 25 U.S.C. 640d-10: *Provided further*, That \$200,000 shall be transferred to the Office of Inspector General of the Department of the Interior, to remain available until expended, for audits and investigations of the Office of Navajo and Hopi Indian Relocation, consistent with the Inspector General Act of 1978 (5 U.S.C. App.).

INSTITUTE OF AMERICAN INDIAN AND ALASKA NATIVE CULTURE AND ARTS DEVELOPMENT

PAYMENT TO THE INSTITUTE

For payment to the Institute of American Indian and Alaska Native Culture and Arts Development, as authorized by title XV of Public Law 99-498 (20 U.S.C. 56 part A), \$11,619,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018.

SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Smithsonian Institution, as authorized by law, including

research in the fields of art, science, and history; development, preservation, and documentation of the National Collections; presentation of public exhibits and performances; collection, preparation, dissemination, and exchange of information and publications; conduct of education, training, and museum assistance programs; maintenance, alteration, operation, lease agreements of no more than 30 years, and protection of buildings, facilities, and approaches; not to exceed \$100,000 for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; and purchase, rental, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for employees, \$712,487,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, except as otherwise provided herein; of which not to exceed \$50,467,000 for the instrumentation program, collections acquisition, exhibition reinstallation, the National Museum of African American History and Culture, and the repatriation of skeletal remains program shall remain available until expended; and including such funds as may be necessary to support American overseas research centers: *Provided*, That funds appropriated herein are available for advance payments to independent contractors performing research services or participating in official Smithsonian presentations.

FACILITIES CAPITAL

For necessary expenses of repair, revitalization, and alteration of facilities owned or occupied by the Smithsonian Institution, by contract or otherwise, as authorized by section 2 of the Act of August 22, 1949 (63 Stat. 623), and for construction, including necessary personnel, \$150,860,000, to remain available until expended, of which not to exceed \$10,000 shall be for services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109.

NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For the upkeep and operations of the National Gallery of Art, the protection and care of the works of art therein, and administrative expenses incident thereto, as authorized by the Act of March 24, 1937 (50 Stat. 51), as amended by the public resolution of April 13, 1939 (Public Resolution 9, Seventy-sixth Congress), including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109; payment in advance when authorized by the treasurer of the Gallery for membership in library, museum, and art associations or societies whose publications or services are available to members only, or to members at a price lower than to the general public; purchase, repair, and cleaning of uniforms for guards, and uniforms, or allowances therefor, for other employees as authorized by law (5 U.S.C. 5901-5902); purchase or rental of devices and services for protecting buildings and contents thereof, and maintenance, alteration, improvement, and repair of buildings, approaches, and grounds; and purchase of services for restoration and repair of works of art for the National Gallery of Art by contracts made, without advertising, with individuals, firms, or organizations at such rates or prices and under such terms and conditions as the Gallery may deem proper, \$130,801,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018, of which not to exceed \$3,620,000 for the special exhibition program shall remain available until expended.

REPAIR, RESTORATION AND RENOVATION OF BUILDINGS

For necessary expenses of repair, restoration and renovation of buildings, grounds and facilities owned or occupied by the National Gallery of Art, by contract or otherwise, for operating lease agreements of no more than 10 years, with no extensions or renewals beyond the 10 years, that address space needs created by the ongoing renovations in the Master Facilities Plan, as au-

thorized, \$22,564,000, to remain available until expended: *Provided*, That contracts awarded for environmental systems, protection systems, and exterior repair or renovation of buildings of the National Gallery of Art may be negotiated with selected contractors and awarded on the basis of contractor qualifications as well as price.

JOHN F. KENNEDY CENTER FOR THE PERFORMING ARTS

OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE

For necessary expenses for the operation, maintenance and security of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, \$22,260,000.

CAPITAL REPAIR AND RESTORATION

For necessary expenses for capital repair and restoration of the existing features of the building and site of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts, \$14,140,000, to remain available until expended.

WOODROW WILSON INTERNATIONAL CENTER FOR SCHOLARS

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses necessary in carrying out the provisions of the Woodrow Wilson Memorial Act of 1968 (82 Stat. 1356) including hire of passenger vehicles and services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$10,500,000, to remain available until September 30, 2018.

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, \$149,849,000 shall be available to the National Endowment for the Arts for the support of projects and productions in the arts, including arts education and public outreach activities, through assistance to organizations and individuals pursuant to section 5 of the Act, for program support, and for administering the functions of the Act, to remain available until expended.

NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE HUMANITIES

GRANTS AND ADMINISTRATION

For necessary expenses to carry out the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, \$149,848,000, to remain available until expended, of which \$139,148,000 shall be available for support of activities in the humanities, pursuant to section 7(c) of the Act and for administering the functions of the Act; and \$10,700,000 shall be available to carry out the matching grants program pursuant to section 10(a)(2) of the Act, including \$8,500,000 for the purposes of section 7(h): *Provided*, That appropriations for carrying out section 10(a)(2) shall be available for obligation only in such amounts as may be equal to the total amounts of gifts, bequests, devises of money, and other property accepted by the chairman or by grantees of the National Endowment for the Humanities under the provisions of sections 11(a)(2)(B) and 11(a)(3)(B) during the current and preceding fiscal years for which equal amounts have not previously been appropriated.

ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS

None of the funds appropriated to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities may be used to process any grant or contract documents which do not include the text of 18 U.S.C. 1913: *Provided*, That none of the funds appropriated to the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities may be used for official reception and representation expenses: *Provided further*, That funds from nonappropriated sources may be used as necessary for official reception and

representation expenses: *Provided further*, That the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts may approve grants of up to \$10,000, if in the aggregate the amount of such grants does not exceed 5 percent of the sums appropriated for grantmaking purposes per year: *Provided further*, That such small grant actions are taken pursuant to the terms of an expressed and direct delegation of authority from the National Council on the Arts to the Chairperson.

COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For expenses of the Commission of Fine Arts under chapter 91 of title 40, United States Code, \$2,762,000: *Provided*, That the Commission is authorized to charge fees to cover the full costs of its publications, and such fees shall be credited to this account as an offsetting collection, to remain available until expended without further appropriation: *Provided further*, That the Commission is authorized to accept gifts, including objects, papers, artwork, drawings and artifacts, that pertain to the history and design of the Nation's Capital or the history and activities of the Commission of Fine Arts, for the purpose of artistic display, study or education: *Provided further*, That one-tenth of one percent of the funds provided under this heading may be used for official reception and representation expenses.

NATIONAL CAPITAL ARTS AND CULTURAL  
AFFAIRS

For necessary expenses as authorized by Public Law 99-190 (20 U.S.C. 956a), \$2,000,000.

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC  
PRESERVATION

SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (Public Law 89-665), \$6,480,000.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION  
SALARIES AND EXPENSES

For necessary expenses of the National Capital Planning Commission under chapter 87 of title 40, United States Code, including services as authorized by 5 U.S.C. 3109, \$8,099,000: *Provided*, That one-quarter of 1 percent of the funds provided under this heading may be used for official reception and representational expenses associated with hosting international visitors engaged in the planning and physical development of world capitals.

UNITED STATES HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL  
MUSEUM

HOLOCAUST MEMORIAL MUSEUM

For expenses of the Holocaust Memorial Museum, as authorized by Public Law 106-292 (36 U.S.C. 2301-2310), \$57,000,000, of which \$1,215,000 shall remain available until September 30, 2019, for the Museum's equipment replacement program; and of which \$2,500,000 for the Museum's repair and rehabilitation program and \$1,264,000 for the Museum's outreach initiatives program shall remain available until expended.

TITLE IV

GENERAL PROVISIONS

(INCLUDING TRANSFERS OF FUNDS)

RESTRICTION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 401. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall be available for any activity or the publication or distribution of literature that in any way tends to promote public support or opposition to any legislative proposal on which Congressional action is not complete other than to communicate to Members of Congress as described in 18 U.S.C. 1913.

OBLIGATION OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 402. No part of any appropriation contained in this Act shall remain available for

obligation beyond the current fiscal year unless expressly so provided herein.

REPROGRAMMING PROCEDURES, DISCLOSURE OF  
ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES, AND OPERATING  
PLANS

SEC. 403. (a) DEFINITIONS.—For the purposes of this section:

(1) "Reprogramming" includes:

(A) The reallocation of funds from one program, project, or activity, to another within any appropriation funded in this Act.

(B) For construction, land acquisition, and forest legacy accounts, the reallocation of funds, including unobligated balances, from one construction, land acquisition, or forest legacy project to another such project.

(C) An operating plan or any later modification thereof submitted under subsection (i) of this section.

(D) Proposed reorganizations even without a change in funding, including any change to the organization table presented in the budget justification.

(2) "Program", "project", and "activity" constitute the delineation below the appropriation account level of any agency funded by this Act, as shown in any table of the report accompanying this Act.

(3) "Funds" includes funds provided in this Act or previous appropriations Acts that are available for obligation in the current fiscal year and any amounts available for obligation in the current fiscal year derived from collections, fees or charges.

(4) "Assessment" is any overhead charge, deduction, reserve or holdback, including working capital fund and cost pool charges, from any program, project, and activity to support government-wide, departmental, agency, or bureau administrative functions or headquarters, regional, or central operations or to provide for contingencies.

(b) GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR REPROGRAMMING.—

(1) A reprogramming should be made only when an unforeseen situation arises, and then only if postponement of the project or the activity until the next appropriation year would result in actual loss or damage.

(2) Any project or activity, which may be deferred through reprogramming, shall not later be accomplished by means of further reprogramming, but instead, funds should again be sought for the deferred project or activity through the regular appropriations process.

(3) Except under the most urgent situations, reprogramming should not be employed to initiate new programs or increase allocations specifically denied or limited by the Congress, or to decrease allocations specifically increased by the Congress.

(4) New programs requested in the budget should not be initiated before enactment of the bill without notification to, and the approval of, the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate (hereinafter "the Committees"). This restriction applies to all such actions regardless of whether a formal reprogramming of funds is required to begin the program.

(c) CRITERIA.—

(1) A reprogramming shall be submitted to the Committees in writing 30 days prior to implementation if—

(A) it exceeds \$1,000,000 individually or cumulatively or results in a cumulative increase or decrease of more than 10 percent of funds annually in any affected program, project, or activity;

(B) it is a reorganization; or

(C) it is an operating plan or any later modification thereof as submitted under subsection (i) of this section: *Provided*, That such plan or modification thereof also meets any of the other criteria under subsection (c)(1) of this section.

(2) No funds shall be available for obligation or expenditure through a reprogramming until 30 days after the receipt by the Committees of a notice of proposed reprogramming.

(3) A reprogramming shall be considered approved 30 days after receipt if the Committees have posed no objection. However, agencies will be expected to extend the approval deadline if specifically requested by either Committee.

(d) EXCEPTIONS.—

(1) With regard to the tribal priority allocations of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, there is no restriction on reprogrammings among these programs. However, the Bureau shall report on all reprogrammings made during a given fiscal year no later than 60 days after the end of the fiscal year.

(2) With regard to the Environmental Protection Agency, State and Tribal Assistance Grants account, the Committees do not require reprogramming requests associated with States and Tribes Partnership Grants.

(e) ASSESSMENTS.—

(1) No assessment shall be levied or collected unless such assessment and the basis therefor are presented to the Committees in the budget justifications and are subsequently approved by the Committees. The explanation for any assessment in the budget justification shall show the amount of the assessment, the activities assessed, and the purpose of the funds.

(2) Proposed changes to estimated assessments, as such estimates were presented in annual budget justifications, shall be submitted through the reprogramming process set out in this section and shall be subject to the same dollar and reporting criteria as any other reprogramming.

(3) Each department, agency or bureau that utilizes assessments shall submit an annual report to the Committees which provides details on the use of all funds assessed from any other program, project, or activity.

(4) In no case shall contingency funds or assessments be used to finance agency actions disapproved or limited by the Congress.

(f) LAND ACQUISITIONS, EASEMENTS, AND FOREST LEGACY.—Lands shall not be acquired for more than the approved appraised value (as addressed in section 301(3) of Public Law 91-646), unless such acquisitions are submitted to the Committees for approval in compliance with these procedures.

(g) LAND EXCHANGES.—Land exchanges, wherein the estimated value of the Federal lands to be exchanged is greater than \$1,000,000, shall not be consummated until the Committees have had a 30-day period in which to examine the proposed exchange. In addition, the Committees shall be provided advance notification of exchanges valued between \$500,000 and \$1,000,000.

(h) BUDGET STRUCTURE.—The program, project, and activity structure for any agency appropriation account shall not be altered without advance approval of the Committees.

(i) OPERATING PLANS.—Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this Act, each department or agency funded by this Act shall submit an operating plan to the Committees to establish the baseline for application of reprogramming for the current fiscal year. The operating plan shall include—

(1) a table for each appropriation with a separate column to display the President's budget request, adjustments made by the Congress, enacted rescissions, if appropriate, and the fiscal year enacted level;

(2) a delineation in the table for each appropriation by program, project, and activity for the respective appropriation; and

(3) an identification of items of special congressional interest.

## MINING APPLICATIONS

SEC. 404. (a) LIMITATION OF FUNDS.—None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available pursuant to this Act shall be obligated or expended to accept or process applications for a patent for any mining or mill site claim located under the general mining laws.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Subsection (a) shall not apply if the Secretary of the Interior determines that, for the claim concerned (1) a patent application was filed with the Secretary on or before September 30, 1994; and (2) all requirements established under sections 2325 and 2326 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 29 and 30) for vein or lode claims, sections 2329, 2330, 2331, and 2333 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 35, 36, and 37) for placer claims, and section 2337 of the Revised Statutes (30 U.S.C. 42) for mill site claims, as the case may be, were fully complied with by the applicant by that date.

(c) REPORT.—On September 30, 2018, the Secretary of the Interior shall file with the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations and the Committee on Natural Resources of the House and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report on actions taken by the Department under the plan submitted pursuant to section 314(c) of the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 1997 (Public Law 104-208).

(d) MINERAL EXAMINATIONS.—In order to process patent applications in a timely and responsible manner, upon the request of a patent applicant, the Secretary of the Interior shall allow the applicant to fund a qualified third-party contractor to be selected by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to conduct a mineral examination of the mining claims or mill sites contained in a patent application as set forth in subsection (b). The Bureau of Land Management shall have the sole responsibility to choose and pay the third-party contractor in accordance with the standard procedures employed by the Bureau of Land Management in the retention of third-party contractors.

## CONTRACT SUPPORT COSTS, PRIOR YEAR LIMITATION

SEC. 405. Sections 405 and 406 of division F of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2015 (Public Law 113-235) shall continue in effect in fiscal year 2017.

## CONTRACT SUPPORT COSTS, FISCAL YEAR 2017 LIMITATION

SEC. 406. Amounts provided by this Act for fiscal year 2017 under the headings “Department of Health and Human Services, Indian Health Service, Contract Support Costs” and “Department of the Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs and Bureau of Indian Education, Contract Support Costs” are the only amounts available for contract support costs arising out of self-determination or self-governance contracts, grants, compacts, or annual funding agreements for fiscal year 2017 with the Bureau of Indian Affairs or the Indian Health Service: *Provided*, That such amounts provided by this Act are not available for payment of claims for contract support costs for prior years, or for repayments of payments for settlements or judgments awarding contract support costs for prior years.

## FOREST MANAGEMENT PLANS

SEC. 407. The Secretary of Agriculture shall not be considered to be in violation of subparagraph 6(f)(5)(A) of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1604(f)(5)(A)) solely because more than 15 years have passed without revision of the plan for a unit of the National Forest System. Nothing in this section exempts the Secretary from any other

requirement of the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.) or any other law: *Provided*, That if the Secretary is not acting expeditiously and in good faith, within the funding available, to revise a plan for a unit of the National Forest System, this section shall be void with respect to such plan and a court of proper jurisdiction may order completion of the plan on an accelerated basis.

## PROHIBITION WITHIN NATIONAL MONUMENTS

SEC. 408. No funds provided in this Act may be expended to conduct preleasing, leasing and related activities under either the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 181 et seq.) or the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) within the boundaries of a National Monument established pursuant to the Act of June 8, 1906 (16 U.S.C. 431 et seq.) as such boundary existed on January 20, 2001, except where such activities are allowed under the Presidential proclamation establishing such monument.

## LIMITATION ON TAKINGS

SEC. 409. Unless otherwise provided herein, no funds appropriated in this Act for the acquisition of lands or interests in lands may be expended for the filing of declarations of taking or complaints in condemnation without the approval of the House and Senate Committees on Appropriations: *Provided*, That this provision shall not apply to funds appropriated to implement the Everglades National Park Protection and Expansion Act of 1989, or to funds appropriated for Federal assistance to the State of Florida to acquire lands for Everglades restoration purposes.

## TIMBER SALE REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 410. No timber sale in Alaska’s Region 10 shall be advertised if the indicated rate is deficit (defined as the value of the timber is not sufficient to cover all logging and stumpage costs and provide a normal profit and risk allowance under the Forest Service’s appraisal process) when appraised using a residual value appraisal. The western red cedar timber from those sales which is surplus to the needs of the domestic processors in Alaska, shall be made available to domestic processors in the contiguous 48 United States at prevailing domestic prices. All additional western red cedar volume not sold to Alaska or contiguous 48 United States domestic processors may be exported to foreign markets at the election of the timber sale holder. All Alaska yellow cedar may be sold at prevailing export prices at the election of the timber sale holder.

## PROHIBITION ON NO-BID CONTRACTS

SEC. 411. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act to executive branch agencies may be used to enter into any Federal contract unless such contract is entered into in accordance with the requirements of Chapter 33 of title 41, United States Code, or Chapter 137 of title 10, United States Code, and the Federal Acquisition Regulation, unless—

(1) Federal law specifically authorizes a contract to be entered into without regard for these requirements, including formula grants for States, or federally recognized Indian tribes; or

(2) such contract is authorized by the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act (Public Law 93-638, 25 U.S.C. 450 et seq.) or by any other Federal laws that specifically authorize a contract within an Indian tribe as defined in section 4(e) of that Act (25 U.S.C. 450b(e)); or

(3) such contract was awarded prior to the date of enactment of this Act.

## POSTING OF REPORTS

SEC. 412. (a) Any agency receiving funds made available in this Act, shall, subject to

subsections (b) and (c), post on the public website of that agency any report required to be submitted by the Congress in this or any other Act, upon the determination by the head of the agency that it shall serve the national interest.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply to a report if—

(1) the public posting of the report compromises national security; or

(2) the report contains proprietary information.

(c) The head of the agency posting such report shall do so only after such report has been made available to the requesting Committee or Committees of Congress for no less than 45 days.

## NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS GRANT GUIDELINES

SEC. 413. Of the funds provided to the National Endowment for the Arts—

(1) The Chairperson shall only award a grant to an individual if such grant is awarded to such individual for a literature fellowship, National Heritage Fellowship, or American Jazz Masters Fellowship.

(2) The Chairperson shall establish procedures to ensure that no funding provided through a grant, except a grant made to a State or local arts agency, or regional group, may be used to make a grant to any other organization or individual to conduct activity independent of the direct grant recipient. Nothing in this subsection shall prohibit payments made in exchange for goods and services.

(3) No grant shall be used for seasonal support to a group, unless the application is specific to the contents of the season, including identified programs or projects.

## NATIONAL ENDOWMENT FOR THE ARTS PROGRAM PRIORITIES

SEC. 414. (a) In providing services or awarding financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965 from funds appropriated under this Act, the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts shall ensure that priority is given to providing services or awarding financial assistance for projects, productions, workshops, or programs that serve underserved populations.

(b) In this section:

(1) The term “underserved population” means a population of individuals, including urban minorities, who have historically been outside the purview of arts and humanities programs due to factors such as a high incidence of income below the poverty line or to geographic isolation.

(2) The term “poverty line” means the poverty line (as defined by the Office of Management and Budget, and revised annually in accordance with section 673(2) of the Community Services Block Grant Act (42 U.S.C. 9902(2))) applicable to a family of the size involved.

(c) In providing services and awarding financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 with funds appropriated by this Act, the Chairperson of the National Endowment for the Arts shall ensure that priority is given to providing services or awarding financial assistance for projects, productions, workshops, or programs that will encourage public knowledge, education, understanding, and appreciation of the arts.

(d) With funds appropriated by this Act to carry out section 5 of the National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965—

(1) the Chairperson shall establish a grant category for projects, productions, workshops, or programs that are of national impact or availability or are able to tour several States;

(2) the Chairperson shall not make grants exceeding 15 percent, in the aggregate, of such funds to any single State, excluding grants made under the authority of paragraph (1);

(3) the Chairperson shall report to the Congress annually and by State, on grants awarded by the Chairperson in each grant category under section 5 of such Act; and

(4) the Chairperson shall encourage the use of grants to improve and support community-based music performance and education.

#### STATUS OF BALANCES OF APPROPRIATIONS

SEC. 415. The Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, the Forest Service, and the Indian Health Service shall provide the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and Senate quarterly reports on the status of balances of appropriations including all uncommitted, committed, and unobligated funds in each program and activity.

#### REPORT ON USE OF CLIMATE CHANGE FUNDS

SEC. 416. Not later than 120 days after the date on which the President's fiscal year 2018 budget request is submitted to the Congress, the President shall submit a comprehensive report to the Committees on Appropriations of the House of Representatives and the Senate describing in detail all Federal agency funding, domestic and international, for climate change programs, projects, and activities in fiscal years 2016 and 2017, including an accounting of funding by agency with each agency identifying climate change programs, projects, and activities and associated costs by line item as presented in the President's Budget Appendix, and including citations and linkages where practicable to each strategic plan that is driving funding within each climate change program, project, and activity listed in the report.

#### PROHIBITION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. 417. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act may be used to promulgate or implement any regulation requiring the issuance of permits under title V of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7661 et seq.) for carbon dioxide, nitrous oxide, water vapor, or methane emissions resulting from biological processes associated with livestock production.

#### GREENHOUSE GAS REPORTING RESTRICTIONS

SEC. 418. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, none of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to implement any provision in a rule, if that provision requires mandatory reporting of greenhouse gas emissions from manure management systems.

#### MODIFICATION OF AUTHORITIES

SEC. 419. (a) Section 8162(m)(3) of the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2000 (40 U.S.C. 8903 note; Public Law 106-79) is amended by striking "September 30, 2016" and inserting "September 30, 2017".

(b) For fiscal year 2017, the authority provided by the provisos under the heading "Dwight D. Eisenhower Memorial Commission—Capital Construction" in division E of Public Law 112-74 shall not be in effect.

#### FUNDING PROHIBITION

SEC. 420. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to regulate the lead content of ammunition, ammunition components, or fishing tackle under the Toxic Substances Control Act (15 U.S.C. 2601 et seq.) or any other law.

#### EXTENSION OF GRAZING PERMITS

SEC. 421. The terms and conditions of section 325 of Public Law 108-108 (117 Stat. 1307), regarding grazing permits issued by the For-

est Service on any lands not subject to administration under section 402 of the Federal Lands Policy and Management Act (43 U.S.C. 1752), shall remain in effect for fiscal year 2017.

#### RECREATION FEE

SEC. 422. Section 810 of the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act (16 U.S.C. 6809) is amended by striking "September 30, 2017" and inserting "September 30, 2018".

#### STEWARDSHIP CONTRACTING AMENDMENTS

SEC. 423. Section 604(d) of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6591c(d)) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5), by adding at the end the following: "Notwithstanding section 2 of the Act of July 31, 1947 (commonly known as the Materials Act of 1947; 30 U.S.C. 602), the Director may enter into an agreement or contract under subsection (b)."; and

(2) in paragraph (7)—

(A) by striking "and the Director"; and  
(B) by inserting "entered into by the Chief" after "contracts and agreements".

#### FUNDING PROHIBITION

SEC. 424. (a) None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to maintain or establish a computer network unless such network blocks the viewing, downloading, and exchanging of pornography.

(b) Nothing in subsection (a) shall limit the use of funds necessary for any Federal, State, tribal, or local law enforcement agency or any other entity carrying out criminal investigations, prosecution, or adjudication activities.

#### DEFINITION OF FILL MATERIAL

SEC. 425. None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce any change to the regulations in effect on October 1, 2012, pertaining to the definitions of the terms "fill material" or "discharge of fill material" for the purposes of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.).

#### CLARIFICATION OF EXEMPTIONS

SEC. 426. Notwithstanding section 404(f)(2) of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(2)), none of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require a permit for the discharge of dredged or fill material under the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.) for the activities identified in subparagraphs (A) and (C) of section 404(f)(1) of the Act (33 U.S.C. 1344(f)(1)(A), (C)).

#### WATERS OF THE UNITED STATES

SEC. 427. None of the funds made available in this Act or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used to develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce any change to the regulations and guidance in effect on October 1, 2012, pertaining to the definition of waters under the jurisdiction of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251, et seq.), including the provisions of the rules dated November 13, 1986, and August 25, 1993, relating to said jurisdiction, and the guidance documents dated January 15, 2003, and December 2, 2008, relating to said jurisdiction.

#### HUNTING, FISHING, AND RECREATIONAL SHOOTING ON FEDERAL LAND

SEC. 428. (a) LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS.—None of the funds made available by this or any other Act for any fiscal year may be used to prohibit the use of or access to Federal land (as such term is defined in section 3 of the Healthy Forests Restoration Act of 2003 (16 U.S.C. 6502)) for hunting, fishing, or recreational shooting if such use or access—

(1) was not prohibited on such Federal land as of January 1, 2013; and

(2) was conducted in compliance with the resource management plan (as defined in section 101 of such Act (16 U.S.C. 6511)) applicable to such Federal land as of January 1, 2013.

(b) TEMPORARY CLOSURES ALLOWED.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Agriculture may temporarily close, for a period not to exceed 30 days, Federal land managed by the Secretary to hunting, fishing, or recreational shooting if the Secretary determines that the temporary closure is necessary to accommodate a special event or for public safety reasons. The Secretary may extend a temporary closure for one additional 90-day period only if the Secretary determines the extension is necessary because of extraordinary weather conditions or for public safety reasons.

(c) AUTHORITY OF STATES.—Nothing in this section shall be construed as affecting the authority, jurisdiction, or responsibility of the several States to manage, control, or regulate fish and resident wildlife under State law or regulations.

#### LEAD TEST KIT

SEC. 429. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce regulations under sections 745.84 and 745.86 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, or any subsequent amendments to such regulations, until the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency—

(1) publicizes Environmental Protection Agency recognition of a commercially available lead test kit that meets both criteria under section 745.88(c) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations; or

(2) solicits public comment on alternatives to subpart E of part 745 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, following the date of enactment of this Act.

#### FINANCIAL ASSURANCE

SEC. 430. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop, propose, finalize, implement, enforce, or administer any regulation that would establish new financial responsibility requirements pursuant to section 108(b) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9608(b)).

#### GHG NSPS

SEC. 431. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to propose, finalize, implement, or enforce—

(1) any standard of performance under section 111(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(b)) for any new fossil fuel-fired electricity utility generating unit if the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency's determination that a technology is adequately demonstrated includes consideration of one or more facilities for which assistance is provided (including any tax credit) under subtitle A of title IV of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 15961 et seq.) or section 48A of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986;

(2) any regulation or guidance under section 111(b) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(b)) establishing any standard of performance for emissions of any greenhouse gas from any modified or reconstructed source that is a fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating unit; or

(3) any regulation or guidance under section 111(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(d)) that applies to the emission of any greenhouse gas by an existing source that is a fossil fuel-fired electric utility generating unit.

#### AVAILABILITY OF VACANT GRAZING ALLOTMENTS

SEC. 432. The Secretary of the Interior, with respect to public lands administered by

the Bureau of Land Management, and the Secretary of Agriculture, with respect to the National Forest System lands, shall make vacant grazing allotments available to a holder of a grazing permit or lease issued by either Secretary if the lands covered by the permit or lease or other grazing lands used by the holder of the permit or lease are unusable because of drought or wildfire, as determined by the Secretary concerned. The terms and conditions contained in a permit or lease made available pursuant to this section shall be the same as the terms and conditions of the most recent permit or lease that was applicable to the vacant grazing allotment made available. Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4332) shall not apply with respect to any Federal agency action under this section.

#### PROTECTION OF WATER RIGHTS

SEC. 433. None of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to condition the issuance, renewal, amendment, or extension of any permit, approval, license, lease, allotment, easement, right-of-way, or other land use or occupancy agreement on the transfer of any water right, including sole and joint ownership, directly to the United States, or any impairment of title, in whole or in part, granted or otherwise recognized under State law, by Federal or State adjudication, decree, or other judgment, or pursuant to any interstate water compact. Additionally, none of the funds made available in this or any other Act may be used to require any water user to apply for or acquire a water right in the name of the United States under State law as a condition of the issuance, renewal, amendment, or extension of any permit, approval, license, lease, allotment, easement, right-of-way, or other land use or occupancy agreement.

#### LIMITATION ON STATUS CHANGES

SEC. 434. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to propose, finalize, implement, or enforce any regulation or guidance under Section 612 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7671k) that changes the status from acceptable to unacceptable for purposes of the Significant New Alternatives Policy (SNAP) program of any hydrofluorocarbon used as a refrigerant or in foam blowing agents, applications or uses. Nothing in this section shall prevent EPA from approving new materials, applications or uses as acceptable under the SNAP program.

#### USE OF AMERICAN IRON AND STEEL

SEC. 435. (a)(1) None of the funds made available by a State water pollution control revolving fund as authorized by section 1452 of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-12) shall be used for a project for the construction, alteration, maintenance, or repair of a public water system or treatment works unless all of the iron and steel products used in the project are produced in the United States.

(2) In this section, the term “iron and steel” products means the following products made primarily of iron or steel: lined or unlined pipes and fittings, manhole covers and other municipal castings, hydrants, tanks, flanges, pipe clamps and restraints, valves, structural steel, reinforced precast concrete, and construction materials.

(b) Subsection (a) shall not apply in any case or category of cases in which the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency (in this section referred to as the “Administrator”) finds that—

(1) applying subsection (a) would be inconsistent with the public interest;

(2) iron and steel products are not produced in the United States in sufficient and reasonably available quantities and of a satisfactory quality; or

(3) inclusion of iron and steel products produced in the United States will increase the cost of the overall project by more than 25 percent.

(c) If the Administrator receives a request for a waiver under this section, the Administrator shall make available to the public on an informal basis a copy of the request and information available to the Administrator concerning the request, and shall allow for informal public input on the request for at least 15 days prior to making a finding based on the request. The Administrator shall make the request and accompanying information available by electronic means, including on the official public Internet Web site of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(d) This section shall be applied in a manner consistent with United States obligations under international agreements.

(e) The Administrator may retain up to 0.25 percent of the funds appropriated in this Act for the Clean and Drinking Water State Revolving Funds for carrying out the provisions described in subsection (a)(1) for management and oversight of the requirements of this section.

#### SOCIAL COST OF CARBON

SEC. 436. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act shall be used for the social cost of carbon (SCC) to be incorporated into any rulemaking or guidance document until a new Interagency Working Group (IWG) revises the estimates using the discount rates and the domestic-only limitation on benefits estimates in accordance with Executive Order 12866 and OMB Circular A-4 as of January 1, 2015: *Provided*, That such IWG shall provide to the public all documents, models, and assumptions used in developing the SCC and solicit public comment prior to finalizing any revised estimates.

#### LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVES

SEC. 437. None of the funds made available by this or any other Act may be used to implement or enforce, or to require States to implement or enforce, the provisions of 40 CFR 170.311(b)(9) as published in the Federal Register on November 2, 2015.

#### OZONE

SEC. 438. To implement the national ambient air quality standards for ozone published in the Federal Register on October 26, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 65292):

(1) the Governor of each State shall designate areas of the State as attainment, non-attainment, or unclassifiable with respect to the standards not later than October 26, 2024;

(2) the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency shall promulgate final designations for all areas in all States with respect to the standards not later than October 26, 2025;

(3) each State shall submit the plan required by section 110(a)(1) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(1)) for the standards not later than October 26, 2026;

(4) the standards shall not apply to the review and disposition of a preconstruction permit application required under part C or D of title I of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7470 et seq.) if the Administrator or the State, local or tribal permitting authority, as applicable, has determined the application to be complete prior to the date of promulgation of final designations, or has published a public notice of a preliminary determination or draft permit before the date that is 60 days after the date of promulgation of final designations; and

(5) the provisions of subsections (1) through (4) above shall apply notwithstanding the deadlines set forth in Section 107(d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7407(d))

and Section 110(a)(1) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7410(a)(1)).

#### METHANE EMISSIONS

SEC. 439. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to develop, propose, finalize, implement or enforce—

(1) any rule or guideline to address methane emissions from sources in the oil and natural gas sector under Sections 111(b) or (d) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7411(b), 7411(d));

(2) any rule changing the term “adjacent” for purposes of defining “stationary source” and “major source” as applied to the oil and gas sector under the Clean Air Act; and

(3) proposed Draft Control Techniques Guidelines for the Oil and Natural Gas Industry released September 18, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 56577).

#### ROYALTY RATES

SEC. 440. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement any changes to royalty rates or product valuation regulations under Federal coal, oil, and gas leasing programs.

#### PROGRAM REVIEW

SEC. 441. (a) TERMINATION.—Secretarial Order 3338, issued by the Secretary of the Interior on January 15, 2016, shall have no force or effect on and after the earlier of—

(1) September 30, 2017; or

(2) the date of publication of notice under subsection (b).

(b) PUBLICATION OF NOTICE.—The Secretary of the Interior shall promptly publish notice of the completion of the Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement directed to be prepared under that order.

#### NATIONAL GALLERY OF ART

SEC. 442. Section 6301(2) of title 40, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding subparagraph (A), by striking “The National Gallery of Art” and inserting “(A) The National Gallery of Art”;

(2) by redesignating subparagraphs (A), (B), and (C) as clauses (i), (ii), and (iii), respectively; and

(3) by adding at the end the following new subparagraph: “(B) All other buildings, service roads, walks, and other areas within the exterior boundaries of any real estate or land or interest in land (including temporary use) that the National Gallery of Art acquires and that the Director of the National Gallery of Art determines to be necessary for the adequate protection of individuals or property in the National Gallery of Art and suitable for administration as a part of the National Gallery of Art.”.

#### BLM PLANNING 2.0 RULEMAKING ON LAND USE PLANNING PROCEDURES

SEC. 443. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to promulgate, implement, administer, or enforce the rule published by the Bureau of Land Management in the Federal Register on February 25, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 9673 et seq.; Fed. Reg. Doc. No. 2016-03232), to amend subparts 1601 and 1610 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations, which establish the procedures used to prepare, revise, or amend land use plans pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.), until the Secretary of the Interior provides an additional 90-day period for public comments on the proposed rule and holds at least one more public meeting on the proposed rule in each of the eleven contiguous Western States (as defined in section 103(o) of such Act (43 U.S.C. 1702(o))), Texas, and Oklahoma.

#### HUMANE TRANSFER OF EXCESS ANIMALS

SEC. 444. Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary of the Interior may transfer excess wild horses or burros



that have been removed from the public lands to other Federal, State, and local government agencies for use as work animals: *Provided*, That the Secretary may make any such transfer immediately upon request of such Federal, State, or local government agency: *Provided further*, That any excess animal transferred under this provision shall lose its status as a wild free-roaming horse or burro as defined in the Wild Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act: *Provided further*, That any Federal, State, or local government agency receiving excess wild horses or burros as authorized in this section shall not destroy the horses or burros in a way that results in their destruction into commercial products, or sell or otherwise transfer the horses in a way that results in their destruction for processing into commercial products.

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR TREATMENT OF LESSER PRAIRIE CHICKEN UNDER ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973

SEC. 445. None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to treat the lesser prairie chicken as an endangered species or threatened species, or a candidate for listing as such a species, under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

INDIAN HEALTH GOVERNING BOARD

SEC. 446. Not later than six months after the date of receipt by the Secretary of Health and Human Services of a written request from the tribe or tribes served by a hospital operated by the Indian Health Service, the Secretary shall install a governance board exclusively for such hospital for a trial period of three years: *Provided*, That the governance board shall be comprised of Indian Health Service senior executives, elected tribal officials, and hospital administration experts outside of the Indian Health Service system: *Provided further*, that the governance board shall follow industry-wide best practices: *Provided further*, that the governance board shall approve, oversee the implementation of, and evaluate metrics of quality care, patient safety and satisfaction, and finance: *Provided further*, that the governance board shall work with the Indian Health Service on developing standards and procedures for employee recruitment, retention, training, communication, and dismissal to assure consistency with other high performing federally run health facilities: *Provided further*, that the hospital shall have a chief executive officer hired and accountable to the Director of the Indian Health Service who shall be a liaison between the Indian Health Service and the governance board: *Provided further*, that the chief executive officer shall retain authority for all hospital personnel matters in accordance with existing law: *Provided further*, that the chief executive officer and the governance board shall sign a memorandum of understanding to share all pertinent hospital information while protecting individual privacy rights in accordance with existing law: *Provided further*, that the Secretary shall replace the chief executive officer upon receipt of a written request by the governance board: *Provided further*, that the governance board shall meet at the hospital regularly: *Provided further*, that the governance board shall regularly communicate to the affected tribe or tribes, to the Secretary, and to the Congress: *Provided further*, that at the end of the trial period, the governance board shall publish and disseminate a report evaluating the aforementioned metrics and providing recommendations for any other tribe or tribes wanting to establish a similar governance board at any other hospital operated by the Indian Health Service: *Provided further*, that if a tribe moves from direct service delivery to delivery through contracting or com-

acting pursuant to Public Law 93-638, the tribe involved in the pilot has the opportunity to end the pilot and the opportunity to collaborate with the Indian Health Service to reconfigure a governance structure in which that Indian Health Service may upon request continue its participation in the governance structure in a contracted or compacted arrangement.

SCIENTIFICALLY SUPPORTED IMPLEMENTATION OF OMR FLOW REQUIREMENTS

SEC. 447. (a) To maximize water supplies for the Central Valley Project and the State Water Project, in implementing the provisions of the smelt biological opinion or salmonid biological opinion, or any successor biological opinions or court orders, pertaining to management of reverse flow in the Old and Middle Rivers, the Secretary of the Interior shall—

(1) consider the relevant provisions of the applicable biological opinions or any successor biological opinions;

(2) manage export pumping rates to achieve a reverse OMR flow rate of -5,000 cubic feet per second unless existing information or that developed by the Secretary of the Interior under paragraphs (3) and (4) leads the Secretary to reasonably conclude, using the best scientific and commercial data available, that a less negative OMR flow rate is necessary to avoid a significant negative impact on the long-term survival of the species covered by the smelt biological opinion or salmonid biological opinion. If the best scientific and commercial data available to the Secretary indicates that a reverse OMR flow rate more negative than -5,000 cubic feet per second can be established without an imminent negative impact on the long-term survival of the species covered by the smelt biological opinion or salmonid biological opinion, the Secretary shall manage export pumping rates to achieve that more negative OMR flow rate;

(3) document, in writing, any significant facts about real-time conditions relevant to the determinations of OMR reverse flow rates, including—

(A) whether targeted real-time fish monitoring pursuant to this section, including monitoring in the vicinity of Station 902, indicates that a significant negative impact on the long-term survival of species covered by the smelt biological opinion or salmonid biological opinion is imminent; and

(B) whether near-term forecasts with available models show under prevailing conditions that OMR flow of -5,000 cubic feet per second or higher will cause a significant negative impact on the long-term survival of species covered by the smelt biological opinion or salmonid biological opinion;

(4) show, in writing, that any determination to manage OMR reverse flow at rates less negative than -5,000 cubic feet per second is necessary to avoid a significant negative impact on the long-term survival of species covered by the smelt biological opinion or salmonid biological opinion, and provide, in writing, an explanation of the data examined and the connection between those data and the choice made, after considering—

(A) the distribution of Delta smelt throughout the Delta;

(B) the potential effects of documented, quantified entrainment on subsequent Delta smelt abundance;

(C) the water temperature;

(D) other significant factors relevant to the determination; and

(E) whether any alternative measures could have a substantially lesser water supply impact; and

(5) for any subsequent smelt biological opinion or salmonid biological opinion, make the showing required in paragraph (4) for any

determination to manage OMR reverse flow at rates less negative than the most negative limit in the biological opinion if the most negative limit in the biological opinion is more negative than -5,000 cubic feet per second.

(b) NO REINITIATION OF CONSULTATION.—In implementing or at the conclusion of actions under subsection (a), the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce shall not reinitiate consultation on those adjusted operations unless there is a significant negative impact on the long-term survival of the species covered by the smelt biological opinion or salmonid biological opinion. Any action taken under subsection (a) that does not create a significant negative impact on the long-term survival to species covered by the smelt biological opinion or salmonid biological opinion will not alter application of the take permitted by the incidental take statement in the biological opinion under section 7(o)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

(c) CALCULATION OF REVERSE FLOW IN OMR.—Within 90 days of the enactment of this title, the Secretary of the Interior is directed, in consultation with the California Department of Water Resources to revise the method used to calculate reverse flow in Old and Middle Rivers, for implementation of the reasonable and prudent alternatives in the smelt biological opinion and the salmonid biological opinion, and any succeeding biological opinions, for the purpose of increasing Central Valley Project and State Water Project water supplies. The method of calculating reverse flow in Old and Middle Rivers shall be reevaluated not less than every five years thereafter to achieve maximum export pumping rates within limits established by the smelt biological opinion, the salmonid biological opinion, and any succeeding biological opinions.

TEMPORARY OPERATIONAL FLEXIBILITY FOR FIRST FEW STORMS OF THE WATER YEAR

SEC. 448. (a) IN GENERAL.—Consistent with avoiding an immediate significant negative impact on the long-term survival upon listed fish species over and above the range of impacts authorized under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 and other environmental protections under subsection (d), the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce shall authorize the Central Valley Project and the California State Water Project, combined, to operate at levels that result in negative OMR flows at -7,500 cubic feet per second (based on United States Geological Survey gauges on Old and Middle Rivers) daily average as described in subsections (b) and (c) to capture peak flows during storm events.

(b) DAYS OF TEMPORARY OPERATIONAL FLEXIBILITY.—The temporary operational flexibility described in subsection (a) shall be authorized on days that the California Department of Water Resources determines the net Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta outflow index is at, or above, 13,000 cubic feet per second.

(c) COMPLIANCE WITH ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT AUTHORIZATIONS.—In carrying out this section, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce may continue to impose any requirements under the smelt biological opinion and salmonid biological opinion during any period of temporary operational flexibility as they determine are reasonably necessary to avoid additional significant negative impacts on the long-term survival of a listed fish species over and above the range of impacts authorized under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, provided that the requirements imposed do not reduce water supplies available for the Central Valley Project and the California State Water Project.

## (d) OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTIONS.—

(1) STATE LAW.—The actions of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce under this section shall be consistent with applicable regulatory requirements under State law. The foregoing does not constitute a waiver of sovereign immunity.

(2) FIRST SEDIMENT FLUSH.—During the first flush of sediment out of the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta in each water year, and provided that such determination is based upon objective evidence, OMR flow may be managed at rates less negative than  $-5,000$  cubic feet per second for a minimum duration to avoid movement of adult Delta smelt (*Hypomesus transpacificus*) to areas in the southern Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta that would be likely to increase entrainment at Central Valley Project and California State Water Project pumping plants.

(3) APPLICABILITY OF OPINION.—This section shall not affect the application of the salmonid biological opinion from April 1 to May 31, unless the Secretary of Commerce finds, based on the best scientific and commercial data available, that some or all of such applicable requirements may be adjusted during this time period to provide emergency water supply relief without resulting in additional adverse effects over and above the range of impacts authorized under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. In addition to any other actions to benefit water supply, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce shall consider allowing through-Delta water transfers to occur during this period if they can be accomplished consistent with section 3405(a)(1)(H) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act. Water transfers solely or exclusively through the California State Water Project that do not require any use of Reclamation facilities or approval by Reclamation are not required to be consistent with section 3405(a)(1)(H) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act.

(4) MONITORING.—During operations under this section, the Commissioner of Reclamation, in coordination with the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, National Marine Fisheries Service, and California Department of Fish and Wildlife, shall undertake expanded monitoring programs and other data gathering to improve Central Valley Project and California State Water Project water supplies, to ensure incidental take levels are not exceeded, and to identify potential negative impacts, if any, and actions necessary to mitigate impacts of the temporary operational flexibility to species listed under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(e) EFFECT OF HIGH OUTFLOWS.—In recognition of the high outflow levels from the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta during the days this section is in effect under subsection (b), the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce shall not count such days toward the 5-day and 14-day running averages of tidally filtered daily Old and Middle River flow requirements under the smelt biological opinion and salmonid biological opinion, as long as the Secretaries avoid significant negative impact on the long-term survival of listed fish species over and above the range of impacts authorized under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

(f) LEVEL OF DETAIL REQUIRED FOR ANALYSIS.—In articulating the determinations required under this section, the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce shall fully satisfy the requirements herein but shall not be expected to provide a greater level of supporting detail for the analysis than feasible to provide within the short timeframe permitted for timely decision

making in response to changing conditions in the Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta.

(g) OMR FLOWS.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce shall, through the adaptive management provisions in the salmonid biological opinion, limit OMR reverse flow to  $-5,000$  cubic feet per second based on date-certain triggers in the salmonid biological opinions only if using real-time migration information on salmonids demonstrates that such action is necessary to avoid a significant negative impact on the long-term survival of listed fish species over and above the range of impacts authorized under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

(h) NO REINITIATION OF CONSULTATION.—In implementing or at the conclusion of actions under this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall not reinitiate consultation on those adjusted operations if there is no immediate significant negative impact on the long-term survival of listed fish species over and above the range of impacts authorized under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Any action taken under this section that does not create an immediate significant negative impact on the long-term survival of listed fish species over and above the range of impacts authorized under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 will not alter application of the take permitted by the incidental take statement in those biological opinions under section 7(o)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

## STATE WATER PROJECT OFFSET AND WATER RIGHTS PROTECTIONS

## SEC. 449. (a) OFFSET FOR STATE WATER PROJECT.—

(1) IMPLEMENTATION IMPACTS.—The Secretary of the Interior shall confer with the California Department of Fish and Wildlife in connection with the implementation of this section on potential impacts to any consistency determination for operations of the State Water Project issued pursuant to California Fish and Game Code section 2080.1.

(2) ADDITIONAL YIELD.—If, as a result of the application of this section, the California Department of Fish and Wildlife—

(A) determines that operations of the State Water Project are inconsistent with the consistency determinations issued pursuant to California Fish and Game Code section 2080.1 for operations of the State Water Project; or

(B) requires take authorization under California Fish and Game Code section 2081 for operation of the State Water Project in a manner that directly or indirectly results in reduced water supply to the State Water Project as compared with the water supply available under the smelt biological opinion and the salmonid biological opinion; and as a result, Central Valley Project yield is greater than it otherwise would have been, then that additional yield shall be made available to the State Water Project for delivery to State Water Project contractors to offset that reduced water supply.

(3) NOTIFICATION RELATED TO ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTIONS.—The Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Commerce shall—

(A) notify the Director of the California Department of Fish and Wildlife regarding any changes in the manner in which the smelt biological opinion or the salmonid biological opinion is implemented; and

(B) confirm that those changes are consistent with the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

(b) AREA OF ORIGIN AND WATER RIGHTS PROTECTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce, in carrying out the mandates of this section, shall take no action that—

(A) diminishes, impairs, or otherwise affects in any manner any area of origin, wa-

tershed of origin, county of origin, or any other water rights protection, including rights to water appropriated before December 19, 1914, provided under State law;

(B) limits, expands or otherwise affects the application of section 10505, 10505.5, 11128, 11460, 11461, 11462, 11463 or 12200 through 12220 of the California Water Code or any other provision of State water rights law, without respect to whether such a provision is specifically referred to in this section; or

(C) diminishes, impairs, or otherwise affects in any manner any water rights or water rights priorities under applicable law.

(2) SECTION 7 OF THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT.—Any action proposed to be undertaken by the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce pursuant to both this section and section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) shall be undertaken in a manner that does not alter water rights or water rights priorities established by California law or it shall not be undertaken at all. Nothing in this subsection affects the obligations of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973.

(3) EFFECT OF ACT.—

(A) Nothing in this section affects or modifies any obligation of the Secretary of the Interior under section 8 of the Act of June 17, 1902 (32 Stat. 390, chapter 1093).

(B) Nothing in this section diminishes, impairs, or otherwise affects in any manner any Project purposes or priorities for the allocation, delivery or use of water under applicable law, including the Project purposes and priorities established under section 3402 and section 3406 of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (Public Law 102-575; 106 Stat. 4706).

(c) NO REDIRECTED ADVERSE IMPACTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Interior and Secretary of Commerce shall not carry out any specific action authorized under this section that will directly or through State agency action indirectly result in the involuntary reduction of water supply to an individual, district, or agency that has in effect a contract for water with the State Water Project or the Central Valley Project, including Settlement and Exchange contracts, refuge contracts, and Friant Division contracts, as compared to the water supply that would be provided in the absence of action under this section, and nothing in this section is intended to modify, amend or affect any of the rights and obligations of the parties to such contracts.

(2) ACTION ON DETERMINATION.—If, after exploring all options, the Secretary of the Interior or the Secretary of Commerce makes a final determination that a proposed action under this section cannot be carried out in accordance with paragraph (1), that Secretary—

(A) shall document that determination in writing for that action, including a statement of the facts relied on, and an explanation of the basis, for the decision;

(B) may exercise the Secretary's existing authority, including authority to undertake the drought-related actions otherwise addressed in this title, or to otherwise comply with other applicable law, including the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.); and

(C) shall comply with subsection (a).

(d) ALLOCATIONS FOR SACRAMENTO VALLEY WATER SERVICE CONTRACTORS.—

(1) DEFINITIONS.—In this subsection:

(A) EXISTING CENTRAL VALLEY PROJECT AGRICULTURAL WATER SERVICE CONTRACTOR WITHIN THE SACRAMENTO RIVER WATERSHED.—The term "existing Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractor within the Sacramento River Watershed" means

any water service contractor within the Shasta, Trinity, or Sacramento River division of the Central Valley Project that has in effect a water service contract on the date of enactment of this section that provides water for irrigation.

(B) YEAR TERMS.—The terms “Above Normal”, “Below Normal”, “Dry”, and “Wet”, with respect to a year, have the meanings given those terms in the Sacramento Valley Water Year Type (40-30-30) Index.

(2) ALLOCATIONS OF WATER.—

(A) ALLOCATIONS.—Subject to subsection (c), the Secretary of the Interior shall make every reasonable effort in the operation of the Central Valley Project to allocate water provided for irrigation purposes to each existing Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractor within the Sacramento River Watershed in accordance with the following:

(i) Not less than 100 percent of the contract quantity of the existing Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractor within the Sacramento River Watershed in a “Wet” year.

(ii) Not less than 100 percent of the contract quantity of the existing Central Valley Project agricultural water service Contractor within the Sacramento River Watershed in an “Above Normal” year.

(iii) Not less than 100 percent of the contract quantity of the existing Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractor within the Sacramento River Watershed in a “Below Normal” year that is preceded by an “Above Normal” or “Wet” year.

(iv) Not less than 50 percent of the contract quantity of the existing Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractor within the Sacramento River Watershed in a “Dry” year that is preceded by a “Below Normal”, “Above Normal”, or “Wet” year.

(v) Subject to clause (ii), in any other year not identified in any of clauses (i) through (iv), not less than twice the allocation percentage to south-of-Delta Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractors, up to 100 percent.

(B) EFFECT OF CLAUSE.—Nothing in clause (A)(v) precludes an allocation to an existing Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractor within the Sacramento River Watershed that is greater than twice the allocation percentage to a south-of-Delta Central Valley Project agricultural water service contractor.

(3) PROTECTION OF ENVIRONMENT, MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL SUPPLIES, AND OTHER CONTRACTORS.—

(A) ENVIRONMENT.—Nothing in paragraph (2) shall adversely affect—

(i) the cold water pool behind Shasta Dam;

(ii) the obligation of the Secretary of the Interior to make water available to managed wetlands pursuant to section 3406(d) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (Public Law 102-575; 106 Stat. 4722); or

(iii) any obligation—

(I) of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce under the smelt biological opinion, the salmonid biological opinion, or any other applicable biological opinion; or

(II) under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) or any other applicable law (including regulations).

(B) MUNICIPAL AND INDUSTRIAL SUPPLIES.—Nothing in paragraph (2)—

(i) modifies any provision of a water Service contract that addresses municipal or industrial water shortage policies of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce;

(ii) affects or limits the authority of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary

of Commerce to adopt or modify municipal and industrial water shortage policies;

(iii) affects or limits the authority of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Commerce to implement a municipal or industrial water shortage policy;

(iv) constrains, governs, or affects, directly or indirectly, the operations of the American River division of the Central Valley Project or any deliveries from that division or a unit or facility of that division; or

(v) affects any allocation to a Central Valley Project municipal or industrial water service contractor by increasing or decreasing allocations to the contractor, as compared to the allocation the contractor would have received absent paragraph (2).

(C) OTHER CONTRACTORS.—Nothing in subsection (b)—

(i) affects the priority of any individual or entity with Sacramento River water rights, including an individual or entity with a Sacramento River settlement contract, that has priority to the diversion and use of Sacramento River water over water rights held by the United States for operations of the Central Valley Project;

(ii) affects the obligation of the United States to make a substitute supply of water available to the San Joaquin River exchange contractors;

(iii) affects the allocation of water to Friant division contractors of the Central Valley Project;

(iv) results in the involuntary reduction in contract water allocations to individuals or entities with contracts to receive water from the Friant division; or

(v) authorizes any actions inconsistent with State water rights law.

SEC. 450. None of the funds in this Act shall be available to implement the Stipulation of Settlement (Natural Resources Defense Council, et al. v. Kirk Rodgers, et al., Eastern District of California, No. Civ. 9 S-88-1658 LKK/GGH) or subtitle A of title X of Public Law 111-11.

SEC. 451. None of the funds in this Act shall be available for the purchase of water in the State of California to supplement instream flow within a river basin that has suffered a drought within the last two years.

SEC. 452. The Commissioner of Reclamation is directed to work with local water and irrigation districts in the Stanislaus River Basin to ascertain the water storage made available by the Draft Plan of Operations in New Melones Reservoir (DRPO) for water conservation programs, conjunctive use projects, water transfers, rescheduled project water and other projects to maximize water storage and ensure the beneficial use of the water resources in the Stanislaus River Basin. All such programs and projects shall be implemented according to all applicable laws and regulations. The source of water for any such storage program at New Melones Reservoir shall be made available under a valid water right, consistent with the State water transfer guidelines and any other applicable State water law. The Commissioner shall inform the Congress within 18 months setting forth the amount of storage made available by the DRPO that has been put to use under this program, including proposals received by the Commissioner from interested parties for the purpose of this section.

SEC. 453. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to make a Presidential declaration by public proclamation of a national monument under chapter 3203 of title 54, United States Code in the counties of Coconino, Maricopa, Mohave and Yavapai in the State of Arizona, in the counties of Modoc and Siskiyou in the State of California, in the counties of Chaffee, Conejos, Dolores, Moffat, Montezuma, and Park in the State of Colorado, in the coun-

ties of Carson City, Churchill, Clark, Douglas, Elko, Eureka, Humboldt, Lander, Lincoln, Lyon, Nye, Pershing, Storey and Washoe in the State of Nevada, in the county of Otero in the State of New Mexico, in the counties of Jackson, Josephine and, Malheur in the State of Oregon, in the counties of Beaver, Carbon, Duchesne, Emery, Garfield, Iron, Juab, Kane, Millard, Piute, San Juan, Sanpete, Sevier, Tooele, Uintah, Washington, and Wayne in the State of Utah, or in the county of Penobscot in the State of Maine.

SPENDING REDUCTION ACCOUNT

SEC. 454. The amount by which the applicable allocation of new budget authority made by the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 exceeds the amount of proposed new budget authority is \$0.

The CHAIR. Are there any points of order against that portion of the bill?

POINT OF ORDER

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I raise a point of order against section 128—that is, page 71, lines 19 through 25—of an otherwise excellent H.R. 5538 for failure to comply with clause 2 of rule XXI. This provision proposes to construe existing law by approving after the fact certain actions of the Secretary of the Interior found to violate section 5 of the Indian Reorganization Act of 1939 by the Supreme Court in the case of *Carcieri v. Salazar*. That case held that lands taken into trust by the Secretary of the Interior for tribes that were not federally recognized on June 18, 1934, were invalid.

This constitutes legislation on an appropriations bill in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI. I ask for a ruling from the Chair.

The CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, if I could ask Chairman BISHOP to a question, I just want to be clear. Is the chairman planning on moving the Carcieri language that has been in his committee for quite a while?

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman may argue on the point of order only.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Oh, I am sorry. Thank you.

The CHAIR. Does any other Member wish to be heard on the point of order?

The Chair is prepared to rule.

The Chair finds that this provision construes existing law by deeming specified lands to be trust land. The provision, therefore, constitutes legislation in violation of clause 2 of rule XXI.

The point of order is sustained, and the provision is stricken from the bill.

No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in House Report 114-683, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of House Resolution 820, and pro forma amendments described in section 4 of that resolution.

Each amendment printed in the report shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in

the report, shall be considered as 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 except as provided by section 4 of House Resolution 820, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except as provided by section 4 of House Resolution 820, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

During consideration of the bill for amendment, the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees may offer up to 10 pro forma amendments each at any point for the purpose of debate.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 114-683.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. 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 8, line 22, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$2,434,000)".

Page 38, line 20, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$2,434,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment increases the law enforcement budget for America's national wildlife refuges by \$2.4 million to match the President's budget request. The plus-up would be fully offset from the account relating to the Office of the Secretary.

Mr. Chairman, America's national wildlife refuges encompass millions and millions of acres of public conservation lands and waters that provide endless opportunities for families to fish and enjoy the great outdoors. Our wildlife refuges are extremely popular, with over 48 million visitors annually, but many folks do not know they are suffering from a serious shortfall in law enforcement protection.

In May of 2015, the International Association of Chiefs of Police recommended substantial increases to law enforcement resources for our national wildlife refuges. The report detailed the urgent need for officers to counter

nefarious activities like drug production and smuggling, wildlife poaching, illegal border activity, assaults, and a variety of natural resource violations.

This is consistent with what I hear at home in the Tampa Bay area. I represent the Egmont Key National Wildlife Refuge. It is part of a massive 30,000-acre national wildlife refuge complex, the Chassahowitzka on the west coast of Florida along the Gulf of Mexico. That 30,000 acres has two law enforcement officers assigned to it, and this is a busy, busy tourist area. People really enjoy the wildlife refuges, but they are really suffering from a lot of nefarious activities.

We need these additional funds, and with the additional funds, the Service should prioritize hiring additional Federal wildlife officers to serve the urban refuges and obtain equipment that is necessary to protect the resources and protect the visitors.

In 2014, Service Federal wildlife officers managed over 42,000 service-related incidents, crimes, and request for services. That was a 20 percent increase from 2013, which included rapes, robberies, kidnappings, assaults, burglaries, larcenies, motor vehicle thefts, natural resource violations, timber thefts, arsons, trespassing, poaching, hunting and fishing violations, undocumented person apprehensions. In 2015, there were over 306 serious incidents reported, a 6 percent increase over the previous year.

My home State of Florida is blessed with beautiful bays and rivers and coastline. We have the most wildlife refuges in the country, with 29, including the three in Tampa Bay: The beautiful Egmont Key Wildlife Refuge, Pinellas, and Passage Key. These are areas we have to protect, and we have to protect the visitors that enjoy our wildlife refuges.

The number of visitors is increasing every year, and we can't ignore the shortage of law enforcement officers anymore. This is an ongoing shortage that must be addressed. I urge my colleagues to address this important public safety issue and adopt the Castor amendment.

I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Ms. CASTOR's amendment.

This amendment seeks additional funding for the refuge law enforcement, which we saw here the national wildlife refuge highlight the need for adequate law enforcement to protect our national wildlife refuge.

This amendment will also ensure that refuge law enforcement, along with others in the Interior bill who provide law enforcement, will make sure that our visitors and our public employees and our natural resources all remain safe, and especially that these men and women can come home to their loved ones at the end of their shift.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I recognize and support the need for a right size law enforcement presence wherever people visit Federal lands, but this amendment would implement the budget request to hire 16 more Federal wildlife fire officers primarily in urban areas.

Urban areas already have a strong local law enforcement presence, so the Federal Government should first look to contract with local law enforcement before deciding to hire more Federal officers. Furthermore, of all the law enforcement responsibilities covered in this bill, the biggest gap exists on Indian reservations, where 911 response times are often measured in hours and days instead of minutes.

Before we pull more money out of the account that pays unsung civil servants to carry out the most fundamental functions of the department, let's make sure we are putting the dollars where they are needed the most. I encourage the rest of my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate Chairman CALVERT's comments, but I can speak from personal experience. Our local law enforcement officers are overworked and often not equipped to handle the concerns on our national wildlife refuges. This is a Federal responsibility, to protect these conservation lands, to protect the visitors who are hunting and fishing who are sometimes disturbing natural resource areas.

I mean, look at that list. It is really surprising: rapes and robberies and kidnappings and assaults. We can do better than this. We have to do everything we can to keep our neighbors safe at home and to protect our natural lands.

I urge adoption of the Castor amendment so that we can address this important public safety issue.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

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

Ms. CASTOR. 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 Florida will be postponed.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr.

COLE), a valued member of our Interior Subcommittee, for the purpose of a colloquy.

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

I would like to thank the chairman for his extraordinary work on this legislation. Furthermore, both he and Chairman BISHOP of the Committee on Natural Resources have graciously tried to resolve a matter of great significance to Indian Country.

Beginning in the late 16th century, the size of so-called Indian Country, in what later became the United States, has steadily diminished. To reverse this trend, in 1934 Congress passed a law which allowed the Federal Government to take land into trust for the benefit of Indian tribes. Interior has done so for the past 82 years.

Interior's ability to take land into trust for all tribes was questioned in 2009 following the Supreme Court's opinion in the *Carcieri v. Salazar* decision. The *Carcieri* opinion cast doubt on whether Interior has the ability to take land into trust for the benefit of tribes if they were not "under Federal jurisdiction" in 1934.

Since then, Indian tribes have been threatened by legal challenges to the status of their trust lands. The possibility of litigation chills economic and infrastructure development on trust lands.

Together we have worked closely with the House Committee on Natural Resources on a provision that would have settled any dispute as to the status of a trust land up to the *Carcieri* decision of 2009. I come to the House floor today to express my gratitude for that effort.

□ 1730

I would like to stress that this provision had nothing to do with promoting or enhancing the ability of tribes to build and operate a gaming facility away from reservations or existing land, though, of course, they have every right to operate on existing lands as long as they comply with the provisions of the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act of 1988.

In no way is this provision designed to promote off-reservation gaming. Quite frankly, the overwhelming majority of Indian trust lands are used to provide essential government services, such as education, health care, and housing.

Well in advance of the Interior Subcommittee markup, a meeting was held between myself, Chairman CALVERT, Chairman YOUNG, and Chairman BISHOP of the Natural Resources Committee. We believed an agreement had been reached between the authorizers and the appropriators. However, further staff discussions revealed that differences still remain. For that reason, we have decided to table this matter for the time being and continue working together on a solution amenable to all parties involved.

I would like to emphasize that both the authorizers and the appropriators

have worked in good faith, and I promise that we will keep doing so.

Despite the fact that the so-called Cole provision was stricken from the Interior appropriation bill, I am encouraged with the progress we have made thus far. There is no easy solution for the *Carcieri* problem. But if we keep working at it, I am convinced that we can reach an agreement that is acceptable to all parties.

Again, I thank the chairman for his work.

Mr. CALVERT. Reclaiming my time, I thank my friend and distinguished colleague from Oklahoma and the Chickasaw Nation. He has been a true leader for Indian Country during his tenure on the Appropriations Committee. I think we can both be proud of the progress we have made, working together in a nonpartisan way with our friends on the other side of the aisle.

On the matter of land into trust and the *Carcieri* decision, I am grateful for the opportunity to work with you, as well as Chairman BISHOP and Chairman YOUNG of the Natural Resources Committee, to try to come to an agreement that would affirm land taken into trust before the *Carcieri* decision and would improve our understanding of how the Department of the Interior arrived at decisions to take land into trust after the *Carcieri* decision.

It has been over 7 years since the *Carcieri* decision, and tribal, municipal, and State governments continue to struggle in the aftermath. We need to bring clarity and certainty to the matter of land taken into trust on behalf of our American Indian brothers and sisters.

Mr. COLE, you have my commitment to continue to work with you and the rest of our colleagues on a solution.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,500,000)".

Page 38, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,500,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

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

I rise today to offer an amendment which would provide a modest increase to the operation of the National Park Service account.

This August 25 will mark the 100th anniversary of our National Park Service. Each year, more than 275 million

people visit our national parks. Our national parks, heritage areas, monuments, and historical sights occupy more than 84 million acres of land in all 50 States and are home to more than 1,000 endangered and threatened animal species.

My home State of Rhode Island is home to one of the newest units in the National Park Service, the Blackstone River Valley National Historic Park. The Blackstone Valley marks the birthplace of the American industrial revolution and serves as a monument to the growth of our Nation. Sites like Old Slater Mill in Pawtucket and the Museum of Work and Culture in Woonsocket help tell the story of how America became an economic superpower.

It is essential that our national park system receives the funding that is necessary to help tell America's story and preserve it for generations to come.

Being one of the newest units of the park system, Blackstone relies on long-term partnerships built over several decades in cities and towns as well as other public and private partnerships to help define its boundaries and strengthen its economic and cultural impact. However, it relies on Federal dollars, as well, from the National Park Service for its operations, including seasonal and year-round staff, maintenance of its facilities, and ongoing planning for the park's development.

Unfortunately, this bill has underfunded the account for our national parks significantly below the budget request for fiscal year 2017. As a result, the more than 400 units of the National Park Service, including Blackstone, will be forced to do more with less. This will also be a step backward for the Blackstone River Valley National Historic Park.

While the budget increase for Blackstone was modest for this year, it was an essential step forward to continue the momentum needed to allow the park to continue meeting its potential as a vital part of the New England landscape and a driver of economic growth in Rhode Island and Massachusetts.

My amendment makes a modest reduction of \$2.5 million from the departmental operations account for the Department of the Interior, which receives a funding level in this bill that is more than \$470 million above the budget request, and moves it to the operation of the National Park Service account, which was underfunded by more than \$89 million.

This small increase to the Office of National Park Service account will not be enough to make up for the constraints that the bill places on our national parks, nor will it, of course, guarantee that Blackstone will be able to receive all the resources it truly needs. What it will do is ensure that some additional funds are available that may help Blackstone continue to

increase the momentum it has built since its establishment in 2014. The extra funds this amendment provides will help provide some relief to our national parks, which provide a critical boost to our economy.

According to the National Parks Conservation Association, every dollar the Federal Government invests in our national parks generates \$10 in economic activity. Let's continue to support these critical investments in our national parks, which are the envy of the world. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I would urge adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HIMES

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY), I offer amendment No. 3.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$300,000)(increased by \$300,000)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Chairman, I am delighted to offer an amendment that was authored by my good friend and colleague, JOE COURTNEY of Connecticut.

This is an amendment that would provide, on a budget-neutral basis, \$300,000 to the national park system for the New England National Scenic Trail.

This is something that is very important to us in the region of New England. It is an environmental treasure that is located in the backyards of millions of Connecticut and Massachusetts residents. The trail was officially designated as a National Scenic Trail in 2009, but has long been enjoyed by all southern New Englanders.

The New England National Scenic Trail winds through 40 communities, and nearly 2 million people live within 10 miles of it. Starting in Guilford, Connecticut, just outside my district, on the shores of the Long Island Sound, the trail winds northward on a ridgeline tracing the Connecticut River, across the Pioneer Valley highlands in Massachusetts, and ends at

Royalston Falls on the Massachusetts-New Hampshire border.

This budget-neutral amendment simply ensures that \$300,000 within the operation of the National Park System account will be set aside to fund the New England National Scenic Trail.

Over a decade ago, the National Park Trail feasibility study recommended that the New England Trail would need an annual operating budget of \$271,000 in Federal funding; but the trail has, unfortunately, received an average of less than half that—\$127,000 annually, in the NPS operations funding. Of this funding, the National Park Service takes one-third, leaving only about \$43,000 for each State to manage this 223-mile-long trail, a trail that winds through some of the most scenic areas of New England and some of the most historic parts of our country with respect to the Revolutionary War.

The Massachusetts-based Appalachian Mountain Club and the Connecticut Forest and Park Association have done an outstanding job leveraging the minimal \$127,000 in funding, raising \$1.5 million in non-Federal dollars in 2015 alone.

Mr. Chair, this amendment will ensure stable funding for the New England Trail and safeguard a high-quality recreational and wilderness experience for the many thousands of trail users in our small, densely populated region of the country. I respectfully urge my colleagues to support this budget-neutral amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, unfortunately, the bill before us already funds the New England National Scenic Trail at the requested level, so any additional funds are not necessary at this time. I reluctantly urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I request a “no” vote.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES).

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

Mr. HIMES. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 28, line 3, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$15,000,000)”.

Page 28, line 16, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$15,000,000)”.

Page 73, line 3, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$15,000,000)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

My amendment provides a modest increase in grant funding to Appalachian States for the reclamation of abandoned mine lands in conjunction with economic and community development and reuse goals. Funding for these reclamation grants was first established last fiscal year at \$90 million, but was provided exclusively to the three Appalachian States with the greatest amount of unfunded reclamation needs.

Last year, I offered an amendment to expand this program to the next three Appalachian States with the greatest unmet needs. As you might imagine, Virginia is one of those three, with the other two being Alabama and Ohio. I am encouraged that the underlying bill heeds that call and expands these grants to do the next three Appalachian States, but the need is far too great in areas like southwest Virginia, and much more can be accomplished with a small increase in this program.

My amendment increases the funding level for these grants from \$90 million to \$105 million, with that additional funding dedicated to setting a more balanced distribution of funds among Appalachian States. This additional funding is needed to really get in and do some work to help these Appalachian coal communities that have been economically devastated, while at the same time helping reduce the environmental impact of unreclaimed mine lands.

My office has worked closely with the House Interior Appropriations Committee staff on this amendment language to come to a resolution that ensures that additional support for one Appalachian community does not come at the expense of another Appalachian coal community.

This additional support will have a significant impact on economic development work throughout Appalachia, while being offset by a slight reduction in the EPA's environmental programs and management account, totaling only one-half of 1 percent of that account, reducing it from \$2.527 billion to \$2.512 billion.

Additionally, I am encouraged that staff at the Congressional Budget Office have determined that my amendment would result in a reduction of \$6 million in outlays for this fiscal year,

as the money would be spent out at a slower rate over the coming years than would have occurred under the EPA's environmental programs and management account.

This program is an essential tool to help reinvigorate coal communities throughout Appalachia struggling with restoring and reclaiming abandoned mine sites in a way that would help put people back to work. I urge Members to support this amendment and support these coal communities that are struggling now more than ever.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I very strongly oppose this amendment. It takes more money away from an already starved Environmental Protection Agency. The bill severely cuts the EPA's main operating accounts by \$92 million; \$92 million this bill already cuts from the EPA's operating account.

The very air we breathe and the water we drink are endangered by funding and policy decisions already made in this bill, and their consequences will be negatively felt in communities all across this Nation.

Now, I understand that the EPA is an easy target cut for many of my colleagues across the aisle, but I want my colleagues to understand what this amendment would cut, if adopted.

The account funds programs that are important to both sides of the aisle, including permitting for construction projects across the country, toxics risk prevention, and the very successful brownfields program, as well as pesticide listing.

I appreciate the gentleman's amendment. It shows support for the administration's POWER Plus Plan, which is a program it is modeled after. And I understand that the amendment would direct more funding to States in Appalachia that, I agree, have suffered under the ravaging environmental harm caused by coal mining. But unfortunately, I cannot support a deeper cut to the EPA, and I must oppose the amendment.

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

□ 1745

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. I appreciate the work the gentleman from Virginia and his staff put into crafting an amendment that the committee could support. Any program to help promote economic development in an area so devastated as the Appalachia is worthy of our support, so I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, I would just say that I recognize the concerns that the opponents to this

amendment have; but what we are trying to do is to take some money, direct it for an environmental purpose, but also help take the reclaimed mine lands, make them right, make them so that they are the way they are supposed to be, and have a purpose that will then allow us to use—whether it be recreational, whether it be some other form of business, but allow us to use those lands for economic development in an area where unemployment is now peaking up over 10 percent, where depopulation is constant and where, frankly, Mr. Chairman, we can't afford more wait-till-next-year approaches from Washington, D.C.

I yield back the balance of my time. The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. 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 29, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert “(decreased by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, if Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member McCOLLUM are able to commit to work with me on this, I do plan to withdraw this amendment, and I appreciate the time to be able to share a few words with everybody about why this amendment is so important.

I want to say a few words about my amendment and the challenges facing people in my district in New Mexico. My amendment requires the Bureau of Indian Affairs to report, identify, and adjudicate to landowners egress and ingress easements where they do not exist for landowners on land parcels adjudicated under the Pueblo Lands Act of 1924.

While this sounds like a complex issue, Mr. Chairman, it is a very simple issue, and one that was created back in 1924 with the Pueblo Lands Act. This amendment, Mr. Chairman, is the result of an issue that is specific to the State of New Mexico and the 1924 Pueblo Lands Act.

In 1924, Congress passed the Pueblo Lands Act, which established the Pueblo Lands Board. This board was tasked with adjudicating land claims to Pueblo lands, and it took about 6 years, until 1930, for the board to adjudicate these claims between the Pueblos and non-tribal landowners.

For the last 80 years, families have been able to buy homes and build homes, pass land on from one generation to the next. Everything had been going well until recently, when the Bureau of Indian Affairs alleged a trespass on some of the county roads, the County of Santa Fe, which is a local government in the State of New Mexico, that provide egress and ingress to the non-tribal residents.

Now these residents have been given patents by the United States of America. That is what the Pueblo Lands Act did, giving the clearest title to land ownership in the United States of America.

But as a result of the BIA letter, the title insurance companies in the State of New Mexico began to refuse issuing title insurance. Now, as we all know, that complicates your ability to buy a home, sell a home, or even refinance a home so that way you can re-roof a home.

In some instances, some of the families were trying to refinance that home because of bills that they have incurred for healthcare purposes; but because they are not able to get title to their home, they are not able to do so.

Mr. Chairman, these are families who have their entire savings in their homes, like many of us across America. These are families who have been saving up to build a home in a community where they grew up, where their parents grew up, where their grandparents grew up, and now they are fortunate to have a piece of land there.

I want to share with you a paragraph from a constituent by the name of Jeff Archuleta that he sent to me. He writes:

“When I grew up and my wife and I started a family of our own, it was easy for me to decide where I wanted to raise our boys. I was fortunate enough to obtain an acre of land from my father. I don't know exactly how long this parcel of land had been in my family, but I can say that it was listed in the San Idelfonso report of 1929 addressing land titles between the pueblo and non-pueblo residents. This document references land that was in non-pueblo private landowner's possession prior to the Pueblo Lands Act of 1924. Reference is also made to a Spanish Grant approved by Congress December 22, 1858. At the time of this report, the land belonged to Demetrio and Catalina Roybal. They later deeded the land to one of their children, my great uncle Pedro Roybal, who went on to sell it to my father.”

Mr. Chairman, I worry that we need to address this issue, but that this dispute is tearing at the fabric of our communities. For more than 2 years now, I have tried to get anyone from the Bureau of Indian Affairs to provide assistance to me, to provide a way to get this solved.

I have asked the BIA for the process and any criteria they used to issue an alleged trespass, and to share their antiquated database with the public. I

have asked for maps and historical documents that the BIA considered. Nothing was produced.

I asked for the chain-of-command that was followed and the BIA's interpretation and understanding of the Pueblo Lands Act of 1924 and the actions of the Pueblo Lands Board. Nothing was produced.

I even asked the BIA for information related to mediation services, Mr. Chairman, because the fabric of these communities are being torn apart. That is why I felt compelled to offer this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I am happy to work with the gentleman and Ms. MCCOLLUM in a nonpartisan way to address the concerns of your constituents.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member who has also encouraged us to find a way to work together.

I also want to thank Chairman CALVERT and his staff for being accommodating so we can sit down and look at this very important issue that is specific to the State of New Mexico.

I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the ranking member.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I look forward to working with the gentleman and with Chairman CALVERT on this issue.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I thank everyone. I thank all the staff.

Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. 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 29, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(decreased by \$1,000,000)(increased by \$1,000,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, this is an amendment that is related to the previous amendment that I offered. It was something that I uncovered as I was learning more and more about how to solve the egress-ingress issue pursuant to the 1924 Pueblo Lands Act.

Chairman CALVERT, again, with your commitment, and that of Ranking Member MCCOLLUM, if you are able to work with me on this issue, I plan to withdraw this amendment.

This amendment sought to reprogram \$1 million in the Bureau of Indian Affairs funding to require the Bureau of Indian Affairs to update and digitize its inventory of rights-of-way records and to make them publicly available in a commonly used mapping format.

Unfortunately, the Bureau of Indian Affairs has long failed to adequately maintain rights-of-way records, and the Bureau is often unable to provide requested documentation to tribes and other stakeholders in a timely manner.

For example, when my office asked for information related to the rights-of-way in New Mexico, the Bureau of Indian Affairs could not share it with my office in a timely fashion.

And just today, Mr. Chairman, the Pueblo of Zia, a pueblo in the State of New Mexico, provided me documentation that the Pueblo of Zia has asked the Bureau of Indian Affairs for a request of specific rights-of-way information this past February, February 24, 2016, to be exact. It is now July. The Pueblo of Zia tells me that none of this information has been provided to the pueblo.

My argument is this, Mr. Chairman. If this information was made available to the public in a way that the Bureau of Indian Affairs, as I understand it, should already be making available, this information should be readily available.

This is simply unacceptable that the information is not being provided, and especially with the trust responsibilities the Bureau of Indian Affairs has with tribes as well. Thankfully, I believe there is a commonsense solution.

In February 2014, the Tribal Transportation Unity Caucus, the National Congress of American Indians, and the Intertribal Transportation Association, jointly developed recommendations for a highway reauthorization, including one to improve the Bureau of Indian Affairs' rights-of-way management.

They suggested requiring the BIA to update and computerize rights-of-way documentation and make them available in a commonly used mapping format. The National Congress of American Indians then passed a resolution endorsing these recommendations in April of 2014. Unfortunately, this commonsense provision didn't make it into the highway bill, which is why I am offering the amendment today.

Too often, the BIA's mismanagement of these records disrupts and slows down projects that are important to tribes and surrounding communities while creating unnecessary conflict.

Mr. Chairman, if we can map the human genome, then surely the BIA can map a few roads, manage its rights-of-way records, and build an accessible, public database to provide certainty to tribes, local governments, and State governments, and other stakeholders.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, again, I am happy to work with the gentleman and Ms. MCCOLLUM in a nonpartisan way to address these issues, and I look forward to working with him to resolve this for his constituents.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. I thank Chairman CALVERT again for his leadership and for his staff again. I appreciate the time to work together. And, again, Ranking Member MCCOLLUM, to you and the minority staff, thank you for all that you do.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 7 will not be offered.

The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RICE of South Carolina) assumed the chair.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate disagrees to the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 2012) "An Act to provide for the modernization of the energy policy of the United States, and for other purposes.", and agrees to the request by the House for a conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and appoints Ms. MURKOWSKI, Mr. BARRASSO, Mr. RISCH, Mr. CORNYN, Ms. CANTWELL, Mr. WYDEN, and Mr. SANDERS to be the conferees on the part of the Senate.

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

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. ELLISON. 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 38, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank Ranking Member BETTY MCCOLLUM.



We can raise the living standards for working families all over the country right now if we use Federal dollars to create good jobs. The United States Government is the largest buyer of goods and services in the world, and the United States Government should use that power to create good jobs and to create a high-road economy for all Americans.

My amendment would reprogram funds to create an Office of Good Jobs in the Interior Department that would do the following: it would help ensure the Department's procurement, grant-making, and regulatory decisions encourage the creation of decently paid jobs, collective bargaining rights, and responsible employment practices.

Mr. Chairman, it is important for all Americans to know that more than 1 in 5 Americans are employed by companies with Federal contracts. Right now the U.S. Government is America's leading low-wage job creator.

That is right. The United States Government, at this very hour, funds over 2 million low-paying jobs through contracts, loans, and grants with corporate America. That is why more than the total number—the total number of low-wage workers employed by Walmart and McDonalds combined do not equal the number of low-wage jobs funded by the United States Government.

□ 1800

That is right. Wal-Mart and McDonald's combined have fewer low-wage jobs than are funded by the Federal Government right now. U.S. contract workers earn so little that nearly 40 percent of them use public assistance programs like food stamps and Section 8 to feed and shelter their families.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment. This Office of Good Jobs would help ensure that the Interior contracting employment decisions encourage the creation of decent paid jobs, implementation of fair labor practices, and responsible employer practices.

The Federal Government should set an example to the Nation when it comes to contracting decisions, and the office will guide Interior to make responsible contracting employment decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. RICE from South Carolina). The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is duplicative. It ignores the existing contractor award system that is already in place. Contracting officers must already consult the system for award management to ensure a contractor can be awarded a contract.

Businesses on the excluded parties list system have been suspended or debarred through a due process system and may not be eligible to receive or renew Federal contracts for such cited offenses.

The best way to ensure that the government contracts with or provides grants to the best employers is to enforce the existing suspension and debarment system.

Bad actors who are in violation of the basic worker protections should not be awarded Federal contracts. That is why the Federal Government already has a system in place to deny Federal contracts to bad actors. If a contractor fails to maintain high standards of integrity and business ethics, agencies already have the authority to suspend or debar the employer from government contracting. In 2014, Federal agencies issued more than 1,000 suspensions and nearly 2,000 debarments to employers who bid on Federal contracts.

The amendment would delay the procurement process with harmful consequences. On numerous occasions, the nonpartisan Government Accountability Office has highlighted costly litigation stemming from complex regulatory rules, including from the Fair Labor Standards Act.

This amendment punishes employers who may unknowingly or unwillingly get caught in the Federal Government's maze of bureaucratic rules and reporting requirements. The procurement process is already plagued by delays and inefficiencies.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, let me point out that the gentleman confuses the debarment process, which says that we are going to look at the very worst actors and exclude them and the Office of Good Jobs, which would say that we will use education and we will use prioritization to make sure that the best employers are the ones that the American taxpayer is going to employ in order to award contracts. It is just a simple matter of understanding the difference between excluding the very worst and rewarding the best.

I think that the American people would like to see the Federal Government say: You are a good employer, you pay good wages and good benefits, and we think that that kind of practice is the kind of thing we like to see, and, therefore, our Office of Good Jobs is going to prioritize such businesses.

Time and time again, we hear Members of the party opposite confuse the debarment process with the Office of Good Jobs concept. It is a big difference, and I think that the American people would agree that where we find

the best practices, we should reward them, not simply create a big, big bottle, a big, big vat of the best competing with the mediocre, and then exclude the very, very worst.

I just want to make this point. This is good for good contractors in many ways, because if you are an excellent contractor and you go out of your way to reward good workers and help create a hybrid economy, you are still competing with the people who are doing the bare minimum they can just to avoid debarment. I think that is not fair to good contractors. I think good contractors ought to be rewarded.

I think that if we establish this Office of Good Jobs, what we will see is a general wave throughout our economy as the private sector will look to the Federal Government as to what the best ways to create a fair economy could be, and we would see a greater measure of economic equality and opportunity throughout the land.

I just want to say that if the system we had was adequate, why, then, would we have 40 percent of all people who work for Federal contractors eligible for Federal Government programs, like Section 8 and food stamps? Why would we see that? Well, because we are not prioritizing good jobs. We are just saying that if you are a lawbreaker, you will be excluded, but other than that, we don't really care. An Office of Good Jobs would change that.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote.

It is intended that the appropriation for Departmental Operations in the Office of the Secretary at the United States Interior Department be used to establish an Office of Good Jobs in the Department aimed at ensuring that the Department's procurement, grant-making, and regulatory decisions encourage the creation of decently paid jobs, collective bargaining rights, and responsible employment practices. The office's structure shall be substantially similar to the Centers for Faith-Based and Neighborhood Partnerships located within the Department of Education, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Department of Homeland Security, Department of Health and Human Services, Department of Labor, Department of Agriculture, and Department of Commerce, Department of Veterans Affairs, U.S. Department of State, Small Business Administration, Environmental Protection Agency, the Corporation for National and Community Service, and U.S. Agency for International Development.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, we have a process in place. I certainly won't support subjective Federal decision-makers deciding who is a good employer and who is a bad employer. As a former employer myself, I know that most employers in this country are good people who want to make sure that people have good jobs.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. NORCROSS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 9 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 38, line 20, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$13,060,000)”.

Page 40, line 7, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$13,060,000)”.

Page 74, line 25, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$13,060,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman, my simple amendment would add \$13 million to the Hazardous Substance Superfund to equal the level requested by the EPA.

Superfund cleanup is the right thing for the environment, right for the economy, and certainly right for public health.

I am from the Garden State. We are known across the country for having the best tomatoes, corn, blueberries, and cranberries we grow. But in south Jersey, we have a history as a cornerstone of heavy industry. New Jersey found out the hard way what you can and what you can't dump into the lakes, backyards, and other facilities.

Then companies left, leaving our constituents holding the bag. Representative Jim Florio, who held my seat from 1975 to 1990, saw these very issues in south Jersey and across the country. That is why he authored the Superfund legislation back in 1980. Almost four decades later, the list of Superfund sites is still overflowing. There are well over 1,000 contaminated sites across the country, and I have 13 in my district alone.

In 2015, the GAO studied the progress of the Superfund program. The report found that, in real dollars, appropriations to the EPA Superfund program declined almost \$1 billion from 1999 to 2013.

Congress has funded less than 40 percent of shovel-ready cleanup projects. The EPA is often forced to prioritize one seriously contaminated site over another, leaving those other sites to be contaminated, in some cases, up to 50 years.

This amendment would help the EPA clean up more contaminated materials in their parks, backyards, and commercial properties sooner rather than later.

Mr. Chairman, later the House will consider another amendment of mine that would designate an additional \$15 million within the Superfund account, specifically for the enforcement division.

Not only do we consistently underfund Superfund cleanup activities, we have even underfunded the EPA office that is supposed to go after those polluters who have been found guilty of dumping and polluting our environment.

As I mentioned earlier, in my district alone, I have over 13 sites that lay contaminated today. I just briefly want to tell you about three of them. The sites are named after the company that was accused and has been found liable, that is the Sherwin-Williams site. These sites include the Sherwin-Williams/Hilliard's Creek site located in Gibbsboro, the Route 561 Dump Site in Gibbsboro, and United States Avenue Burn Site in Gibbsboro. Those other sites include part of Voorhees also.

Back in the 1930s, Sherwin-Williams opened a paint factory. For 20 years, they dangerously dumped these chemicals that were related to their synthetic varnish to be produced and dumped in around the Gibbsboro and Voorhees area.

These toxic chemicals from the varnish seeped into the groundwater, contaminating not only the commercial properties, but the streams, lakes, and homes for miles around. After the devastating events of Flint, Michigan, I know I don't have to tell you about the horrific effects of lead exposure on children's developmental issues and pregnant women. According to the EPA, long-term exposure to high levels of arsenic can lead to cancers like skin cancer, bladder cancer, and lung cancer.

This is why my constituents and, quite frankly, all Americans across the country are faced with this decision. They need relief today—not in a few years from now. We must hold companies like Sherwin-Williams accountable for the havoc that they have wreaked in communities like Gibbsboro and Voorhees. We owe it to our constituents to do everything in our power to protect their health.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “yes” vote on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, while I appreciate the intent of the gentleman's amendment to increase funding for the Superfund, something that we all support, it is important that Members understand two things: First, top line funding for the Superfund is already increased in the bill by \$27 million from the FY16 enacted level.

Second, the gentleman proposes to reduce funding for the Payments in

Lieu of Taxes, PILT, program which is critical to counties and local governments in 49 States, including New Jersey, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico, and the U.S. territories. PILT is fully funded in this bill. It is a program supported by a large, bipartisan majority in the House. A reduction in the PILT funding would have a detrimental effect on counties and local governments across the country.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman, this is about protecting public health from designated sites that have been contaminated for literally decades.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “yes” vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS).

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

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 10 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 67, strike lines 4 through 19.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment simply strips the language that would block the implementation of the Stream Protection Rule.

We should not willfully delay or stop this rule. I am very familiar with mountaintop removal mining. When I was Lieutenant Governor of Virginia in the 1990s, mountaintop removal mining became the most prevalent coal mining technique in central Appalachia. I made more than 100 trips to Virginia's coalfields, and I know firsthand the negative impact mountaintop removal has had on the environment and on the health of these communities.

If we know of reasonable ways to mitigate negative effects, we should be doing everything in our power to implement them. That is why the Stream Protection Rule is so important.

During mountaintop removal, tens of thousands of cubic feet of mountaintops are blown off with explosives and

pushed over the sides, filling mountain valleys with enormous waste piles.

□ 1815

These valley fills, as they are called, bury headwater streams and everything else that once populated the valley. Already, mountaintop removal mining has flattened more than 500,000 acres of forested land and permanently buried over 2,000 miles of streams, destroying sources that feed our water.

Emerging science has documented a dramatic decline in the diversity, the abundance, and the biomass of fish in streams with pollution that results from mining. It is the coal industry that asked the government to clearly define the expectations for environmental protection, and that is what this rule does. By introducing verified scientific methods and testing, the government provides regulatory certainty and achieves the environmental protection that is required by law.

Without this rule, stream destruction continues to occur and the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement will remain vulnerable to more legal challenges. Local citizens will be forced to resort to the courts instead of having their government act to protect their welfare.

The stream protection rule is sufficiently flexible to accommodate the different regions where coal is mined. It is very different in Wyoming than it is in southwest Virginia. The rule is designed to prevent water pollution due to coal mining using current scientific understanding. It is designed to protect our families while protecting jobs. In fact, the Office of Surface Mining's analysis shows this rule will have minimal impact on coal companies and minimal job loss. The estimate is 10 lost jobs—10.

We have seen how necessary this rule is in Virginia. Water monitoring found that Kelly Branch Mine in Wise County dumped the toxic pollutant selenium into streams at levels way above State water quality standards and without a permit to allow such pollution. As a result of a citizen suit, Southern Coal Corporation has since agreed to perform environmental cleanup projects and pay penalties and attorney fees for these pollution violations.

But, Mr. Chairman, we shouldn't need lawsuits. This violation shouldn't happen in the first place. Now is the time to give the people of Appalachia and others around the country protections for their waterways that were promised to them by Congress.

I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, in 2008, the Office of Surface Mining finalized revisions to the stream zone buffer rule in an open and transparent man-

ner. After taking office, the Obama administration put on hold that rule and proposed a different rule last year without the input of the States.

The administration's approach under the new rule has been anything but collaborative and inclusive, and States have been totally shut out of the process. In response, the FY16 omnibus includes language to bring the States and the administration back together. To date, OSM has not shared all documents with the States and refuses to meet with the States that have requested meetings.

The American people expect more—more openness and transparency from their government—and that is why this funding prohibition must remain in the base bill.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote “no” and reject this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the ranking member.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

The amendment would allow OMS to deal with the continuing problems posed by mountaintop mining removal because this practice contaminates, destroys streams, and negatively impacts human health. Two lawsuits challenge this Bush-era rule, and in February 2014, U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia vacated a 2008 stream buffer rule.

It is important that we allow this to move forward, and I am going to simply state why.

In a study in 2011, it found that counties near mountaintop mining areas had higher rates for five out of six types of birth defects, including circulatory, respiratory, skeletomuscular, central nervous system, gastrointestinal, and I could go on and on. Clearly, we know that the health effects from mountaintop mining-related air and water contamination is cumulative and is dangerous to public health.

OSM must be allowed to go forward with this water protection rule to guarantee the public an opportunity to live a healthy life.

I urge my colleagues to support the Beyer amendment.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, with great respect to the subcommittee chairman, I was at the hearing all morning at Natural Resources a few months ago when we had the Director of the Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement on this exact issue. He deeply resisted the idea, what he called, I think it was, the fix or the myth that we weren't working closely with the States.

I completely agree with the subcommittee chairman that the Office of

Surface Mining should work very closely with the States to develop this rule and, in fact, insisted that they had from the beginning of the Obama administration, picking up on what the Bush administration had done, right through today. I agree that this is appropriate, but I resist the wisdom of the truth that the States have been shut out of the process.

One more small point, but a really important point. A 2009 report on the NIH Web site estimated that coal mining cost Appalachia five times more in premature deaths—\$42 billion—than it provided the region in all jobs, taxes, and other economic benefits from coal mining—just \$8 billion.

We are not trying to get rid of coal. There is no war on coal. We just want to make sure that the people who are doing the work who live there are protected.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire of the Chair how much time is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Chairman, this is a critically important issue—the prohibition that is contained in this bill—relating to this incredible overreach of the regulatory authority from this administration.

The stream buffer zone rule is similar in character to so many of the efforts of this administration to empower the EPA and, in this case, the Office of Surface Mining to do things that are without legal basis and authority under the law. What is very important about this provision in this bill is saying no to this administration, no, once again, to a regulatory overreach that is not founded in basis of law.

I strongly urge the rejection of this amendment so we maintain the language that is contained in the Interior appropriations bill saying no to this administration's overreach of the rules and regulations. I suggest and encourage a rejection of this amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 11 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentlewoman from New

Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM), I offer amendment No. 11.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 68, strike lines 3 through 8.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes section 122 from the underlying bill. That section would prevent the BLM from meeting its statutory obligations under the Mineral Leasing Act to ensure operators "use all reasonable precautions to prevent waste of oil or gas."

The BLM would also be prevented, if this underlying provision remains, from modernizing the existing 30-year-old oil and gas production rules to bring them into line with technological advancements in the industry. If that provision stays in the bill, States, tribes, and Federal taxpayers stand to lose royalty revenues when natural gas is wasted, which a 2010 GAO report estimated could amount to as much as \$23 million, annually, in royalty revenue.

If this provision remains in the bill, BLM will not be able to update the current royalty rate or raise it as conditions may warrant. A recommendation has been made by both the GAO and the inspector general that they do that, that the conditions do indicate that an increase is in order.

So it is just good government to take this provision out, to update a 30-year-old set of regulations in order to better reflect the current operating climate and to ensure a fair royalty return.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, the bill includes section 122 because the Bureau of Land Management does not have the authority to regulate methane emissions. Congress has given that authority to the Environmental Protection Agency. BLM's proposed regulation is just another part of the administration's overly aggressive regulatory agenda and overly broad interpretation of current law.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

Can you imagine a 30-year-old oil and gas production rule and not being able to update it? This amendment allows a 30-year-old rule to comply with today's

technology to make sure that we are doing what is best practices in the industry and we can work with the industry to do proper oversight.

As was pointed out, if this provision stays in place, States, tribes, and Federal taxpayers would lose royalty revenues. We should be doing everything we can with our public lands to make sure the taxpayer receives full value whenever there is a lease.

I support this amendment, and I urge for its adoption.

Just once again, imagine not being able to update 30-year-old rules and not being able to update current royalty rates. We need to do better by the American taxpayer; we need to strike this provision; we need to do the updates; we need to update 30-year-old regulations; and we need to make sure that the American taxpayer gets a fair return on its royalties.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 12 printed in House Report 114-683.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 69, beginning at line 3, strike section 124.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, my amendment ensures that we keep the appropriate safety regulations in place for offshore oil drilling to reduce the risk of an offshore oil disaster and the devastating impacts on our economy and environment.

The Deepwater Horizon blowout of 2010 is still very fresh in our minds. I represent a Gulf Coast district in Florida, in Tampa Bay, and I remember very well the 87 days that oil spewed out of that Deepwater well, the 11 lives lost, and the huge economic losses.

One study said that, in Florida, we lost 50,000 jobs because of that blowout,

not to mention the environmental catastrophe that it was, that we are still trying to determine the long-term impacts.

□ 1830

For 87 days, the well continued to pump 134 million gallons of toxic oil before it could be stopped. This tarred fisheries, wildlife, and fragile ecosystems. I will always remember the motel owner from Pinellas County who cried because all of her business had evaporated. We didn't even have oil on the Gulf Coast beaches around Tampa Bay, but all of the tourists left. Our lifeblood in Florida is the tourism industry and the fishing industry.

This is really inexplicable after years of working with industry, after congressional hearings to determine the causes of that disaster, after numerous investigative reports, including the bipartisan National Oil Spill Commission, led by former Florida Governor and Senator Bob Graham, and Republican and former EPA Administrator William Riley, where they zeroed in on the fact that it was the well casing and the blow-out preventer that was the source of the problem. Based upon all of those findings and investigations, the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement developed its final Well Control Rule, which focuses on the blow-out preventer and well control requirements, because this is America, and we can develop state-of-the-art technology for risky oil drilling no matter where it is occurring.

The final rule was developed after unprecedented outreach and consultation with industry and other stakeholders. It addresses the full range of systems and equipment that are related to well control operations, with a focus on blow-out preventer requirements, well design, well control casings, cementing, real-time monitoring, and subsea containment. These measures are designed to improve equipment reliability, especially for blow-out preventers. The most important thing is they protect our communities. They protect us from a disaster like the BP Deepwater Horizon from ever happening again.

It is really inexplicable that the Republicans on the House Appropriations Committee zeroed in on this safety rule in this appropriations bill and said we are not going to support it, that we are not going to fund it for this year. What is that going to do? Industry already supports most of these things. They don't want to be on the hook for billions and billions of dollars. It is just, clearly, inexplicable to put our communities at risk again for another disaster like that.

The Castor amendment eliminates this harmful provision, and it maintains the Department of the Interior's critical safety standards to prevent offshore oil disasters. The Gulf Coast is still reeling from the disaster of 2010, and local economies across the country cannot afford another catastrophe like

BP's. I urge the adoption of the Castor amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the ranking member.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mr. Chairman, investigations were conducted by industry experts, and they determined the actual causes of the catastrophe of the Deepwater. Many of the requirements of this rule are not new, and they already exist in industry standards.

This rule has one goal for me, and that is to save lives. Eleven lives were lost in that explosion. We have learned from that event. It was a tragic event what happened with the Deepwater Horizon. We should do everything we can to put workers' safety ahead of Big Oil's profits.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, at various hearings throughout the year, Chairman CALVERT expressed concern that the administration was taking a page out of its "war on coal" playbook and applying it to oil production.

The Department of the Interior has been attempting to make it as costly as possible to operate offshore so that companies will make the decision not to apply for a permit. They took that a step further last week with its Arctic regulations. In this instance, the Department set onerous requirements under the Well Control Rule that mandated that all wells should have the same thickness regardless of where you are drilling. Now, any engineer will tell you that these are site-specific decisions that are based on many factors and that the thickness will vary, depending on where the well is drilled.

Instead, the White House wants to lock in that decision from Washington, D.C. and ignore recommendations from technical experts. The result is an Obama administration de facto moratorium on oil production as part of the White House's "keep it in the ground" strategy. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chairman, if you support the tourism industry, if you support the jobs in the fishing industry, if you support just saving lives, and being able to prevent disasters like the BP Deepwater Horizon from ever happening again, it is important that you stand up for these very basic, industry supported safety standards. The well rule was developed after months and years of investigations and study with stakeholder help.

The bottom line is we have to do everything we can to prevent this from ever happening again in order to protect our economy, to protect our jobs, to protect our natural environment; so I urge the adoption of the Castor amendment.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR).

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

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 70, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 71, line 18.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad that my colleague from Florida brought up the Deepwater Horizon tragedy because it was 6 years ago this week, actually, after 87 terrible days of the worst oil spill in history, that the BP Deepwater Horizon's wellhead was finally capped. The toll of that disaster, as everyone knows, was horrific—11 workers killed, untold economic damage to communities around the Gulf of Mexico, and, of course, devastating and ongoing impacts on fish and wildlife.

This is a good time for us to reflect and to discuss the role of the Federal Government in reviewing the environmental impacts of oil and gas development, not just in the Gulf of Mexico, but in a place where the environmental damage could be even worse if and when something went wrong, say, in the Arctic Ocean.

My amendment would strike section 127 of the underlying bill. Doing that would allow the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to move forward with its proposed update of regulation on air quality control reporting and compliance. It would allow that proposed rule to serve its intended purpose, which is to bring decades-old rules on offshore air emissions into the 21st century.

The BOEM, itself, is a new agency. It was born out of the response to the BP Deepwater Horizon spill, but it was also born out of an awareness that the old agency—the Minerals Management Service—was, frankly, too cozy with Big Oil, and that that is why that old

agency never updated these old rules. These existing air pollution rules have been in place since 1988, and it is past time that we moved forward with new pollution standards, new modeling, and new technology.

The proposed rule, in this case, seeks to address the emissions of several very harmful air pollutants, including volatile organic compounds, nitrogen oxides, sulfur oxides, carbon monoxide, and particulate matter. The proposed rule does that with flexibility. Actually, in some cases, it reduces regulatory burdens by eliminating redundant reporting requirements and by allowing operators to use emissions credits.

The residents of the Arctic and other oil-producing regions and the workers in the industry shouldn't be subjected to additional air pollution from oil and gas development simply because of where they live and work. We should let these new rules go forward. If history teaches us anything, it teaches us that Big Oil cannot be trusted to do the right thing when it is left unregulated. I would hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle would agree that strong and consistent oversight is necessary. I ask for a "yes" vote.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Idaho is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, the administration has started the process to promulgate new air quality regulations for offshore operations with the intention of finalizing them by year's end; however, key studies are currently underway that will not be finished until sometime next year, in 2017. The administration wants to finalize these rules before these key studies are done.

The Bureau of Ocean Energy Management has allocated nearly \$4 million for the studies to determine if there are any impacts to a State's air quality from offshore operations. Section 127 of this bill instructs the Department to wait until these studies are finalized and to restart only if the findings indicate there is a need for rulemaking.

This is one of those cases in which we say let the science be the science, and let's find out what the studies say before we make final decisions on this. There is a regulatory process which should be followed, and there is a scientific process that should be followed. That is coming from a Republican. The administration cannot circumvent one for the expediency of the other; so I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, it always warms my heart to hear my Republican colleagues embrace science. It is a beautiful thing. I wish it happened a lot more often.

In this case, we have had 30 years of study. We know a lot. The administration has developed this rule to the

point at which it believes it is ready. It is an important rule; it is long overdue; and it is time to move forward. I continue to request a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I urge Members to vote "no" on this amendment and to let the process go through and the studies and to find out what the studies say. Let's follow the science. I urge my colleagues to follow that and to vote "no" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 14 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 72, line 11, after the aggregate dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$88,282,000)".

Page 184, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$88,282,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, under the Obama administration, we have seen an explosion of new regulations that have impacted every area of our lives. From the way we heat our homes in the winter to the way that we choose our health care, this administration knows no bounds in its regulatory overreach.

The EPA leads the way on this front. According to a report that was released by the American Action Forum, the EPA now imposes nearly 200 million hours of paperwork to comply with its regulations. This is the equivalent of 95,000 Americans working full-time for a year. This represents an astonishing 23 percent increase from 2009 and a 34 percent increase since 2002 in the EPA's paperwork burden.

New regulations, such as the Clean Power Plan, waters of the United States, and the ozone rule, all contribute to this growing burden. Yet, this burden isn't limited to just the act of doing paperwork. These regulations raise the price of energy, cost Missourians jobs, and hurt their bottom lines. The EPA uses the Air, Climate and En-

ergy, ACE, program to advance research and regulations that are geared toward a climate change agenda. Regulations to address climate change are costing Americans billions with there being very little actual impact on global temperatures to show for it. The result of ACE research furthers regulations, which burden our Nation's energy sector and communities across the country.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and cut the ACE program and leave us with one less program to advance the regulatory overreach of this administration's and save taxpayer dollars.

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

□ 1845

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment would eliminate the funding for the EPA Air, Climate, and Energy research program. I think we all know that the Clean Air Act has resulted in one of the most effective public health programs in American history by addressing air quality in the United States.

What this amendment would do would be to set back any advances in new technology and new scientific tools that would help protect the American public from harmful exposure to air pollutants which, as we know, can damage our health, causing lung and heart disease, impact our immune, nervous, and reproductive systems, and shorten our lives.

Millions of people in America live in counties that do not meet air quality standards for one or more pollutants, and new threats from climate change expand the air quality challenges confronting our society.

The energy choices we make clearly influence air quality and climate change. Eliminating EPA funding to research and understand the impacts on air quality from alternative energy sources is, at a minimum, shortsighted.

The bill already reduces the EPA by \$164 million from the FY 2016 enacted level. I think we have already done enough damage in that particular reduction.

For the health and welfare of our citizens, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I continue to urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MRS. LUMMIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), I offer amendment No. 15.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 73, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$14,000,000)".

Page 74, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,038,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment transfers approximately \$10 million to the EPA's Office of Inspector General from the \$2.5 billion EPA environmental programs and management appropriations account. The amendment is necessary to support the EPA OIG's work related to preventing waste, fraud, and abuse, and identifying inefficiencies and potential cost savings at the EPA.

The EPA Office of Inspector General has faced significant funding challenges in recent years. Its full-time employees dropped from 349 to 289, a decrease of almost one-fifth of the office's workforce.

Despite significant resource challenges, the Office of Inspector General at EPA continued to conduct important investigations and audits that saved money for taxpayers and revealed misconduct and abuses at the agency. During FY14, EPA OIG reported \$380 million in savings, which is a \$7.35 return on investment for every dollar in the OIG budget. The EPA's Office of Inspector General identified \$4.1 million in savings during the most recent semiannual reporting period.

The EPA OIG has also investigated gross misconduct and abuses at EPA that yielded savings for taxpayers. For instance, in 2013, the office conducted a criminal investigation into former EPA employee John Beale, who was found to have stolen government money and engaged in travel voucher fraud and time and attendance fraud. Beale committed these frauds by masquerading as an employee of the Central Intelligence Agency. Beale agreed to pay restitution of \$890,000 to EPA and \$500,000 to the Department of Justice. Beale was also sentenced to 32 months in prison.

The EPA Office of Inspector General also investigated allegations of gross

mismismanagement at the Chemical Safety Board in 2012 and found hostility toward whistleblowers and a toxic, ineffective work environment undermined by the board's chemical accident investigations. The EPA OIG's investigation and pressure from Congress caused the President to remove the CSB chairman.

I want you to know that as the subcommittee chairman on our committee, that we have looked at the EPA and we have taken the Inspector General's reports and we have used them to make considerable changes that have increased morale, especially at the Chemical Safety Board; and that we have also saved taxpayer dollars because we have utilized the Office of Inspector General reports. They have shed light on a litany of other employee misconduct. This is a good investment of taxpayer dollars.

This amendment ensures that EPA OIG will have the resources it needs to continue to conduct these essential investigations. So the amendment increases funding for the EPA OIG by \$10,038,000. It decreases EPA environmental programs and management appropriations by \$14 million. That is actually awash when you look at the out years.

I strongly encourage adoption of the Chaffetz amendment to this legislation.

Mr. Chairman, with gratitude for your time, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I just want to make a few points about this amendment. As my colleague has said, this would reduce the funds from EPA operations by \$14 million and increase the Inspector General by \$10 million. I think we would certainly agree that it would be a good idea to increase the funding for the Inspector General, and we would like to see the other side increase those funds.

But we are uncomfortable with the idea of taking the funding from the operating account. This account has already been cut by \$92 million, and it would reduce the operating account by \$14 million, putting that money over there. This seems like too severe of a cut on top of what has already been done.

We don't disagree that the work of the Inspectors General across all agencies in Federal Government are necessary and very important and they do good work.

So, once again, I just oppose the shift in funding. I think it would be great if the other side wanted to enhance the funding for the Office of Inspector General, just not through this mechanism.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 16 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 73, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$70,000,000)".

Page 95, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$70,000,000)".

Page 96, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$70,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a commonsense amendment that redirects funds from EPA bureaucracy to the Forest Services' hazardous fuels account in order to prevent dangerous wildfires.

In 2015, over 10 million acres burned throughout the country, setting a new record. In that same year, fire season appropriations requests were approximately \$4 billion for all wildfire programs. Shamefully, the President requested only \$356 million of those funds go toward hazardous fuels reduction activities.

Thinning overgrown forests and removing hazardous fuels creates jobs and increases overall forest health. Unfortunately, extremist self-interest groups and Washington bureaucrats have failed to recognize this correlation. As a result, timber harvests are down 80 percent over the last 30 years.

Such flawed thinking also negatively impacts education and local communities. Historically, 25 percent of the receipts from timber harvests by the Federal Government go toward schools and important infrastructure projects.

The failure to prioritize hazardous fuels reduction activities is also bad for our environment, as sound data from NASA concludes that one catastrophic wildfire can emit more carbon emissions in a few days than total emissions in an entire State over the course of a year.

As it currently stands, the Forest Service consistently raids its own treasury when firefighting costs exceed their estimated yearly allotment, taking money from programs that clear brush and remove dead trees. This represents yet another classic example of Washington's misguided prioritization of Federal funds.

The Forest Service's own Fuel Treatment Effective Database reports that "over 90 percent of the fuel treatments were effective in changing fire behavior and/or helping with control of the wildfire."

Hazardous fuels reduction activities work. In eastern Arizona, areas that

were treated in the Apache-Sitgreaves National Forest as part of the White Mountain Stewardship Project help prevent further destruction from the catastrophic Wallow Fire.

Today there are still healthy trees as firefighters were able to control previously thinned areas. On other lands that were untouched by thinning practices and managed by the Forest Service, all that is left behind is scorched earth and sterilized soil.

It is of the utmost urgency that the Federal Government adopt a forward-thinking, active management strategy that combats dangerous wildfires before they get started. My amendment helps accomplish that task by redirecting scarce resources to important hazardous fuels reduction activities.

I am honored that this amendment is supported by the Americans for Limited Government, Public Lands Council, National Cattlemen's Beef Association, Agribusiness & Water Council of Arizona, Lake Havasu Area Chamber of Commerce, New Mexico Wool Growers, New Mexico Federal Lands Council, Yavapai County Cattle Growers' Association, Yuma County Chamber of Commerce, and countless other organizations and individuals in my home State of Arizona.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. I thank the chairman and ranking member for their good work on this bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I have to strongly oppose this amendment that would take even more money from the already starved EPA. The bill has already severely cut the Environmental Protection Agency's main operating account by \$92 million. This would cut it by another \$70 million. And so far tonight, we have agreed to another \$29 million through amendments.

The very air we breathe and the water we drink are endangered by the funding and the policy decisions that are already made in this bill. Their consequences will be felt negatively in communities across this country.

I know it is often an easy target for my colleagues across the aisle to cut the EPA, but I do want my colleagues to understand what this amendment would mean if this cut was adopted.

The account funds programs that are important to both sides of the aisle, including permitting for construction projects across the country; toxics; risk prevention; part of the successful brownfields program; pesticides licensing, which, as we know, is a critical part of fighting the Zika crisis.

In my opinion, this very large cut would be irresponsible, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I believe that the Forest Service needs to be more proactive in managing our national forests. The latest estimates show that there are nearly 66 million dead and dying trees in California right now. This sets the stage for what could be a disastrous fire seed. We simply must get ahead of this situation. This is why we provided significant increases for hazardous fuel and management programs in this bill, but certainly we would support any additional help.

I would move to adopt this very important amendment.

□ 1900

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. ROSLEHTINEN). The gentleman from Arizona has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, while the bill does include nearly \$2.9 billion for wildfire activities, which I am thankful for, most of these dollars are focused on suppression activities.

As I stated previously, the 2015 fire season set a new record, burning more than 10 million acres throughout the country. It is easy to make that statement when it is not your home burning. Clearly, we must focus on proactive solutions for our Nation's forests.

The best way to do so is by providing the Forest Service hazardous fuel account with appropriate funding in order to prevent hazardous wildfires. My amendment accomplishes that task by redirecting scarce resources from the EPA's bureaucracy.

The EPA is far from being underfunded. As it stands, this bill currently funds the EPA at over \$7.98 billion. This marginal loss to a rogue administration that continues to circumvent Congress in order to implement lawless regulations is better spent through my amendment and will dramatically increase the Forest Service's ability to prevent dangerous wildfires. Again, I urge the support of my amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I just want to reiterate again, this bill has already severely cut the EPA's main operating account by \$92 million. Already tonight, amendments have cut it another \$29 million. This agency is fundamental. The protection that they do is critical. This account funds programs that are important to us on both sides of the aisle.

No one disagrees that it is important to fund the disastrous wildfires that have taken over in our country, and we very much understand those challenges, but this amendment is irresponsible. I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 17 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 73, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$12,000,000)".

Page 90, line 7, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I would like to thank the gentleman from California, Chairman CALVERT, for allowing me the opportunity to offer this important amendment.

I rise today in support of my amendment. My amendment is simple. It removes \$12 million from the EPA's environmental programs and management account and places \$10 million into the U.S. Forest Service's forest and rangeland research account, which funds important scientific research through the Forest Inventory and Analysis Program and the Forest Products Laboratory. This will free up money from the Federal bureaucracy for use in on-the-ground scientific research into forest health, wood products, biomass, and threatened species.

To make sound forest management decisions, it is imperative to quantify the amount of standing timber, the harvest and usage rates, how much is lost to insects and disease infestation, how many trees are lost to wildfire, and how much net growth occurs in our forest. The Forest Inventory and Analysis Program does just that.

The data is used to assess the quantity and quality of our forestlands, both public and private. It lets us know if we are gaining or losing forestland, and it tells us if we have a net loss or net gain in trees and tree volume. This data is critical to calculate how much carbon storage we have in our forest, and without this data, we cannot understand our total carbon balance.

The Forest Service often finds itself on extended sampling periods, sometimes as many as 6 or 7 years, leading to delayed analysis of our Nation's forest landscape. This forces States to increase their matching contributions in order to have sound, timely scientific data for statewide forest management plans.

FIA takes proactive, positive steps in the area of better forest management. FIA leads to scientific forest management practices that increase carbon storage and reduce the threat to wildfire. Additional funding to FIA will also give wood products and timber in-

dustries certainty in making business decisions. Forestry employs approximately 2.8 million people nationwide, and this is larger than the automotive industry.

The forest and rangeland research account also funds the Forest Products Laboratory. The Forest Products Laboratory conducts significant scientific research into wood products, forest biomass, the use of wood in tall buildings and threats to various species, such as white-nose syndrome. This amendment is a win-win for a healthy environment and scientific research.

Madam Chair, I again want to thank the gentleman from California, Chairman CALVERT, for the opportunity to offer this amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CALVERT. I just want to make a point.

I appreciate the gentleman's interest in forestry issues and his support for changing the way we budget for catastrophic wildland fires. An increase in the Forest Service's research capability will help address our forest management issues. I support the amendment, and I certainly urge its adoption.

I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, again, I must oppose this amendment because it continues to take more money from the already-starved EPA. The EPA's main operating account was cut by \$92 million in the bill. With the last amendment that just passed, we have cut another \$99 million tonight from the EPA account.

We are not arguing that funding for forest and rangeland research is a poor purpose, but it was fully funded in the budget, and it is starting to feel a little bit like we are just seeing amendment after amendment that is a way to starve the EPA.

The EPA is a critical agency. The very air that we breathe, the water that we drink are endangered by the funding and policy decisions that are being made in this bill. The consequences will be felt negatively in communities across the country.

I just cannot support taking money from an underfunded agency and putting it into a program that is already receiving an increase in this bill, so I oppose the amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, healthy forests are critical to clean air, clean water, better wildlife habitat, better recreation opportunities, and more biodiversity. This amendment will promote healthy forests, and I urge a "yes" vote.



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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, we certainly support healthy forests. I represent the State of Maine, where we have a tremendous amount of forests and many people who work in the forest products industry, so we respect the value of this research. But it was fully funded in the budget, and this is just another cut to the EPA and will take away from the work that they are able to do to protect our clean air and clean water. I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. JOHNSON  
OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 73, line 17, insert “, consistent with Executive Order 12898,” after “implementation”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Madam Chair, power companies are closing coal-fired power plants as we move toward cleaner, more sustainable ways to generate electricity. A material known as coal ash is a byproduct of this industry. Coal ash contains carcinogens, known carcinogens, such as arsenic, lead, and mercury.

The EPA is now regulating coal ash with its final rule on the disposal of coal combustion residuals from electric utilities. Many of the neighborhoods already exposed to dangerous levels of coal ash are in predominantly low-income and minority communities.

The problem of low-income and minority communities being disproportionately exposed to chemicals, hazardous waste, and toxic materials is neither new nor confined to one area of the country. More than 134 million Americans—their homes, schools, businesses, parks, and places of worship—are in harm’s way from dangerous exposure to coal ash.

A 2014 study found that residents in vulnerable zones are disproportionately African American or Latino, have higher rates of poverty than the U.S. as a whole, and have lower housing values, incomes, and education levels. The poverty rate in these zones is 50 percent higher than the national average. The percentage of Blacks is 75 percent greater than for the U.S. as a whole,

while the percentage of Latinos is 60 percent greater. This means that almost half of the people more likely to suffer from exposure are Black or Latino.

But make no mistake, Madam Chair, coal ash poisoning is not racially discriminatory. Rural White communities throughout north Georgia, North Carolina, Tennessee, and Oklahoma are suffering from exposure to coal ash dumping, leaking coal ash ponds, and coal ash dust from coal ash transport. We cannot allow people across the country to fall between the regulatory cracks simply because they live in a certain neighborhood or have certain income levels.

This amendment requires implementation of the EPA’s coal ash rule to be consistent with Executive Order No. 12898. That executive order’s purpose was to focus Federal attention on the environmental and public health effects that Federal regulations have on minority and low-income communities.

More coal ash is expected to be dumped in the State of Georgia. In Jesup, Georgia, a landfill has agreed to accept over 10,000 tons of coal ash per day. Duke Energy is moving their coal ash from North Carolina to a landfill in Banks County, Georgia. Elsewhere within Georgia, communities have been exposed to contaminated drinking water by existing coal ash facilities. Last month, arsenic, beryllium, and selenium were found in the groundwater of various coal ash sites in the State.

As we saw in Flint, we need to act at the Federal level before our failure to do so results in irreversible damage to the health and to the environment of the communities we represent. American families, regardless of income level, should not be unfairly and unreasonably exposed to toxic chemicals.

I ask for support for my amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, because the gentleman’s amendment restates current law and nothing more, I am more than willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I thank the gentleman.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MS. ESTY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 19 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. ESTY. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 74, line 25, after the dollar amount insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 76, line 18, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

Page 83, line 6, after the dollar amount insert “(increased by \$10,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Connecticut.

Ms. ESTY. Madam Chair, my amendment would increase funding by \$10 million to match the President’s budget request for the State and Tribal Assistance Grants to clean up and revitalize brownfields.

Too many cities and towns across America with proud manufacturing legacies are now struggling with vacant brownfield properties. As our country transitioned away from manufacturing, plants and mills began to close, leaving too many communities to deal with these industrial sites on their own.

These former industrial sites have come to be known as brownfields, land where the presence or potential presence of contamination prevents expansion, redevelopment, or reuse of the land. Brownfield sites aren’t limited to abandoned factories or buildings. They can also be former dry cleaning establishments or gas stations that are no longer in use. Every single congressional district in our Nation has at least one brownfield site, and some, in fact, have hundreds.

In April, I was in Torrington, Connecticut, a former mill town in my district where, like many communities in the Naugatuck River Valley, there are brownfields scattered throughout the city. I met with Mayor Carbone and other city and local officials to learn about plans to clean up and repurpose two industrial sites, which would create jobs and revitalize the downtown area.

□ 1915

The plan to revitalize downtown Torrington was made possible by funding provided through the EPA’s brownfields grant program. However, to implement Torrington’s transformative plan, we need additional funding in the brownfields program.

I think it is important to note that addressing brownfields is not simply an issue for our cities. Expanding funding for brownfields helps not only our cities, but also our suburbs and agricultural communities. Cleaning up and putting brownfields back into economic use in our cities helps preserve open space and surrounding communities by taking pressure off of demand for virgin or undeveloped land.

Additionally, taxpayer dollars go a long way in the brownfields program. For every dollar expended by the EPA’s brownfields program, it leverages, on average, approximately \$18 in additional public and private investment and, in many cases, property values have more than doubled when communities were given the resources necessary to repurpose brownfield sites.

According to a 2007 study, approximately 10 jobs are created for every acre of brownfields redevelopment, and with over 400,000 brownfields sites across the country, the work needed to clean up these sites is far from complete.

So let's do our job as elected officials by empowering our constituents with additional funding to clean up contaminated properties, attract new businesses, create jobs, safeguard public health, and revitalize our downtowns.

I encourage all of my colleagues to support the Esty amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I certainly understand the value of EPA's brownfields program. It is highly leveraged and promotes economic development in communities by cleaning up lightly contaminated properties and returning them to beneficial use. These are good things, no doubt about it. That is why the FY 2017 Interior bill continues to provide the brownfields program with \$80 million. That is equal to the enacted level.

With limited resources, we need to be strategic about where we provide increases. The FY 2017 bill increases funding to clean up most toxic contaminated Superfund sites across the Nation.

We will debate some Democratic amendments that seek to increase the Superfund account beyond what we have done in the bill in order to match the President's request. Certainly, no one wants to live next to a Superfund site. We have more than 1,300 sites on the Superfund list. These sites contain lead, arsenic, cadmium, PCBs, and other highly toxic chemicals. We need to make progress on these 1,300 sites.

So, I must oppose the proposed cut to the Superfund and strongly urge my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. ESTY. Madam Chair, again, with all due respect, I think, as my colleague has noted, these dollars make an enormous impact, and I would respectfully request and urge my colleagues to support the Esty amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I urge opposition to the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. ESTY).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 20 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 76, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$100,000,000)".

Page 84, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$100,000,000)".

Page 184, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$100,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Chair, I commend the gentleman from California for his and his colleagues' work on this bill.

Madam Chair, my amendment would eliminate funding for the Diesel Emissions Reduction Act grant program, saving taxpayers \$100 million. Funds from this program have gone to a number of questionable items, including \$750,000 for cherry pickers in Utah, \$1 million for electrified parking spaces at a truck stop in Delaware, and \$1.2 for a new engine and generators for a 1950s locomotive in Pennsylvania.

This program was intended to be a short-term effort to assist States and local governments in meeting diesel emissions standards, but has joined a long list of temporary government programs for which there is no end in sight.

As Ronald Reagan famously said that, "The nearest thing to eternal life we will ever see on this Earth is a government program."

One of the things I have learned as a freshman Member of Congress is that we have an office tasked with holding Federal agencies accountable and reporting on their programs. That office is the Government Accountability Office. One of the things that has surprised me is how rarely we act on their recommendations. I hope that won't be the case with this program.

The GAO has noted that funding to reduce diesel emissions is fragmented across 14 programs at the Department of Energy, the Department of Transportation, and the Environmental Protection Agency. Surely we can make do with one less.

The \$100 million provided in this bill represents an increase of 100 percent compared to last year's bill and an increase of 100 percent compared to the omnibus bill passed in December.

With a national debt exceeding \$19 trillion, and growing every day, we cannot afford to double the budget of a program that clearly duplicates, at least in part, 13 other programs, and has a marginal impact at best.

The program was originally authorized in the Energy Policy Act of 2005, and was reauthorized for 5 years in 2010. This authorization expired in fiscal year 2016, making any appropriation an unauthorized one.

Congress should not provide \$100 million for a wasteful and unauthorized

program, and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, Ronald Reagan was mentioned in discussing the gentleman's amendment.

Ronald Reagan signed into law CalEPA in the State of California. He also signed into law the first air quality district to regulate air in the United States, the South Coast Air Quality Management District, in the State of California, which was authored by a former colleague of ours named Jerry Lewis.

Clean air is not a political or partisan issue. Certainly, in my area, which has some of the dirtiest air in the United States, we have done a lot to clean up air in our area in California.

We have included a great number of policy provisions to address EPA's regulatory overreach, which I agree with, in this bill. And we have cut the EPA's budget dramatically, which I am in favor of doing. However, I believe that this specific amendment targets a program that is yielding great benefits. When you have a program that is actually working, we ought to keep it.

Many counties across the Nation are currently not in containment with EPA's existing standards for particulate matter and ozone. In many instances, these counties have been in non-containment for years, and those communities need help to improve their air quality.

The Diesel Emission Reduction Act grant program, DERA, is a proven, cost-effective program that provides grants to States to retrofit old diesel engines. So it is a program that supports manufacturing jobs, while also reducing pollution significantly.

Another benefit is these grants are highly leveraged, producing \$13 of economic benefit for every Federal dollar that is invested in this program.

Today, newer engines produce 90 percent less toxic emissions than the older diesel engines. However, only 30 percent of trucks and heavy-duty vehicles transition to these cleaner technologies. We need to follow the science and accelerate the replacement of old engines with newer, cleaner engines.

From fiscal year 2009 to fiscal year 2013, DERA grant funding has replaced or retooled almost 59,000 engines in vehicles, trucks, trains, and other equipment. Again, DERA is an effective, proven program that is delivering results.

I strongly urge Members to vote "no" on the gentleman's amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman's concerns.

Over the last 30 years or so, the air quality in the United States has improved dramatically, despite the fact that we have seen huge increases in vehicle miles traveled, a 30-something percent increase in our GDP, and a 30-something percent increase in population. Yet, we have seen dramatic improvement in air quality, and I appreciate the fact that government programs have had a part to play in that.

In regard to the savings, the EPA has said that for every dollar we spend, we will get \$14 in benefits. I would also like to point out that they also say that the Clean Power Plan will help the economy and that EPA regulations haven't lost jobs. I think the EPA estimates on savings are a little suspect.

The program was funded at \$30 million in FY 2015 and \$50 million in 2016. Now we are considering a bill to increase it to \$100 million in 2017. We cannot afford to continue spending without limits and pretend as if there are no consequences. Keep in mind that there are 14 programs. Surely, we can consolidate these into one effective program.

I also think it is important to note that this was supposed to expire after the first authorization. It was reauthorized for 4 more years. And that expires this year, making any appropriation for FY 2017 another wasteful, unauthorized program.

The Republican Study Committee budget recommended elimination and noted that the grants have gone to a number of wasteful programs.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I want to point out that DERA is not a regulatory program. The power plant rule that was mentioned earlier is a regulatory program.

What DERA does is replace old technology with the new technology that is up to 90 percent cleaner than the old trucks, old diesel engines that we are presently using. This is working.

I am not in favor of programs and continuous studies and other oppressive methods by EPA that don't produce clean air. This does. It was mentioned that our air is getting cleaner. It is getting cleaner because of programs like DERA that actually work. It is measurable in the South Coast Air Quality Management District and other areas throughout the United States.

They have been able to take these dirty, old trucks off the road. You have all seen them. You have been on the freeway and you see an old diesel truck that is putting out more emissions than virtually everything else around them. You take that truck off the road and it has immediate results.

So let's not get rid of something that works. Let's work against these regulatory programs that oppress the economy and don't have any results.

I might point out, too, the administration has been opposed to DERA. Most of the environmental folks have

been opposed because they don't want any carbon in the economy. So they don't want us to clean up diesel because they want to have electric vehicles or zero emission vehicles, which do not have the horsepower or the ability to deliver the goods that we need to have in this Nation.

So, I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALMER. May I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. PALMER. In regard to the EPA, the gentleman from California cited an EPA finding on the benefits and my response to that—that it is not a regulatory program—but that is beside the fact. What it is, is a duplication of other programs. It is unauthorized and it is wasteful.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I might point out that the FBI is not authorized at the present time. We continue to fund it.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY  
LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 76, line 18, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$6,000,000)(reduced by \$6,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

□ 1930

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, last August, the Environmental Protection Agency was responsible for the blowout at the Gold King Mine in Colorado that spilled 3 million gallons of wastewater, impacting New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, Arizona, and the Navajo Nation.

I was in Farmington, New Mexico, when the toxic plume turned the Animas River yellow. I met with the community and heard their concerns about the toll that the spill was taking on businesses, farmers, families, and individuals.

Madam Chair, we are almost 1 year removed from the spill, and in communities that have been impacted, there remains serious concerns about the long-term effects that the spill will have on the river and all that its water sustains, from drinking water to farming and livestock.

Long-term water quality monitoring is essential to ensure that communities along the Animas River have the data they need to protect the health of all those who rely on this water.

Unfortunately, the State of New Mexico and the EPA have been unable to agree on what the long-term monitoring should look like. As a result, the State has moved ahead with a lawsuit against the EPA.

Madam Chair, it is disappointing that it has come to this point of legal action. My amendment today seeks to address this issue by providing \$6 million to direct the EPA to work with affected States and Indian Tribes to implement long-term monitoring programs for water quality on the Animas and San Juan Rivers in response to the Gold King Mine spill.

The State of New Mexico has worked with stakeholders to develop a robust monitoring plan that I believe can serve as a basis for a truly comprehensive effort. Monitoring now and well into the future is necessary to protect the health of all those who rely on this water, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's remarks. It is important that EPA right the wrong that caused the Gold King Mine spill, and ensure that the affected States and Tribes have the resources they need following the spill.

The FY17 bill includes language instructing the EPA to continue to operate a temporary water treatment plant to treat contaminated flows in the area until a more permanent water treatment solution is developed. And the FY16 omnibus instructed EPA to work with the States and tribes on an independent water monitoring plan.

At this time I must respectfully oppose the gentleman's amendment, but I would also ask the gentleman to work with me as the committee continues to monitor the implementation and what the EPA is continuing to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I appreciate the leadership of the chairman. He has been very

gracious, he and his staff, with several amendments that are important to New Mexico during this debate as well.

What has happened now is the temporary facility has been located in the State of Colorado as well, where this has taken place, where this blowout took place; but we are still seeing remnants of heavy metals all the way down to that contamination plume, and it just hasn't been enough.

I will read something that our Attorney General from the State of New Mexico recently said.

"The release of hazardous substances into waters that are the lifeblood of our economy and culture in New Mexico has had a devastating impact on our historical rural, agricultural and tribal communities . . . It is inappropriate for the EPA to impose weak testing standards in New Mexico and I am demanding the highest testing standards that the EPA would impose in any other state in the nation to protect the health and well-being of our citizens. Additionally, remediation and compensation dollars have been far too minimal for these very special agricultural and cultural communities who depend on this precious water source for irrigation and drinking water. They must be properly compensated and there must be appropriate independent monitoring to prevent future dangers to public health and the economy."

Attorney General Hector Balderas.

Mr. CALVERT, I really want to be able to get a vote on this one. I understand the opposition here, but I really want to force this point home to the EPA and the administration, that what has been put on the table, which is \$2 million, is simply not enough to help us in New Mexico.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Again, I appreciate what the gentleman is up to. I wouldn't expect you not to have a vote if you choose to have a vote. Just know that we are working on this, and we will continue to work on this. We will continue to work with your office, but at this point I have to reluctantly oppose the bill.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN).

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

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 22 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 106, strike lines 8 through 22.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The gentlewoman from Michigan is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, my amendment strikes language in the bill that would exempt a number of potentially damaging activities in our national forests from full consideration under the National Environmental Policy Act. Simply put, this sort of language has no place in an appropriations bill.

Our national forests are a true public legacy that sustains both our environment and our economy. They provide clean air, clean water, precious wildlife habitat, and they support approximately 450,000 jobs throughout the country. We should all be coming together to ensure that our forests are healthy and that future generations will be able to enjoy them.

Yet, the language that my amendment proposes to strike could allow many types of damaging activities to occur in our national forests without a full review under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA, as we call it.

NEPA has a simple premise; you look before you leap. This landmark law gives the public an opportunity to review and comment on actions proposed by the government, adding unique perspectives to the evaluation process that highly specialized, mission-driven agencies might otherwise ignore.

The underlying legislation proposes to make six different activities in our national forests eligible for a categorical exclusion under NEPA, which means a full review would not be conducted and the public would not have the right to be heard.

While some of these activities may be appropriate to consider for a categorical exclusion, they should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis and should not automatically be eligible for categorical exclusion, as this legislation proposes.

As the Council on Environmental Quality has stated: "Categorical exclusions are appropriate in many circumstances but should not be relied on if they thwart the purposes of NEPA, compromising the quality and transparency of agency decisionmaking or the opportunity for meaningful public participation."

I couldn't agree with them more. CEQ was right, and that is exactly what this bill proposes to do.

As an example, the underlying bill proposes to exclude all activities related to reducing hazardous fuel loads from a full NEPA review. This makes

little sense. If a hazardous fuel load reduction is not done properly, it could destroy an entire forest. This is exactly the sort of activity that should have a thorough and comprehensive NEPA review.

I hope my colleagues will join me in standing up for public participation in government decisionmaking by supporting this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentlewoman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chair, I must say, as I rise in opposition to this amendment, that I serve on the Natural Resources Committee with the gentlewoman from Michigan, and I know that we hold a common idea to be good stewards of our resources. We just happen to have a difference of opinion on the best way to do that on this issue, so I must rise in opposition to her amendment.

Our Nation's forests are in dire health, and Congress must provide the Forest Service additional tools to allow more management of our national forest system.

This amendment would needlessly deny the Forest Service an opportunity to more quickly address a forest system that is overgrown and prone to wildfire, disease, and insect infestation.

Last summer I was proud to sponsor H.R. 2647, the Resilient Federal Forest Act, which passed the House with a strong bipartisan majority. This bill included several provisions to allow the Forest Service to engage in urgently needed restoration in a more timely fashion.

These are forest stands that are already being destroyed by natural occurrences; and in order to restore those forest habitats, we have to act in an urgent and a timely manner.

One specific provision would allow the Forest Service to treat up to 3,000 acres of land at a time under a categorical exclusion from NEPA within limited circumstances. Some of these circumstances include treating a forest infected by invasive species, if a forest has been affected by a natural disaster such as a hurricane or tornado, or if work is needed to protect a municipal water source.

This provision was based on a carefully crafted provision in the 2014 farm bill that the Forest Service has used successfully to reduce the threat of catastrophic wildfire in our rural communities. I am pleased that Chairman CALVERT chose to include this provision in the fiscal year 2017 Interior Appropriations bill.

The Natural Resources Committee has heard testimony from stakeholders

across the country about the dire need to better manage our forests. We have heard from the Forest Service that nearly 60 million acres of land are in need of some form of treatment. While we wait for the Senate to act on wildfire legislation, we must continue to seek opportunities to help reduce the threat of wildfire to communities across the country.

This amendment would strip this important provision from the appropriations bill. We should be doing more to shorten the timeframe for the Forest Service to engage in restoration work. I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment.

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I want to quickly respond to the comments made by my dear friend. We are good friends, and we all do need to work together to protect our great lands in this country, but I would respectfully disagree. I have nothing but the utmost respect for both of my Republican colleagues that I hate disagreeing with, and we agree on the same goal, but I respectfully disagree on your disagreeing on my amendment.

Some of these activities may be appropriate for a categorical exclusion, but that should be decided by the agency on a case-by-case basis, not be dictated by Congress, which you tell us many times, in an appropriations bill.

Make no mistake, mandating the use of categorical exclusions, like this bill proposes, is simply a ruse to make an end run around NEPA and the public process that is so important to it.

We often hear that NEPA is a scapegoat for projects being delayed, and I would not want that to be the case; but GAO and others have found that outside issues, including the complexity of the project, local opposition and, most importantly, funding issues, are almost always the cause of the delays.

We shouldn't be limiting public comments and involvement in government decisions, but, instead, should be enhancing them. This bill does the opposite, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I just want to make a point. At this time there are about 66 million dead and dying trees in my State. It is estimated that over the next few years, we could lose up to 120 million trees. That is 20 percent of the entire State of California's total. The trees are dying from drought, severe insect and disease infestation, which only intensifies the potential for disastrous and potentially catastrophic fires.

Unfortunately, we have already seen the loss of life and property from the fast-moving wildfires this year, just most recently, right in the Majority Leader's Congressional District, where people, unfortunately, lost their lives.

I have worked with the senior Senator from California on this. We have used this to the benefit of our State, and other States have used it to the benefit of theirs. This provision is truly limited in nature.

□ 1945

It can only be used on small acreages about 3,000 acres or less.

Madam Chairman, I urge opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

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

Mrs. DINGELL. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairwoman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) for the purpose of colloquy.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Madam Chair, Federal land management agencies are biting off more than they can chew. Not only are these agencies tasked with managing one-third of the entire landmass in the United States of America, but they are also asked to provide law enforcement and police support to some 660 million acres on the Federal estate.

Land management agencies should not be in the business of policing. Currently, the Nation's largest land management agency, the Bureau of Land Management, has just one office—one person—per 1 million acres of Federal land. This is an inadequate system that does not serve the public, Federal lands, or local communities very well.

Local county sheriffs, on the other hand, and local law enforcement deputies are in a better position to police lands within their county. These individuals are known by members of their community. They are trusted, they are better equipped, and there are more of them. Already local law enforcement agencies contract with the Federal Government to carry out the very same law enforcement functions that Federal agencies require. We need to expand this concept and take actions to limit the role of land management agency law enforcement officials.

Madam Chair, I believe we must work to transfer authorities and, ultimately, funding to those local jurisdictions and sheriffs. There will come a time when the Appropriations Committee will play a key role in executing this strategy. I request that the chairman work with Chairman ROB BISHOP of the Committee on Natural Resources, me, and other Members to accomplish this important policy change.

Mr. CALVERT. Reclaiming my time, I am pleased the gentleman has raised this issue. It is important to work together to ensure law enforcement arrangements are best suited to the pop-

ulations they serve. I appreciate the gentleman's dedication to this issue, and I look forward to working together to assess the role of law enforcement.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 23 will not be offered.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 24 printed in House Report 114-683.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. CARTWRIGHT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 25 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk, and I ask that it be considered.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 425.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, this amendment is very simple. It strikes section 425 of H.R. 5538. Section 425 would prohibit the EPA from updating the definition of the terms "fill material" or "discharge of fill material" under the Clean Water Act.

These definitions underlie section 404 of the Clean Water Act, which governs dredge and fill permitting, one of the act's most important components. Put more simply, section 425 would continue giving real legal cover to mountaintop mining companies to dump mining waste into valley streams. As such, section 425 is an attack on the Clean Water Act.

Now, mountaintop mining for coal produces a lot of unusable excess material, known as overburden. The cheapest and easiest way for industry to dispose of overburden is to bulldoze it into valleys and waterways surrounding these decapitated mountains. This had been illegal because the Clean Water Act categorized overburden as waste, which cannot be disposed of in that manner. However, in a 2002 giveaway to the mountaintop mining industry, the George W. Bush administration reclassified overburden as fill. This cleared the path for it to be dumped in mountain valleys once teeming with life.

As if mining overburden were not enough, the definition of fill was expanded to also include material such as wood chips, construction debris, and plastic. As a result, every year, 120 miles of headwater streams are buried in mining debris. These so-called valley fills can be more than 1 mile long, each, and hundreds of feet deep.

This overburden doesn't just take up space; it is also an environmental hazard. Mining debris can contain chemicals and toxins that pose health risks to humans and ecosystems alike. For example, studies have found substantially higher levels of selenium, a mineral that is toxic to fish in high doses, in rivers near mountaintop mine sites. These hazardous substances also pose real dangers to the downstream users of the water.

Overburden dumping and the mining that causes it produce soil erosion and waterway siltation. A 2008 EPA study found that 90 percent of the streams downstream of surface mining had impaired aquatic life. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service estimates that the loss of forest and aquatic habitat to mountaintop mining affects almost 250 species, including several listed species.

This practice also destroys an archetypal American landscape, one which gave rise to a unique culture which has shaped generations of Appalachian residents and which has left its imprint on the broader American culture.

Allowing mountaintop mining operations to continue dumping their waste into our Nation's streams and rivers is both dangerous and irresponsible. I urge my colleagues to join me in putting an end to it. Allow EPA to do their work and protect the environment and the public's health. Support my amendment striking section 425.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairman, the language in section 425 simply maintains the status quo regarding the definition of fill material for purposes of the Clean Water Act. The existing definition was put in place through a rulemaking initiated by the Clinton administration and finalized by the Bush administration. That rule harmonized the definition on the books of the Corps and EPA so both agencies were working within the same definition.

Any attempts to redefine this important definition could significantly negatively impact the ability of all earthmoving industries—road and highway construction and private and commercial enterprise—to obtain vital CWA section 404 permits.

Changing the definition of fill material could result in the loss of up to 375,000 high-paying mining jobs and jeopardize over 1 million jobs that are dependent upon the economic output generated by these operations.

For these reasons, I support the underlying language and oppose the amendment.

Madam Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Madam Chairwoman, the gentleman's points are well taken that the status quo is pre-

served, and that is the problem. Section 425 would prohibit any change in the status quo and would prohibit the EPA from updating the definitions of the terms "fill material" or "discharge of fill material" under the Clean Water Act, thereby hamstringing the EPA from making any kind of sensible updating of those terms. Any attempt at this point to enumerate the number of jobs that could be lost in some as yet undefined change of those terms simply lacks credibility at this point.

There is no point in hamstringing the EPA in this fashion by refusing to allow any further clarification of the terms "fill material" or "discharge of fill material."

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Chairwoman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Madam Chairman, I do also rise in opposition to this amendment. As a Member representing southern West Virginia, I know firsthand the effect a rewrite of the fill material regulations would have on coal mining operations. What this amendment would do would freeze operations and lead to even further layoffs on top of the more than 10,000 jobs we have lost in just the last 5 years.

As the chairman referenced, in last year's omnibus, Congress included—Congress included—similar legislation preventing the EPA and the Corps of Engineers from changing the definition of fill material. Unfortunately, redefining fill material would harm both existing and future operations in the coal mining business, resulting in the loss of thousands of good jobs.

Congress should include this provision to prohibit the EPA from changing the definition of fill material, and I urge opposition.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CARTER of Georgia). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MRS. LAWRENCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 26 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 147, strike lines 10 through 21.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that

would strike section 427 from the underlying bill.

My amendment would preserve the Army Corps of Engineers' and the Environmental Protection Agency's final rule that revises regulations and defines the scope of waters protected under the Clean Water Act. More than 1 million public comments were submitted during this process, a majority of which support the waters of the United States rule. In issuing the final rule, the agencies' intention was to clarify questions of the Clean Water Act's jurisdiction, consistent with the agencies' scientific and technical expertise.

One in three Americans rely on public drinking water systems not previously protected by the Clean Water Act. This rule changes that.

The water crisis in Flint, Michigan, and the crumbling drinking water infrastructure in neighborhoods and communities around the country reinforces the need to protect our streams, ponds, and wetlands. These challenges impact millions of lives and disproportionately affect poor and minority communities.

Our country faces a very difficult choice. We can either overlook the challenges facing our existing water infrastructure and the millions of lives it affects and the billions of dollars that it costs us, or we can all work together to find solutions that ensure that all Americans have access to safe, clean, and affordable drinking water.

The waters of the United States rule is a commonsense reform designed to secure our water sources, while guaranteeing protections to millions of Americans.

□ 2000

This rule represents a commitment to protecting and restoring the national water resources that are vital for our health, environment, and economy.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR.

CARTWRIGHT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), I offer amendment No. 27.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 149, strike lines 3 through 17.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

My amendment would strike section 429, which delays implementation of the EPA's lead renovation, repair, and painting rule.

According to the Centers for Disease Control, at least 4 million households have children who are exposed to high levels of lead. This includes 535,000 children younger than the age of 5. The problem is particularly prevalent in low-income communities.

Yet, even as lead poisoning is a front page news story, the majority ignores another threat from lead and paint. There is no safe blood level of lead for children. That is why it is so imperative that we do everything we can to help families avoid lead poisoning.

The Environmental Protection Agency has proposed reasonable requirements for workers to train and follow lead-safe work practices. It is important to mention that the rule does not apply to do-it-yourselfers or those making improvements to newer homes.

Opponents argue that when EPA first proposed the rule back in 2008, the rule offered a training exemption for those contractors who used an EPA-approved test kit that meets specific criteria. There are now three EPA recognized test kits available on the market.

In light of the tragedy in Flint, Michigan, it is unfathomable that this bill would actively strip one of EPA's tools for addressing lead paint in homes. If we do not remove this harmful rider, we are choosing to endanger the health of our children.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, the Lowey amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, let me be clear, the language in the bill does not block EPA's implementation of the rule.

To date, EPA has not yet approved a test kit that meets the false positive and false negative standards. It is yet another example of EPA finalizing a rule with unattainable standards.

Therefore, the FY17 bill prompts the EPA to finish what it intended to do 7 years ago—approve a lead test kit as an alternative to costly third-party lab testing so as to prevent delays and reduce the cost of in-home renovations. Otherwise, EPA should solicit formal public comment on alternatives. The language in the bill prevents EPA from collecting fines for paperwork and recordkeeping violations until EPA solicits public comments on alternatives.

It is straightforward, commonsense language. As such, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, may I ask the Chair how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my distinguished friend from Pennsylvania.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in very strong support of the Lowey amendment.

This amendment would strike a provision of the bill that waives part of the EPA's lead renovation, repair, and painting rule.

Mr. Chairman, after Flint, we have become more aware of the growing need to protect our communities from the devastating impacts of lead exposure. According to the CDC, at least 4 million households have children who are exposed to high levels of lead, especially in low-income communities.

EPA's rule has been in effect since 2008, so why now, 8 years later, is the majority trying to undermine these protections? Why now? Why after Flint?

Mr. Chairman, lead paint is still present in millions of homes. Now is not the time, it is absolutely the wrong time, to give industry a pass at the expense of America's children.

I urge adoption of the amendment to protect the health and well-being of the American people.

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from New York for those important words.

Either we protect our children from lead paint or we don't.

Mr. Chairman, I don't think anybody here would want to live in a home or send their children to a school that was renovated by a company that recklessly did not have lead-safe training. We owe it to our children and grandchildren to take every step possible to prevent harmful lead exposure.

Vote for my amendment, vote for the Lowey amendment, to improve this bill and help ensure that fewer children will suffer lead poisoning.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, again, we are talking about an agency that can't even get a test right after 7 years. Until they do that, it is yet another example of EPA finalizing a rule with unattainable standards.

I oppose this amendment, and I urge a "no" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. CARTWRIGHT).

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

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. BECERRA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 28 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 149, strikes lines 18 through 25.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment strikes section 430 from the underlying bill. Section 430 blocks efforts by the Environmental Protection Agency to ensure that industries which handle hazardous substances set aside sufficient funds, in the form of bonds or insurance, to clean up toxic spills or releases that are attributable to their hazardous activities.

Under current law, the EPA is required to set financial responsibility requirements for industries at high risk of polluting the environment to the point of creating these toxic Superfund sites. Congress required the EPA to establish financial responsibility requirements to ensure that taxpayers do not have to pay for the cost of cleaning up contaminated sites.

Communities across America experience firsthand what it is like to live and breathe through the contamination of a serial polluter. Right now, thousands of people in my hometown of Los Angeles are living through this very nightmare. After nearly 30 years of operating a lead recycling battery plant, Exide Technologies in the Los Angeles area shut its operations down after contaminating some 10,000 thousand homes with lead—let me repeat that—10,000 homes with lead in the Los Angeles area.

It has been more than a year since Exide shut down this plant and we still don't know who will foot the bill for cleaning those nearly 10,000 homes with each home carrying up to a \$40,000 price tag to get cleaned up. A \$40,000 price tag, 10,000 homes—do the math—\$400 million. And that \$400 million only deals with the cleanup, it doesn't deal with the health effects that those 10,000-plus people will have to deal with for their children and for themselves having suffered from the contamination of lead in and around their property.

Mr. Chairman, section 430 lets polluters off the hook and leaves the American taxpayer on the hook for cleaning up their messes. I don't believe the American people intend for American taxpayers to have to take on the cost of cleaning up someone else's pollution.

That is why I have introduced this amendment to strike section 430 from

the bill, so that polluters, not American taxpayers, take the responsibility for cleaning up their mess.

I urge passage of my amendment to ensure that polluters, not taxpayers, clean up their pollution.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, unfortunately, EPA is under a court order to propose a rule by December 2016, according to a suit brought by the environmentalists, to compel EPA to move forward with more regulation on a schedule they dictate.

BLM, the Forest Service, and the States already impose financial assurance regulations. Therefore, any EPA regulations proposed would be duplicative.

The Western Governors' Association, along with others, have indicated a willingness to work together to ensure that there aren't gaps in the existing regulatory framework so such requirements remain protective. Therefore, there already is a process in place, and language that has been included in the bill, to alleviate the need for EPA to expend taxpayer resources to develop yet another set of duplicative rules.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 2½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, section 430 in this bill provides a blanket prohibition of the EPA having the opportunity to make sure that financial responsibility requirements are imposed on polluters. There may be some provisions in this bill to try to deal with some of these aspects of pollution, but there is nothing that would require the polluter to show financial responsibility if we don't get rid of section 430.

Therefore, in this bill, we would essentially be making lawful polluters polluting communities and not having to take responsibility for cleaning them up. I don't believe the American people, and certainly not American taxpayers, are expecting Congress to be passing bills that put the burden on taxpayers to clean up someone else's pollution.

Beyond the cost of the pollution is the cost to our families. Children who are infected by lead contamination could suffer a permanent effect. I think that we want to make sure we are providing our children and our families with every bit of safety they expect, especially when they had no responsibility for the contamination of the pollution that exists in their neighborhoods.

I urge my colleagues to consider this amendment which simply would strike

this provision so that EPA can do the work that we expect it to do, and that is to preserve the safety and health of our communities by making sure if you are going to have a business that pollutes, that you be responsible for cleaning it up.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I encourage opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chair, if a business pollutes, then it is the responsibility of that business, not the taxpayer, to pay for the cleanup. It is that simple and it is morally right and fair.

I represent Vernon, California, where a lead-acid battery recycling plant, for years, blanketed families in and around Vernon with lead, arsenic, and other toxins.

The plant eventually closed but tragically, its environmental damage remains, leaving an estimated 10,000 contaminated homes.

Because there are no clear requirements for financial responsibility, the response to the lead contamination in my district was delayed, and after more than a year, it still has not been resolved. Families living in these areas continue to live in fear for their children while others struggle to care for children who, as a result of this contamination, are suffering from learning disabilities, cancer and other health related issues.

To allow section 430 to prohibit the EPA from issuing financial responsibility requirements for businesses that handle hazardous substances which can pollute our communities across the country is madness, Mr. Speaker.

We must pass this amendment to ensure that polluters who cheat the system pay the bill, not the American taxpayer.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. BECERRA).

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

Mr. BECERRA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No 29 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE), I offer amendment No. 29.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 150, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 151, line 2.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, everyone who doesn't deny the science understands that climate change is real

and dangerous. Uncontrolled carbon pollution is going into the atmosphere, trapping more heat, and warming the planet.

Americans are experiencing the results in every part of this country. From more devastating fires in the West, including San Diego, to flooding in West Virginia, to coastal erosion in superstorms along the east coast, we are experiencing climate change today and it is getting worse.

□ 2015

We have a choice—pretend it is not happening and abandon future generations, or start to clean up the carbon pollution that is driving climate change.

As President Obama recently said: "Climate change is no longer some far-off problem. It is happening here. It is happening now."

We can't wait for some future generation to take action. To that end, the EPA finalized a workable plan to reduce carbon emissions from power plants, which are the largest uncontrolled source of man-made greenhouse gases in the United States.

The Clean Power Plan gives the States tremendous flexibility to choose how to achieve those reductions. The goals are State-specific and cost-effective. This is a moderate and reasonable approach that ensures flexibility, affordability, reliability, and investment in clean energy technologies; and polls show that the public supports the Clean Power Plan by large majorities. It outlines a path to cleaner air, better health, a safer climate, and a stronger economy. If we make these investments in cleaner energy, the United States can be the world leader in industries of the future.

The majority wants to stop this. They want to deny the science, pretend climate change isn't happening, and let power plants keep spewing carbon pollution without control. They refuse to act to limit carbon pollution, and now they are outraged that President Obama is keeping his word and using his authority under the Clean Air Act to act because we in Congress won't. So they included language in the underlying bill that aims to block the implementation of the Clean Power Plan and the EPA's carbon pollution standards for new and modified power plants. This is a "just say 'no'" agenda. My amendment strikes the harmful rider from the bill.

Let's not heed the arguments on behalf of companies that profit from the status quo. These are defeatist arguments. They aren't interested in developing a plan to help us reduce emissions while maintaining a reasonably and reliably priced electricity system. We have already wasted enough time on legislation to "just say 'no'" to climate action. Now Congress must move on. What we cannot do, as President Obama said, is "condemn our children to a planet beyond their capacity to repair it."



I strongly urge my colleagues to support my amendment. The Clean Power Plan is an important, long overdue, and critical tool in our fight against global climate change.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, the Supreme Court has ruled on a number of occasions that the EPA does not have the authority to rewrite the Clean Air Act, as it has been attempting to do. In February, the Supreme Court issued a stay on the EPA's greenhouse gas rule. It is no surprise that the EPA finds itself on shaky legal ground as it attempts to rely on limited authorities to write a rule that would vastly expand its reach.

This administration's policies, regulations, and rhetoric are all aimed at making energy more expensive in America. The administration cannot be allowed to change the laws of the land administratively, which is why the language in this bill should remain in this bill.

I urge a "no" vote on the amendment to strike.

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ISRAEL).

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of this amendment.

The effects of climate change are real, and they are being felt by Americans every day. NASA says that climate change is causing drought and increased forest fire frequency in the West, flooding in the Midwest, declining water supplies in the Southeast. Ninety-seven percent of all climate experts agree that human activity, specifically the combustion of fossil fuels and the release of carbon into the atmosphere, is changing our climate; yet this Congress continues to deny that there is a crisis, and it refuses to take the action that is necessary to protect the safety, the health, and the well-being of our constituents.

Mr. Chair, the standards that the administration has proposed are just about protecting the health of our children and putting this Nation on a path to a 30 percent reduction in carbon pollution from the power sector by 2030.

We cannot continue to deny that there is something happening with our weather. We cannot continue to deny that there is something happening with our climate nor can we continue to deny that, if we do this right, we will create a new generation of jobs and careers in new technologies. For those

reasons, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chair, we, as a country, should be pursuing a true all-of-the-above approach to energy-electricity generation. Unfortunately, this administration's power plant rules would pick winners and losers. It would determine the market for coal, cost miners their jobs, and raise energy prices for all Americans.

The EPA has exceeded its legal authority by double regulating coal-fired power plants and by forcing States to fundamentally shift their energy portfolios away from coal. It sets standards for new coal-fired power plants that are based on technologies which have not even been proven to be commercially available.

While this administration is using every regulatory effort that is possible to put our hardworking coal miners in the unemployment line, we are pushing back here on the Appropriations Committee. We included this important provision in this bill to protect miners, to protect families, and to protect businesses and our economy.

The chairman is exactly right when he references the United States Supreme Court. The other side would simply take casually the fact that there is no legal authority for the administration to pursue the rules and regulations like in this particular case. It is critically important that we oppose this amendment.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, I understand the gentleman's concern about coal. Without the implementation of the Clean Power Plan, coal has been affected by the market, not by the EPA, and the availability of natural gas has certainly, I think, hurt the coal industry. I understand that, but this is a sensible approach to dealing with air quality and climate change; and I urge my colleagues to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I urge opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS  
The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 152, strike lines 14 through 24.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, my amendment would strike section 434, a harmful policy rider that limits the ability of our environmental agencies to take action to improve public health and to fight the root causes of climate change.

If we are to lower the impact of greenhouse gas emissions, we need Federal action. The largest source of greenhouse gas emissions in the United States is from burning fossil fuels, which raises atmospheric levels of CO<sub>2</sub>. Greenhouse gas emissions can affect coastal regions, energy, defense, food supplies, wildfire preparedness, and our quality of life.

This rider blocks the Environmental Protection Agency's ongoing efforts to reduce the damage that hydrofluorocarbons do to our climate. Hydrofluorocarbons, or HFCs, are factory-made gases that are used in air-conditioning and refrigeration and are up to 10,000 times more potent pound for pound than carbon dioxide.

While not as abundant as carbon dioxide, super pollutants, like HFCs and methane, have contributed up to 40 percent of observed global warming. Unless we act now, the United States' HFC emissions are expected to double by 2020 and to triple by 2030.

By limiting the EPA's authority under the Clean Air Act to propose, finalize, or enforce any regulation or guidance regarding HFCs, this rider would undercut its ability to protect public health and to demonstrate American leadership in emissions reductions.

The EPA's Significant New Alternatives Policy Program, or SNAP, requires us to evaluate substitutes that are already being developed by industry for super pollutants like HFCs. Through SNAP, we can ensure a more smooth transition to safer alternatives for our country's industrial sector. Last year, the SNAP finalized a new rule on HFCs that the Environmental Investigation Agency estimates will reduce emissions by 2030 by the equivalent of taking 21 million cars off the road.

The standards set by the EPA will drive U.S. and international innovation and the market development of low-emission and energy-efficient refrigeration, air-conditioning, foam blowing agents, and aerosol technologies. These innovations will actually get at one of the root causes of climate change before we are forced to react to increasingly extreme weather and sea level rise.

By embracing these forward-thinking proposals, we can tackle the low-hanging fruit while adopting alternatives that are actually much more energy efficient than current HFCs. This is one

example of how embracing the clean energy revolution doesn't just limit damage to our climate but also increases America's competitiveness and creates economic opportunity. Last year, we saw major companies, including Coca-Cola, Carrier, DuPont, Honeywell, PepsiCo, and other industry leaders commit to voluntarily reducing harmful HFC emissions.

I appreciate the concerns of some in the industry about the pace at which they are required to transition to lower emission materials, but the answer to that is not to halt this process entirely. Preventing the SNAP program from functioning when less harmful materials are being developed is not the right approach. My amendment strikes this shortsighted rider so that America can continue to be a leader in advancing innovative solutions to reducing our emissions. We should not be handcuffing the important work being done at the EPA to reduce super pollutants. I ask my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, last year, the EPA issued a final rule to disqualify many refrigerants and other chemicals. The rule contained aggressive deadlines for the phase-out of many chemicals. Some of those deadlines applied within 6 months. Historical experience with the Montreal Protocol indicated that manufacturers needed 6-plus years to successfully transition between new materials.

It is nice if the Fortune 100 companies, as the gentleman mentioned, are able to quickly transfer their technologies, but a lot of Main Street people can't. They just simply go broke. Clearly, the EPA chose winners and losers, and for the losers, the timelines are absolutely unworkable. Manufacturers need time to implement engineering and technology changes and to address new risk and safety challenges.

No sooner did the EPA finalize its regulation last year to disqualify certain products than the EPA initiated version 2.0—that the rulemaking is now in the works. This is truly an out-of-control process that is driven by the White House's agenda.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, I take the gentleman's point. I would just say again that, if there are concerns about the timeline, I would be more than willing to work—and I am sure my colleagues would—on a better timeline, but stopping all activity is not the answer. That is why I think this is the appropriate response; so I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 154, strike line 22 and all that follows through page 155, line 8.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, the social—or real—cost of carbon is the monetary estimate of the damages caused by carbon dioxide emissions to the environment, health, and economic growth.

Today's bill contains an unnecessary and harmful policy rider that would delay, indefinitely, incorporating that cost in rulemaking or guidance documents. My amendment would strike that bad rider and would, instead, put us on a path of responsible policymaking that reflects the realities of changing climates and increasingly extreme weather events.

□ 2030

Former New York City Mayor Michael Bloomberg's bipartisan Risky Business report notes that accounting for the real cost of carbon emissions and preparing for climate change is a smart business practice.

If we continue on our current path, by 2050, between \$66 billion and \$106 billion worth of existing coastal property will likely be below sea level nationwide. Eighty percent of California's GDP is derived from our coastal counties.

Greenhouse gas-driven changes in temperature by burning fossil fuels will necessitate construction of new power generation that Mayor Bloomberg's report estimates will cost residential and commercial ratepayers as much as \$12 billion per year. That is \$12 billion that could be spent by families to put their kids through school or to buy a home. It could be spent by businesses to hire more employees or give annual bonuses.

Accounting for the social cost of carbon now provides greater certainty and greater freedom in the future.

I anticipate my colleagues in opposition to this amendment will suggest that the harmful rider merely delays using the social cost of carbon until a new working group can update the data we use to guide rulemaking. In practice, this would send this rule back to

the drawing board when the data we have now about how carbon emissions damage our economy and our health is perfectly adequate and backed by peer-reviewed science.

By adding more layers of bureaucracy, this rider rejects a forward-thinking approach already used by the private sector and backed by science in favor of the status quo, in favor of doing nothing.

There is a real cost to our environment and our prosperity associated with delaying this rule. For too long we have heard that we have had to choose between supporting prosperity and a clean environment. The implication is we can't have both, but that is a false choice we can't afford to make. We have to provide both economic opportunity and clean water and air for future generations.

I want to take a cue from the private sector, from businesses that already account for the cost of carbon, and let's be sensible and support this amendment.

I want to thank my friends—Congressman POLIS, Congressman LOWENTHAL, Congresswoman ESTY, Congressman BEYER, and Congressman WELCH—for backing this effort.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I have long been concerned with how the EPA conducts its cost-benefit analysis to justify its rulemaking. This is something that the committee has discussed with the EPA on a number of occasions. The Supreme Court recently ruled that EPA's approach to examining costs in their regulations was, at the least, flawed.

The administration's revised estimates for the social cost of carbon help justify, on paper, larger benefits from reducing carbon emissions in any proposed rule. If the administration can inflate the price tag so that the benefits always exceed the costs, then the administration can gold plate required regulations from any department or any agency.

Section 436 says that the administration should reconvene a working group to revise the estimates in a more transparent manner and to make that information available to the public.

I oppose the gentleman's amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, the majority has repeatedly brought bills to this same House floor that add

requirements for Federal agencies to use more cost-benefit analyses; but now, when we are dealing with climate change, we are told that we should remove requirements to honestly consider the cost of climate change.

Which way do you want it? Is cost-benefit analysis only a good thing when it suits the majority's purpose to slow regulation and a bad thing when it may shed some light on the true cost of our carbon-based actions?

Ignoring the facts because we don't like them won't make the problem go away. Greenhouse gas emissions from human activities are causing climate change with profound monetary costs for our health, infrastructure, food security, and national security.

Let's bring more information and transparency into the Federal rule-making process by using the social cost of carbon to quantify those costs. That way we can understand the risks and make sound investments in our Nation's future.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, this is ironic because we hear from Republicans all the time about the importance of cost-benefit analyses before this regulation, before that regulation. Well, of course, we acknowledge and I acknowledge that there are costs to regulation with regard to emissions, there is no doubt. There are also benefits.

I have a tourism-dependent district. We have great ski areas like Vail, Breckenridge. Well, guess what. That is climate dependent. We have agriculture in my district—climate dependent.

You know what? I would also acknowledge, of course, all the costs, all the benefits, those are estimates.

You know, what? No model is perfect, but I guarantee you that the model is far superior to just throwing it out altogether and having no model. There are real costs to carbon emissions, and it is completely appropriate to use the best science-driven data to estimate those in any type of regulation.

It is important to look at costs as benefits, and I feel we are making the argument our Republican friends usually make. But here, in this case, they don't happen to like these particular costs. Maybe they don't think they are real. Maybe they don't believe in them. But we let science guide us.

The fact that I have a weather-dependent district and we have a climate-dependent economy across our country is powerful testimony towards including the social cost of carbon.

I urge my colleagues to adopt the amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chair, folks, here is what is going on: the EPA and other Federal agencies are increasingly using this thing called

social cost of carbon in their environmental rulemaking.

So what is social cost of carbon? It is an ambiguous and confusing matrix that has been used simply to justify the validity of many of the administration's clean air environmental regulations that target the direct and indirect carbon dioxide emissions from various sources.

Since its very first use, the administration has recalculated the models multiple times in order to inflate the supposed cost of small increases in CO<sub>2</sub> in the atmosphere and, thus, supposed benefits.

What is most outrageous is that the administration, which the minority here says is just simply trying to put in the economic factors, is actually ignoring the Office of Management and Budget's circular A-4, which explicitly states that "a real discount rate of 7 percent should be used as a base-case for regulatory analysis."

Guess what. They ran the numbers. Seven percent doesn't get them what they need from the social costs, so what they do is ignore OMB and come up with their own factors. That is the deceptive nature of their supposed cost factor. Change the underlying assumptions, change the factors, get the results you want that justify your findings.

Folks, that is not how we should be doing it. I strongly urge opposition to this amendment.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 30 seconds remaining.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I would just say, again, I think the gentleman makes an excellent point that 7 percent is a pretty aggressive discount rate and maybe we should talk about the methodology. But what we should not do is prevent the discussion in its entirety, which is what that language does.

So I hope that my colleagues will support our amendment and that we will be able to get it right. We can agree on a methodology that fairly represents this issue, and I would be happy to work with my colleague. I hope they will support my amendment so we can, at least, have this discussion.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, this is voodoo environmentalism, so I would absolutely have opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS).

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 32 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 155, strike lines 9 through 15.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

I rise to speak on behalf of the amendment that I have offered to protect farmworkers throughout this Nation.

Every day, farmworkers work long hours under the scorching sun in one of the most dangerous industries in this country, and they suffer the highest rates of chemical injuries and skin disorders due to pesticide exposure. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency estimates that up to 3,000 farmworkers suffer acute pesticide poisoning every year through their work-related exposure.

Every year, an estimated 1.1 billion pounds of pesticides are applied to agricultural crops in the United States. According to the EPA, 10,000 to 20,000 farmworkers suffer pesticide poisoning annually. Exposure to pesticides increases the risk of chronic health problems amongst adult and child farmworkers, such as cancer, infertility, neurological disorders, and respiratory conditions.

There are approximately half a million child farmworkers in the U.S., and farmworker children face increased risks of cancer and birth defects. It should be noted that this workplace, in the farms and working crops, is the only area in this country where child labor laws do not apply. Should we then increase the children's risk and exposure because they are not covered by a law that covers the rest of the children in this country?

Research also shows that both farmworkers and their children may suffer decreased intellectual functioning from even low levels of exposure to insecticides, which are widely used in agriculture.

After more than 20 years, the Environmental Protection Agency finally made the long overdue updates to the worker protection standards for farmworkers. The standards provide basic workplace protections to farmworkers to reduce harmful exposures and result in fewer pesticide-related injuries, illnesses, birth defects, and deaths among farmworkers and their family members.

Farmworkers play a critical role in our economy, ensuring that our constituents have nutritious, quality food

on their tables. The 2017 Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriation Act contains a harmful provision, section 437, that will remove farmworkers' rights to a designated representative.

A designated representative in this process is a critical part of improving access to pesticide information for workers in various situations. There are times when a worker may need the help of a spouse, family member, or co-worker to obtain information. For instance, if a worker is injured or hurt and cannot be there in person, the information could be requested by the treating medical personnel. This standard is in practice in other sectors where workers are exposed to toxic substances and is consistent with the access to exposure records that those workers now have.

To protect the health of those who harvest the food for our constituents and put it on our tables, it is critical to have a uniform Federal standard that applies to all workers, and that is the right to have a designated representative.

In the amendment that I offer, I would simply strike section 437 in order to protect farmworkers' rights and also provide health protections.

I urge my colleagues to support the Grijalva-Sanchez amendment to strike section 437. This amendment is important to the health and safety of farmworkers and their families. We must ensure that farmworkers can appropriately access information on pesticides so they can protect themselves and their families while doing their jobs that are so vital to our Nation and to our economy.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, prior to finalizing the worker protection rule, the EPA shared a draft with the House Committee on Agriculture. The draft did not contain a section that authorized the use of designated representatives. It was later inserted by the EPA without congressional consultation, and the EPA failed to follow the law that requires consultation with the authorizers on these pesticide rules.

However, the broader concern is the substance of the rule. Farmers are concerned they will have little recourse but to turn over their documents to unauthorized individuals. The section of the rule is ill-advised, and unintended consequences were clearly not considered. The EPA needs to reengage with the authorizing committee and the agricultural community on this.

In the meantime, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2045

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, at the urging of many organizations, and

at the urging of being consistent and uniform with the protections extended to workers who work with toxic substances throughout this country, which includes the provision that a representative may represent the interests, seek information, and provide transparency for that worker in order for them to pursue their health and their safety.

I think this section, the worker protection section, if we strike this section, all we are doing is making the process uniform for every industry. To deny farmworkers, and more particularly children, as I mentioned, that is the only workplace sector in which the child labor laws do not apply, to provide them, their families, and children with the simple ability to be treated like every other worker, in every other industry, that deals with toxic substances, I think, is just merely playing a fair game, treating all workers equally, and in this instance, this amendment would be consistent with what is going on in the rest of the Nation and the protections extended to all workers.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 33 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an excellent amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 156, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 157, line 11.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I am proud to offer this amendment, along with my colleagues, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. LUJAN GRISHAM.

It is a very simple amendment. It just strikes a policy rider, section 439 of the bill. This section would block the EPA from doing its job. It would block the EPA's commonsense standards for sources of emissions of methane in the oil and gas industry, an

issue that is literally in our backyards in the State of Colorado.

It would even prevent the EPA from doing research into existing drill sites for methane standard purposes, and, most astonishing, it would actually prevent the EPA from clarifying the scope of emission sources, which would continue to make sure that we know less and are less protected rather than more protected.

The President and the EPA are taking action to protect our country, our planet, from methane emissions. It is past time that we take bold action to combat climate change and reduce the impact of impending catastrophic changes to our climate, to our world, reducing national security and hurting our economy in tourism and agriculture-dependent districts like mine. Taking aggressive action now is, quite simply, a moral imperative, not only within the purview of the EPA, but the actual charge that Congress is giving the Environmental Protection Agency.

The sad reality is that right now, the majority of our energy still comes from fossil fuels. That is why while of course we need to invest in renewables, at the same time, we can't wait to transition entirely to renewable energy before we address the extraction process that releases dangerous chemicals, such as methane as a by-product. Pound for pound, methane pollution from oil and gas wells is 80 times more potent than carbon dioxide and is responsible for one-quarter of human-made climate change, according to scientists.

These EPA rules are long overdue standards for the oil and gas industry, which will reduce methane pollution and provide certainty for the industry. Although I wish, frankly, these new rules went further, I wish, frankly, that Congress had taken bold action, these stricter standards are a good start, and they are necessary. Scientists have recently published even more convincing data showing that the methane released during natural gas extraction is a deadly climate threat.

New scientific mapping shows that 12.4 million people live within a half mile of the 1.2 million active oil and gas facilities in the United States, many in my home of Colorado. This threat radius is a very conservative estimate of the distance from which toxic air emissions from oil and gas facilities have an adverse impact on public health. It is why in many areas of northern Colorado and Wyoming, we have worse air quality than downtown Los Angeles.

We must not prevent the EPA from moving forward to protect our air, our water, and our planet, which is what Congress has charged them to do. It is time for us to allow them to do their science-based work. It is time to make the fossil fuel industry and fracking play by the same set of rules the rest of the country plays by, instead of letting them emit tons of chemicals, literally tons of chemicals into our air that put our health and the future of the planet in jeopardy.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, in May, EPA issued regulations for new and existing oil and gas operations. These are the latest steps in the President's climate agenda. EPA pulled the rug out from underneath these companies, working in good faith to share information with the Agency. The industry was making tremendous progress to reduce emissions through voluntary measures. By any measurable degree, they were making tremendous progress.

But this administration feels the need to overregulate the oil and gas industry at every single turn, to use their police powers to bring this industry to their knees. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, voluntary measures are just that, voluntary. While there might, and perhaps there are a few good actors willing to abide by them in some States, like my home State of Colorado, have implemented air standards. What we care about is the aggregate. We want to discourage a race to the bottom among producers and have a national baseline for methane emissions.

While, again, frankly, I think this rule should go a lot further, at least it provides that baseline, provides the industry certainty, and helps begin the process of us getting a handle on ensuring that the air we breathe is clean and reducing climate change.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS.)

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, here we go again. Just two amendments ago we had something called the social cost of carbon. Well, yes, the administration has now put out a new methane rule. Guess what. Social cost of methane is now being put forth as the economic justification for their rules.

I pointed out just a moment ago that despite the OMB's circular recommending a certain discount rate, unfortunately when running the numbers, apparently the Agency doesn't get the results they want, so what they do is change the underlying assumptions.

I rise in opposition to this amendment. This amendment would remove a critical provision to protect against new, expansive methane regulations that could harm the economy, would harm the economy, and strangle our domestic energy portfolio. These regulations are being developed using the same overly aggressive interpretation of the Clean Air Act that was responsible for the costly, burdensome Clean Power Plan.

What is interesting on this one, however, is that even the EPA found that the methane rule would provide only marginal benefits. But they plow ahead regardless of that finding. I urge the opposition to this amendment.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, you can't just pretend that things don't have costs. Of course, carbon emissions have a cost. Of course, methane emissions have a cost. It doesn't mean that people are proposing we abolish carbon emissions from our economy. It means we want to look at, in this case, methane emissions and their cost. Colorado has implemented similar rules already that the industry has adopted. There are actors in the industry who want this very certainty so they know what they need to do with regard to methane emissions. There are plenty of companies providing new recapture technologies.

All this does is begin to get a handle on it. Again, in my opinion, it doesn't go far enough. In my opinion, it isn't the kind of action I would hope a bold Congress would take. But at the very least, let's have standards for methane emissions. Let's prevent a ban on research into existing drill sites for methane standard purposes.

If this section is left intact, not only does it strike the emission standards, it prevents the EPA from doing research into what the standards should be or could be, so we are never going to reach "the right answer." It should be beholden on those who believe that this is not the right answer to actually support the very kind of research for methane standard purposes that is blocked by this very section, which our amendment will remove from the bill. I ask for your support on this simple, commonsense amendment to remove this policy rider and help keep our air clean.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS).

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 34 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 157, strike lines 13 through 16.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike a misguided policy rider that could cost taxpayers hundreds of millions of dollars, and it maintains a sweetheart, below-market deal for the fossil fuel industry.

My amendment would strike section 440 of the underlying bill, a section that would prevent the Interior Department from updating royalty rates and valuation methodologies for coal, oil, and natural gas resources on public lands.

Now, I would think that saving the taxpayer money by charging a fair return for the development of our public resources is something that both sides of the aisle could agree upon. So maybe the sponsors behind this policy rider didn't know the true magnitude of the cost to taxpayers that their rider to this appropriations bill would impose upon Americans.

To make sure that we all understand, Mr. Chair, what we would be costing the taxpayer if we were to vote to keep this harmful rider, Mr. Chair, I would like to share some eye-opening research on this matter.

The nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office, the CBO, just released in April a detailed study that reviewed possible changes to the oil and gas fiscal system. That report explicitly analyzed how much money the American taxpayer is losing from the current below-market onshore oil and gas royalty rates.

CBO concluded that the U.S. Treasury would receive \$200 million additional and the Western States another \$200 million over 10 years if the Interior Department were to simply raise the onshore royalty rates to parity with the current offshore royalty rates.

So, to be clear, keeping this misguided policy rider would prevent an additional \$200 million from being sent to the Western States and another \$200 million to the Federal taxpayer.

Mr. Chairman, I have also heard specious arguments that claim raising onshore royalty rates will decrease production, put all oil and gas companies out of business and actually reduce the return to the taxpayer. This is false, and here is why: The CBO analyzed these effects and found that this was not the case. The CBO found that the effects on production would be negligible, and that the increases in Federal and State revenues are net increases that include the decreases in income from bonus bids and production changes. Furthermore, production would not simply move to State or private lands to find lower royalty rates because private mineral owners and Western States, like Wyoming, New

Mexico, Louisiana, North Dakota, Montana, even Oklahoma and Texas, all of them charge higher royalty rates.

Thus, I hope these facts will disabuse those who used to believe in keeping onshore oil and gas royalty rates below market price, and now will, instead, support the Lowenthal amendment No. 34 that will allow the Interior Department to provide the taxpayer and Western States with hundreds of millions of dollars in additional revenue.

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

□ 2100

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, we included a provision in this prohibiting the Department of the Interior from changing royalty rates in its valuation regulation for coal, oil, and gas on Federal land in order to stem the hemorrhaging of jobs we are seeing in coal country and throughout the United States.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE).

Mr. ZINKE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to Mr. LOWENTHAL's amendment to strike the language that would defund the administration's efforts to kill coal, oil, and gas development.

My colleagues and I included this language for good reason. We are trying to protect our schools, our infrastructure, our communities, and the very livelihoods that depend on these revenues.

I know that royalty and valuation mean very little outside these walls, but to my constituents across Montana, it means funding schools and empowering local communities.

Mike Johnson, an operating engineer from Billings, I think sums it up best:

I am a working man from Montana. I am not a doctor or a lawyer or anything, but I personally suffered from the Federal mismanagement of our public lands in western Montana. I am a displaced worker from a paper mill. I now work in eastern Montana, and people don't understand the impact these jobs have on our lives. I saw five about five of my friends commit suicide after the mill closed. My wife had cancer, and I lost my health care, and I lost darn good-paying jobs.

The chairman of the great Crow Nation, Old Coyote, said:

A war on coal is a war on the Crow people.

Without Crow revenue, without revenue from coal, the Crow people faced a lifetime of despair and poverty. They have very few options but coal. Yet, this administration, at every turn, tries to prevent the Crow Nation from being sovereign and from having their choice to export and use their resource as they want. These words capture the real problem, and the cost is real people.

I know that many don't understand where Montana is. Montana is the same size as from here to Chicago, plus 2 miles. I understand Montana. I understand that Montana is blessed with re-

sources, and we want to use them in a responsible way. But I also have to protect our families, our ability to provide a living in Montana.

For this reason, I ask my colleagues to vote against this amendment and stand with American workers, families, and the great Crow Nation.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, we heard a very passionate plea that this amendment of mine would hurt jobs, would hurt schools, would kill coal. It is just the opposite.

As I pointed out, the CBO's report just indicated that production would not go down. In fact, the largest impact upon production, the dominant factor that controls production, is the price of crude oil and natural gas, not the royalty rates.

I also would like to remind those on the other side of the aisle that States like Montana already at the State level and also on private property charge much higher than we are asking at the Federal level.

I would agree to the same charge that Montana charges residents for its own oil and gas and coal production.

Mr. Chairman, I request an "aye" vote on this very reasonable amendment that really brings money back to both States and also to the Federal Treasury.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, it is interesting. We hear the devastating effects from people who represent these States that are rich in natural resources and what is happening in coal country and to the oil industry and the rest. I respect their opinion and I, obviously, oppose this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL).

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 35 printed in House Report 114-683.

PERMISSION TO CONSIDER AMENDMENT NOS. 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, AND 40 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA EN BLOC

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that amendment Nos. 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 40 printed in House Report 114-683, be considered en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I offer amendment Nos. 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 40.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments.

The text of the amendments is as follows:

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 162, beginning on line 14, strike section 447.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 166, beginning on line 19, strike section 448.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 172, beginning on line 4, strike section 449.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 182, beginning on line 18, strike section 450.

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 182, beginning on line 24, strike section 451.

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. MCNERNEY OF CALIFORNIA

Page 183, beginning on line 3, strike section 452.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I am submitting an amendment to strike provisions from Mr. VALADAO's bill, H.R. 2898, that were included as riders in this year's Interior and EPA appropriations bill.

I am disappointed that my Republican colleagues continue to attach bad policy on important appropriations bills. In this case, they have attached the same damaging riders to the Interior appropriations bill that would drain the California delta with over pumping. These provisions would ravage the ecology of the delta, destroy the local fish and wildlife, and harm communities we serve.

They would undermine 40 years of progress in protecting our land and resources. They override environmental protection for California rivers, fisheries, threatening thousands of fishing jobs, and weaken the Endangered Species Act. Fish will go extinct. But my Republican colleagues claim that this bill will not harm fish.

These sections violate existing biological opinions protecting salmon and other endangered fish, which would impact the salmon industry across the entire Pacific Coast.

These riders do nothing to prepare our communities for droughts in the future. These are droughts we know are coming. They misstate California water law and encourage further regional divides in the West when we need to work together to bridge those differences.

H.R. 2898 has been opposed by the State and key stakeholders, including commercial and sport fishermen, Native American tribes, environmental groups, and recreational employers. And the Obama administration has already threatened to veto it, but my Republican colleagues keep claiming that water is being wasted.

Hydrological conditions have played a primary role in water deliveries since the start of California's drought. The 2014 water year was the third driest in California's recorded history, and some experts conclude that the current drought may be the State's most severe in 1,200 years.

Currently, 100 percent of the State is experiencing some level of drought, and more than 40 percent is experiencing "exceptional drought," the most severe drought classification according to the U.S. Drought Monitor.

The Department of the Interior estimates that the Endangered Species Act accounted for a mere 2 percent of the water supply reduction in the Central Valley Project water deliveries in 2014, and current estimates suggest a similarly small impact in 2014. California's State Water Resources Control Board estimated that in 2015, only 2 percent of this water flowed out to the ocean solely for environmental protection.

The water that Donald Trump said was being shoved out to sea was actually used to prevent saltwater intrusion that would permanently damage some of the most valuable farmland in the world. Water being released for salinity control protects Central Valley farms from being contaminated.

California and Federal officials have been able to increase exports from the California delta using existing authority. This action has helped maximize the use of what little water exists in the State. A lack of water is our biggest threat, not operational flexibility. And my colleagues still wonder where some of that water went.

Well, according to the Bay Institute, earlier this year, approximately two-thirds of storm runoff was captured or diverted, with only one-third of the runoff making it through the delta estuary. And for the period of October 1 of last year to January 31, 60 percent of storm water was diverted or stored.

Water scarcity in California is caused by longstanding and severe drought and the slow pace of investments in efficiency, water recycling, and other supplies. Many senior water right holders have received 100 percent of their allocation this year. According to State law, they are supposed to get that amount. The other junior right holders got much less, but that is what it means to be a junior water right holder—you don't get as much water in a drought.

California has the right to stop seawater intrusion, protect water quality for our communities and farms, and distribute allocations according to their water right system. Even the junior water right holders have proven their resiliency. In fact, the National Agriculture Statistics Service projects a record almond crop in California this year. The orchards will yield an estimated 2.05 billion pounds, up from an even 2 billion the year before. It would eclipse the record.

I am deeply disappointed this bill has been included in this year's Interior ap-

ropriations bill, and I hope my amendment passes to strike out these harmful provisions.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, we all know there has been a drought in California, except for this year. This year, we have had some relief from the historic drought conditions that have been certainly made worse by Federal actions, which have, undoubtedly, led to increased pressure on California's ability to provide water throughout the State.

I have been following the flows of water through the delta virtually every day. I remember one day there was 185,000 cubic feet per second moving through the delta. And for whatever reason, decisions were made to only pump 2,500 cubic feet per second when you are allowed under the biological opinion to pump 5,000. I am just going to give that as one example.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO), who has been working very hard in the Central Valley for the farms and his constituents.

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Chairman, 380 million gallons a day; that is a number that should have been quoted. When you hear about 380 million gallons a day of sewage being dumped in this estuary that they talk about, this environment they are trying to protect, when you think about that much sewage being dumped into the delta on a daily basis, you hear the same people talking about trying to protect it.

There are things going on in that delta. And they have been restricting our water for the last 20 years, and it has not saved that species. There are provisions in these bills that actually help. We attacked the invasive species that is attacking the delta smelt, the striped bass. We have offered that provision many times.

We are offering many solutions. Like the author mentioned earlier, we have had language in probably five different pieces of legislation going through the House over to the Senate. We have begged for an open and transparent process where we can debate this and have some commonsense ideas brought forward and voted and signed into law so that we can help both our communities.

If you truly care about the delta, stop polluting it. If you truly care about the people of California and what it costs to feed your families, if you truly care about farm workers, if you truly care about these small communities, you would care about water and doing this right and having an honest debate.

Now, I have been approached off camera a million times now to have an-

other off-camera conversation about this, and we have said all along: No more conversation like that. Everything on the floor. This is an open, transparent process. Five pieces of legislation have this language in it. And we are going to continue to push until we can get some support so we can fix this problem.

□ 2115

So those little communities in my district that people claim to care about could actually turn on a faucet and fill a pot of water so they can make themselves some food to eat and some dinner, maybe bathe their children, because that is where we are today. We have houses that, when they turn on a faucet, they no longer have water.

And I get the whole junior water rights concern, but if they were truly concerned about the environment, they would give up some of their water. But you look at Hetch Hetchy, that has had 100 percent of their water and continues to deliver that water via pipeline all the way to San Francisco without one conversation about that water being able to help some of these rivers and some of these species, but they are not willing to give up any of their water. They are willing to take other people's water. It is the same thing we hear about on so many different issues; take someone else's product, or someone else's water and try to solve another problem with it.

And the problem has to be solved the right way: language that we have offered, that has been offered into these amendments, into these bills, and that we have pushed over to the Senate, and the conversation has to be had in an open, transparent process like our Senators have told us they wanted.

So we are here. We are ready for that conversation. We want an honest debate, and we want to talk about the way we actually fix these problems.

We are not going to try to accommodate communities dumping their sewage in the delta, but we want to help those species, and there is language in there to do that, even language in there to help capture some of the water. Use some of the infrastructure we have paid for as taxpayers and allow it to be used to its full capacity so we can continue to store water that we do have and not waste it.

This is an honest piece of language that could actually help solve California's problems, and I think we need to continue to have an honest debate.

Mr. CALVERT. Obviously, this is an emotional subject. It is not just water that is going to the Central Valley, also to the southern California region for the millions of people who live there.

We don't want to see water wasted. This year, we saw hundreds and hundreds of thousands of acre-feet of water being released through the delta, really, with not saving one fish. Even independent agencies will privately agree that they were overly conservative

when they were managing the pump operations of late.

So this suffering that is going on is terrible. It needs to come to an end. I certainly oppose this amendment and urge a “no” vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. MCNERNEY).

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

Mr. MCNERNEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendments offered by the gentleman from California will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 183, strike line 23 and all that follows through page 184, line 15.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to strike section 453 from the underlying bill.

Section 453 restricts funds from being used to establish a national monument pursuant to the Antiquities Act in several Western counties, including Maricopa County in Arizona, a portion of which I represent in Congress.

I understand the Member who inserted this language into the bill during committee consideration is generally opposed, if not totally opposed, to the use of the Antiquities Act.

This section restricts the use of the Antiquities Act on over 160 million acres of public land, nearly one-quarter of all Federal land in the lower 48. I know that many of the Members of Congress who represent these areas do not support this blanket restriction on the use of the Antiquities Act.

So that we are absolutely clear, these monuments can be established only on land already owned by the Federal Government. This is how Federal lands should be preserved. It is not about adding more land to the Federal estate.

Since Theodore Roosevelt’s designation of the first national monument, Devils Tower in Wyoming, 16 Presidents from both parties have used the Antiquities Act to protect more than 160 of America’s best known and most loved landscapes; only 3 Presidents have not.

America’s public places are becoming more and more inclusive, more rep-

resentative of all Americans, and as President Obama has demonstrated with the use of the Antiquities Act, more representative of the real reality, history, culture, and special places of this Nation that represent all people. That is why, presently, I am working with the region’s Native American communities and, in earnest, I have asked the President to designate the Greater Grand Canyon Heritage National Monument on public land surrounding the Grand Canyon.

Section 435 of this bill will jeopardize not only that effort, but other efforts around the country to honor, recognize, and protect our most cherished cultural, historic, and natural resources, and it should be removed from the bill.

I urge my colleagues to stand up in defense of the Antiquities Act and support my amendment to strike Section 435 from this bill.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the gentleman’s amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Chairman, some 20 years ago, President Clinton went to Arizona and he pointed across the border into Utah, in my district, and he said: I’m creating a national monument over there—nearly 2 million acres.

He did not have the courage to come to Utah to defend this monument nor to create it because he knew that the local people did not support it. That monument has been incredibly unpopular since then. It has kicked ranchers off the range. It has decimated the local economies, until we have reached this point, where some of the local school districts have had to declare an emergency because their schools are dying and their children are having to ride a bus for 2 hours, one way, 2 hours, to go to school. Why? Because there are no jobs that can support a family, and people are having to leave.

Local input is so important to the creation of these monuments, and there are examples where local input and where people collaborating have worked together and come to a great solution. ROB BISHOP has done that. Just yesterday, we held a bipartisan press conference where we had local mayors, Republicans and Democrats, on what we called the Mountain Accord.

I am asking President Obama, please, come to my State. Talk to the people in my district. See what they think about this monument. Come talk to us and see how this will impact them.

Now, let me close with this. There is a reason I live in Utah. I love to ski. I love to rock climb. I love to hike. I love to sit on my porch and look at the

beautiful landscape around me. I want to preserve this. All of us do. But there is a right way to do this and there is a wrong way to do this, and the Antiquities Act and the stroke of a pen of a President who won’t even come to the State to defend his action is not the right way.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding the time.

I really want to support this important amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona. It is important because it will strike a section of this bill that will hurt a small group of States, including my State of Maine.

As we all know, the Congress gave the President the right to create a national monument over 100 years ago. Since then, the President has used that authority to create national monuments like Yellowstone, Grand Canyon National Park, and Acadia National Park in my district.

National monuments bring economic benefits to States, and the use of the Antiquities Act has been an important conservation tool for over a century. For my State of Maine, a national monument would bring new visitors to the area and create jobs, not just in the immediate region, but throughout the State.

For example, we already have a national park in Maine, Acadia National Park. Acadia started out as a national monument 100 years ago this very month, and it brings about 3 million visitors a year to the region.

Mr. Chair, this bill has very problematic language in that it will block the creation of national monuments, even in areas where one might be supported by our local communities. We need to strip this provision out of the underlying bill.

I urge my colleagues to strongly support the Grijalva amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, Congressman GRIJALVA, who represents southwestern Arizona, is seeking to lock up 1.7 million acres in northern Arizona, at the behest of special interest groups, for the sole purpose of preventing mining, retiring grazing permits, closing roads to OHV users, and preventing forest thinning activities. There is significant opposition in Arizona to this proposed land grab, as Americans for Responsible Recreational Access recently reported that a scientific poll found that 71.6 percent of Arizonans are opposed.

In April, I held a public meeting to hear concerns about this proposal, and hundreds of local stakeholders showed up in opposition. More than 30 Arizona witnesses submitted formal testimony against this land grab, including Arizona’s Governor, the Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry, numerous businesses, sportsmen’s groups, ag



groups, local officials, and countless taxpayers. In fact, several of the comments pertaining to today are out of line.

In fact, in this proposal, the entire town of Tusayan, which is in Coconino County, would be swallowed up by this proposed monument. Town managers testified against it.

Arizona State Land Department Commissioner Lisa Atkins submitted testimony stating: "Of the 1.7 million acres included in the proposal for the Grand Canyon Watershed National Monument, 64,000 acres belong solely to the Common Schools beneficiary: K-12 education."

The list goes on and on and on. I asked everybody. In fact, Arizona Governor Doug Ducey stated: "Imposition of a preservation management objective overlay on 1.7 million acres of land in Arizona thwarts Arizona's land management objectives and values, and it does so by bypassing a public process that would most certainly result in a much more thoughtful result. The Grand Canyon Watershed National Monument is not narrow, targeted, warranted, or being considered through an open cooperative public process."

I, last but not least, bring up that attorneys also have testified that this proposed monument will tie up future surface water use and future groundwater use.

I urge a "no" vote on amendment 41.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, is there any time left for the opposition?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS).

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of Mr. GRIJALVA's amendment.

I represent the heart of the Las Vegas Valley, which attracts more than 42 million visitors from around the globe every year to the world famous Strip to visit our first-class casinos, restaurants, shopping, and shows.

But that is not the only reason people come to Nevada. They come to see the West as it was hundreds, even thousands, of years ago. They come to see the iconic bighorn sheep, the Joshua tree, the petroglyphs that tell the history of the first people who called southern Nevada home.

Congress rightfully entrusted in the President the authority to designate such special places for protection, but this bill would eliminate his or her ability to do that, to protect those places that tell America's stories.

I urge my colleagues to support Mr. GRIJALVA's amendment to strip out this section from the bill.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me say, since the item came up of the Grand Canyon, the Grand Canyon is an icon to this whole Nation and is supported overwhelmingly by public opinion to create a

monument that protects it from degradation from uranium mining, that protects the watershed that feeds water to 23 million people across the West, Nevada, California, Arizona. To say that this is merely a grabbing and a taking is to misrepresent history, misrepresent the reality of that resource; and, in the long term, understand that this icon, the Grand Canyon, is there to be preserved and protected by this Congress, not to be turned over for exploitation.

I urge support of the amendment to protect the prerogatives of not only a President, but the prerogatives of our natural resources to be protected in perpetuity for generations and generations to come.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 2130

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 42 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce section 1037.601(a)(1) of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, as proposed to be revised under the proposed rule entitled "Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Medium- and Heavy-Duty Engines and Vehicles-Phase 2" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on July 13, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 40138 et seq.), or any rule of the same substance, with respect to glider kits and glider vehicles (as defined in section 1037.801 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, as proposed to be revised under such proposed rule).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to protect American workers and small manufacturing businesses from a misguided provision in a proposed EPA rule. Last year, the EPA released its phase 2 fuel efficiency and emissions standard for new medium- and heavy-duty trucks.

While many in the trucking industry are not opposed to the phase 2 rule as a whole, one section in the proposal wrongly applies these standards to what are known as glider kits.

A glider kit is a group of vehicle parts that can include a brand new truck frame, cab, or axles, but which does not include an engine or transmission. Since a glider kit is less expensive to purchase than a new heavy-duty truck and can extend the investment and working life of a truck, businesses and drivers with a damaged or older vehicle may choose to purchase a glider kit instead of buying a new one.

Glidens extend the useful life of truck engines while frequently having a higher resale price against comparable trucks. Due to their rebuilt engines, they can also often be a more fuel-efficient option, allowing trucking companies and drivers to use less fuel.

Unfortunately, the EPA is proposing to apply the new phase 2 standards to glider kits even though gliders are not really new vehicles. Further, it is unclear whether the EPA even has the authority to regulate the replacement parts like gliders. While the EPA's stated goal with phase 2 is to reduce emissions, the agency has not studied the emissions impact of remanufactured engines and gliders compared to new vehicles.

It appears the agency's actual motivation is to force businesses and drivers that would like to use glider kits to instead buy new trucks. Applying the phase 2 standards to glider kits would certainly harm the workers and owners in the glider industry, leading to possible closure of these businesses and job losses at both manufacturers and dealerships. Additionally, the EPA's rule would limit consumer choice in the marketplace. Under this proposal, many operators and businesses would simply choose to continue using current vehicles, leaving older trucks on the road longer.

My amendment would protect these businesses and American manufacturing jobs by prohibiting the EPA from finalizing, implementing, administering, or even enforcing phase 2 standards on glider kits.

To be clear, this amendment would not—and I repeat, would not—bar the EPA from implementing the whole phase 2 rule for medium and heavy-duty trucks. It would simply clarify that glider kits and glider vehicles are not new trucks as the EPA claims.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment to help support American manufacturing and stop the EPA from attempting to shut down the glider industry.

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chair, last year, the Environmental Protection Agency and the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration issued proposed fuel efficiency standards for medium- and heavy-duty trucks as required by the Energy Independence and Security Act.

This amendment would prohibit EPA from finalizing, implementing, administering, or enforcing this proposed rule or any rule of the same substance with respect to glider vehicles. These new standards are designed to improve fuel efficiency and cut carbon pollution to reduce the impact of climate change.

To be specific, Mr. Chair, these standards are expected to lower CO<sub>2</sub> emissions by roughly 1 billion metric tons, cut fuel costs by \$170 million, and reduce oil consumption by up to 1.8 billion barrels over the lifetime of the vehicles sold under the program. Now, heavy-duty trucks account for 5 percent of the vehicles on the road, and yet they create 20 percent of the greenhouse gas emissions created by all transportation sectors.

I would note for my colleagues that this amendment doesn't actually suspend all aspects of the new rule; it simply carves out an exemption for one particular industry, the industry that produces what are known as glider vehicles.

Glider vehicles are heavy-duty vehicles that place an older or remanufactured engine on a new truck chassis. These are engines that date back to 2001 or older. They have emissions that are 20 to 40 times higher than today's clean diesel engines.

In essence, Mr. Chair, this amendment would allow an entire segment of the truck manufacturing industry to avoid compliance with the new criteria pollutant standards that are in the rule. These are engines that will continue to emit greenhouse gases and slow down our progress in reducing the impacts of climate change. In short, Mr. Chair, this amendment creates a loophole that you could drive a truck through by allowing dirty engines to continue to pollute our environment.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) the chairman.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, it is my understanding that the overall rule is supported broadly by many in the truck and the manufacturing industry. However, as any rule, there are some specifics that do need to be ironed out, and my colleague has narrowly tailored this amendment to address concerns within the EPA's rule. So you really can't drive a truck through it.

I support this language in the Interior bill.

Mr. Chair, I urge Members to vote "aye" on this amendment.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, this proposed language from the EPA is improper and ill-conceived with no regard to jobs. If the EPA is going to promulgate rules that raise the costs and hurt jobs in districts like mine, the least they can do is to have a few facts prepared to back them.

Communities where these kits are manufactured are already struggling with above average unemployment, and would see more job opportunities put out of reach.

Furthermore, there seems to have been little time for the glider industry to even respond and to have little to no economic consideration given prior.

Our constituent, dealers and employees, glider truck owners and operators, and remanufacturing businesses will disproportionately be affected by the EPA's decision to effectively ban the products that they sell, service, and drive. The U.S. truck industry has been a bright spot in the recovery of the national economy, and applying new standards to the gliders would increase expenses for our businesses and their drivers.

Congress has recognized the value of remanufactured parts and components. The United States Senate and House of Representatives have voted overwhelmingly in support of legislation, the Federal Vehicle Repair Cost Savings Act, which was signed into law just last year, to encourage Federal agencies to consider using remanufactured parts in the Federal vehicle fleet. So it is happening in the Federal Government. This is going to affect the private sector.

To restrict the usage of manufactured engines under this rulemaking appears to be counter to the congressional intent.

I will reiterate that gliders, by definition, aren't a motor vehicle, and they therefore should be used outside the EPA's authority.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chair, I would just restate that this amendment creates a loophole. It creates a loophole for one industry. It picks winners and losers. The winners would be one segment of the truck industry. The losers would be jobs, our health, and our environment.

Mr. Chair, I ask for opposition to this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MRS.  
BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Each amount appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act that is not required to be appropriated or otherwise made available by a provision of law is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the recognition. I want to begin by saying I think the committee has done an amazing job with consistently making reductions in what they are spending. It is appropriate that we do that because we are \$19.3 trillion in debt.

My amendment is a very simple reduction in spending. It is a penny out of a dollar—1 percent—across the board. I know it is not popular. I know everybody says it goes too far. But this will save us \$321 million—of course, not a lot when you look at the total budget, but it is very appropriate that we begin to take these steps.

I think it is so interesting talking about Ronald Reagan and how he approached things. He would always say: Let's take a little bit, a few steps at a time and begin to get behind some of this and get our economy and get our government back in shape, right-size it.

That is exactly what he did, and it paid off for our country with economic growth, making certain that our economy was growing, and that our revenues were growing. Indeed, Mr. Chairman, since that time, we have seen our country doesn't have a revenue problem. What we have is a spending problem. What we have is a priority problem. What we fail to do time and time again is to realize that the taxpayers tell us they are overtaxed, our government is overspent, and they want us to consistently make as many spending reductions as we possibly can.

So I come, once again, to the floor with this 1 percent across-the-board spending cut. What it will do is to make that reduction of another \$321 million to build on the success the committee has already shown with coming \$64 million below the 2016 enacted levels. They are to be commended for that. But let's get in behind it. Let's compound these savings and begin to get our fiscal house in order.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I believe that our colleagues will be treated to a rare display of bipartisan harmony on this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose the amendment.

Look, this is not a perfect bill, and there are clear differences on this amendment, but we should not be underfunding what, in my view, is already underfunded. If this amendment were to pass, we are looking at fewer patients that would be seen at the Indian Health Service, fewer safety inspectors ensuring that accidents do not occur, and deferred maintenance on our Nation's drinking water and sanitation infrastructure. More generally, Mr. Chairman, investments in our environmental infrastructure and our public lands will be halted, and jobs will be lost.

The bill is already underfunded in my view, and this amendment would not encourage the agencies to do more with less. Simply put, it would force agencies and our constituents to do less with less. I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CALVERT. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I certainly appreciate the gentleman's amendment and her intent to reduce spending. As she well knows, we have reduced this bill somewhat over the years, as we have on all of the discretionary accounts that the Appropriations Committee is responsible for.

This really is a decision based upon discussion regarding discretionary accounts versus nondiscretionary accounts. If we could have cut the nondiscretionary accounts as much as we have cut discretionary accounts, we could probably balance the budget plus. But unfortunately, we are not there.

So I rise in opposition to this amendment. I commend my colleague for her consistent work to protect taxpayer dollars, but this is not an approach I can support. While the President's proposed budget exceeds the bill, the increases were paid for with proposals and gimmicks that would never be enacted. This bill makes the tough choices with an allocation that adheres to the current law.

We may not agree that it is enough, but that is what the current law is. So we made trade-offs, and we have done many difficult choices to make this work.

Mr. Chair, I urge opposition to this amendment.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 2145

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I have heard every excuse that there is—always do—and I know that spending reductions are not popular around here. I get it. I know it. But let me tell you what I think also is not proper.

I think that it is immoral for us to spend money that we don't have—it is not our money; it is taxpayer money—and to spend it on programs that our constituents don't want.

I think it is also immoral for us to not get our spending under control and to pass along all this debt to our children and our grandchildren. Just think about it. My grandsons, who are 7 and 8 years old, by the time they begin paying taxes, these programs, many of them, will have outlived their usefulness. The utilization of these dollars will be gone.

Do I hope we have the political will to look at the mandatory spending side of the column? Absolutely.

A couple of other points. I would hope that bipartisanship will come to reducing what we spend in this Chamber, that there will be agreement that we are, indeed, overtaxed and overspent, and the fiscal health of this Nation needs to be addressed.

I also think that what we need to look at is the burden of taxation has caused many of our constituents to face deferred maintenance on their homes, on their businesses, on their dreams, because they are having to pay their taxes, they are having to pay what the Federal Government takes out of those paychecks, first right of refusal on those paychecks. It also causes job loss.

It is time for us to address our overspending and our national debt. I do hope we see some work on the mandatory side of the column.

I urge a "yes" vote.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, may I ask how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman notes that it is the taxpayers' money. She is right, it is the taxpayers' money. Taxpayers expect that their money will be spent safeguarding their infrastructure. They expect that their money will be spent on maintenance, maintaining their infrastructure. They expect that their money will be spent making sure that when they turn on the faucets in Flint, Michigan, toxic water doesn't come out. They expect that if they have health problems, they will be able to get some monitoring and that their health will be taken care of. They expect us to spend their dollars wisely.

As I said before, Mr. Chairman, this is not a perfect bill. But the chairman is correct, this bill adheres to the law. While we would say we are not investing enough, and while the chairman would say we are investing about what we have, the gentleman's amendment would actually force us to do much less with even less.

Those are not priorities we can support, Mr. Chairman, which is why I urge my colleagues to join the chairman and our ranking member in opposing this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN).

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. BOUSTANY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to implement, administer, or enforce any rule or guidance of the same substance as the proposed rule regarding Risk Management, Financial Assurance and Loss Prevention for which advanced notice of proposed rulemaking was published by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management on August 19, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 49027) or the National Notice to Lessees and Operators of Federal Oil and Gas and Sulphur Leases, Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) issued by such Bureau (NTL No. 2016-N03).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit the use of funds by the Secretary of the Interior for the purpose of implementation, administering, or enforcing any rule or guidance similar to the proposed guidance that the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management released regarding financial assurances for oil and gas operations on the Outer Continental Shelf.

The Federal Government currently requires American offshore oil and gas companies to buy liability bonds ranging from tens of thousands of dollars to tens of millions of dollars for every offshore lease. In August of 2014, BOEM published an Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking seeking industry input on "risk management, financial assurance, and loss prevention."

Inexplicably, BOEM elected to circumvent the rulemaking process it initiated and, instead, released proposed guidance in August 2015 that creates new rules that will change the way the oil and gas industry funds these decommissioning costs—also referred to as "plugging" or "abandonment"—of wells, pipelines, and other facilities in the Gulf of Mexico's Outer Continental Shelf.

The Obama administration ignored warnings from stakeholders that this proposed guidance could drive many companies into bankruptcy precisely at a time when the industry is suffering from a commodity price collapse. A lot of workers in Louisiana

and across the Gulf Coast have been laid off.

BOEM has asserted that these rule changes are necessary to prevent taxpayers from being left with the tab for decommissioning work in light of a number of recent bankruptcy filings by OCS shelf operators. Ironically, BOEM's solution will likely trigger the major risk that it is trying to protect against. If implemented, these changes will pose an existential threat to many OCS shelf operators, discourage future investment, cost thousands of jobs, and dramatically reduce the royalties to U.S. taxpayers.

For example, under the new rules, each party would be assessed 100 percent on shared leases, and a joint operating agreement is no longer accepted as a reflection of actual liability.

This means that if there are four companies sharing a project and it would cost an estimated \$20 million to remove that particular platform, BOEM would, nevertheless, require each party to post a \$20 million bond to remove the platform. It hardly seems necessary to require \$80 million in bonding for a \$20 million project.

The new rules also require full bonding up front for all possible wells in the exploratory plan, despite the fact that the wells may never be drilled. The P&A liability, in many cases, will not accrue for many, many years. For facilities already in production, BOEM will require capital assurance for the lifetime production value of the property every year, meaning that each year a lessee will be responsible for 100 percent of the P&A liability for every production facility exploration activity in production value.

In fact, many of the industry experts have expressed concern that BOEM has not even provided a clear definition of the problem that the agency is trying to solve nor has there been any justification provided as to the need for major changes to the existing regulatory framework. Experts throughout the industry remain concerned that if this proposed guidance were to be finalized, it would dramatically limit the industry's ability to successfully explore and extract oil and gas from the Gulf of Mexico.

A new rule, guidance, or any other form of notice from BOEM on supplemental bonding will stifle oil and gas production on the OCS and throughout the Gulf of Mexico. This is not in the interest of the United States.

I urge adoption of my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would clearly block the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management from finalizing guidance to clarify financial assurances for oil and gas companies operating in the Outer Continental Shelf.

The guidance is important because it details the procedures that will be used to determine the lessee's financial ability to carry out its obligations so that we, the taxpayer, our constituents, can be sure that the oil company can pay for all of its costs associated with offshore drilling. The guidance is necessary to ensure that oil companies have the financial capability to properly decommission outer shelf facilities instead of abandoning them and leaving the American taxpayer, our constituents, on the hook to pay the cost.

The guidance will modernize the financial assurance regulations to match the current industry practices, provide updated criteria for determining the lessee's ability to self-insure its liabilities based on the lessee's financial capacity and financial strength. We should be working together to ensure that the U.S. taxpayer never pays to decommission an OCS facility and that the environment is protected at the same time.

This amendment protects the special interests of Big Oil at the taxpayer's expense, so I must protect the taxpayer and oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the remainder of my time to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Louisiana for bringing this amendment up.

Here is the reality. This is largely a solution in search of a problem. There has not been a single case in the history of offshore energy production where the government has been left holding the bag. It doesn't exist. So, yes, we should be working together. Representing one of the most ecologically productive coastal areas in the United States, we are very concerned about what happens with our coastal area.

But, again, we are proposing solutions in search of problems. All this is going to do is it is going to result in a decrease in competition for offshore energy production, a decrease in competition, and a decrease in revenue for the United States Treasury. This funds the Land and Water Conservation Fund, something that your side often stands up for and fights for. This has provided nearly \$200 billion for the United States Treasury, one of the largest revenue streams for the United States Government outside of taxes.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support of this amendment. This policy, this notice to lessees, is ill-advised. It simply has been done in the dark of night, and it is a solution in search of a problem.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, we need in this day and age to make sure

that the American taxpayer is protected. We have seen time and time again when environmental disasters happen and brownfields are left behind or what is going on in Flint, the taxpayer picks up the bill.

I just really believe that this guidance is necessary to ensure that oil companies have the financial capability—that they have on the books the financial capability to properly decommission their Outer Continental Shelf facilities instead of abandoning them, leaving the American taxpayer to pay for the cleanup.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. BOUSTANY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to implement, administer, or enforce any rule of the same substance as the proposed rule entitled "Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations in the Outer Continental Shelf-Blowout Preventer Systems and Well Control" and published April 17, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 21504), the final rule issued by the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement with that title (Docket ID: BSEE-2015-0002; 15XE1700DX EEEE500000 EX1SF0000.DAQ000), or any rule of the same substance as such proposed or final rule.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will prohibit any money being spent for the implementation or enforcement of any rule or guidance similar to the well-controlled rule offered by the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, or BSEE.

Unfortunately, according to experts throughout the oil and gas industry, many of the prescriptive requirements contained within the final well-controlled rule will neither improve safety nor reduce environmental risk in drilling, but will actually have unintended consequences of increasing risk beyond that of existing regulations.

Additionally, the final rule will create significant additional expenses and burdens for those engaged in exploration development and production activities on the Outer Continental Shelf.

Ultimately, these added economic and compliance cost tens of billions of

dollars over 10 years, and together with other regulatory burdens, they could force some smaller operators out of business and drive larger operators from the Federal OCS toward countries with less prescriptive regulatory environments or other opportunities. This means that the negative impacts of this destructive rule will likely be felt throughout all 50 States.

To my colleagues who represent States that do not have offshore development, I would argue that you should support this amendment because BSEE's well-controlled rule is yet another example of the Obama administration not listening to real experts in this industry and, instead, forcing rules and regulations into place that will hurt the domestic industry and our U.S. economy.

In effect, the well-controlled rule ultimately could increase risk and decrease safety on the Outer Continental Shelf. It is a one-size-fits-all proposal that really is not realistic.

□ 2200

It will also negatively impact the attractiveness of the Gulf of Mexico for future oil and gas investment, and it will likely result in oil and gas operators choosing to develop energy resources in other parts of the world, taking those jobs and those investment opportunities with them.

As the House's Task Forces on Reducing Regulatory Burdens and Restoring Constitutional Authority explains in its mission statement, we as a government should be working to "make it easier to invest, produce, and build in America with a modern and transparent regulatory system that relieves the burden on small businesses and other job creators and encourages financial independence while balancing environmental stewardship, public safety, and consumer interests."

BSEE's well control rule does not do this. America cannot continue to be the global energy leader without policies that foster this kind of innovation, investment, and development of our energy resources. Safety, not convenience, must always be the driving force behind these initiatives. BSEE'S well control rule not only leaves industry with numerous questions about compliance, but it also has experts concerned that these new measures will increase risk.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I am surprised this amendment is being offered because there is already a rider in the bill that pretty much accomplishes what the gentleman's amendment would do. Let's be clear what this amendment does.

It reverses the safety improvements that were developed following the

Deepwater Horizon tragedy. It would delay or prevent the implementation of a rule that was developed directly from the recommendations of numerous investigations. There was a full investigation. These are the recommendations from it. The investigations were conducted by industry experts, and they determined the actual cause of the Deepwater Horizon tragedy and the impact on the Gulf of Mexico and on the surrounding States and on the local communities, as we heard Ms. CASTOR from Florida talk about earlier.

Many of the requirements of this rule are not new. They were already in existence as industry standards, notice to lessees and guidance and equipment and operation requirements that were already part of the regulation. What the rule does is consolidates these requirements into one section and makes them enforceable—yes, enforceable. The Department of the Interior estimates that the regulation amendment blocks would prevent between \$657 million and \$4.4 billion of damage caused by well blowouts over 10 years.

Most importantly, this estimate does not take into account the human element of these protections. I think we can all agree that you cannot put a price on human life. The Deepwater Horizon was a tragic event. Eleven lives were lost in that explosion. It is unconscionable that this amendment, once again, looks to put the profits of big oil companies ahead of workers' safety; so I oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Louisiana has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman from Louisiana for yielding and also for bringing up this amendment.

Let's talk about reality versus fiction. Here is the reality.

The reality is that these regulations have not been out there. They were not subject to investigations and studies. I was the lead trustee for the State of Louisiana. I was the tip of the spear who was fighting BP during the entire Deepwater Horizon, and I was the natural resource manager for the coast of Louisiana under which over 600 miles of our coast was oiled.

I appreciate the gentleman for stepping in and trying to defend our environment and our resources. For the constituents whom I represent who lost family members, the reality is this: 60 percent of the wells since the Deepwater Horizon couldn't even be drilled under this proposed rule. The reality is that the Department of the Interior's cost estimate said it was going to cost \$883 million to comply with when a private study said it was going to be \$93 billion.

The reality is this: you have a bunch of bureaucrats who are sitting around in a vacuum who have no idea what they are doing and who are proposing things under the auspices of safety but that actually threaten the lives of our citizens in south Louisiana who are producing energy for this Nation—in fact, approximately 17 percent of the energy for the United States.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 3 minutes remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, in closing, that is why I do not understand the redundancy, the duplicity—why we keep doing this over and over and over again. This bill already undoes a lot of what the regulation would do to protect the environment and to protect workers' safety.

I read from the bill at page 69, line 4, section 124, and this is about drilling margins:

"None of the funds made available in this act or any other act for any fiscal year may be used to develop, adopt, implement, administer, or enforce any change to regulations and guidance." It goes on.

This amendment would reverse the safety improvements that were developed following the Deepwater Horizon tragedy, something to which, I think, America said no more: no more loss of life, no impact like this on our environment.

I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. BOUSTANY. Mr. Chair, in Louisiana, we understand quite clearly how good environmental policy, economic policy, energy policy march hand in hand. We also know that the men and women who work on these rigs are our friends, our neighbors, our family, and safety is first. We also know from experts across the industry that this proposed rule is a one-size-fits-all proposal that increases risk. It makes it more risky, and we will not stand to allow this rule to go forward. That is why I urge the adoption of this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. BOUSTANY).

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 114-683 on

which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. HIMES of Connecticut.

Amendment No. 8 by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 9 by Mr. NORCROSS of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 10 by Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

Amendment No. 11 by Mr. HUFFMAN of California.

Amendment No. 12 by Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

Amendment No. 13 by Mr. HUFFMAN of California.

Amendment No. 14 by Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

Amendment No. 20 by Mr. PALMER of Alabama.

Amendment No. 21 by Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

Amendment No. 22 by Mrs. DINGELL of Michigan.

Amendment No. 27 by Mr. CARTWRIGHT of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 28 by Mr. BECERRA of California.

Amendment No. 29 by Mr. PETERS of California.

Amendment No. 31 by Mr. PETERS of California.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR) 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 Acting 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 225, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 417]

AYES—197

Adams, Cárdenas, Davis (CA), Aguilar, Carney, Davis, Danny, Ashford, Carson (IN), DeFazio, Bass, Cartwright, DeGette, Beatty, Castor (FL), Delaney, Becerra, Castro (TX), DeLauro, Bera, Chu, Judy, DeBene, Beyer, Cicilline, DeSaulnier, Bilirakis, Clark (MA), Deutch, Bishop (GA), Clarke (NY), Dingell, Blumenauer, Clay, Doggett, Bonamici, Cleaver, Doyle, Michael F., Boyle, Brendan, Clyburn, F., Cohen, Duckworth, Brady (PA), Connolly, Edwards, Brown (FL), Conyers, Ellison, Brownley (CA), Cooper, Engel, Buchanan, Costello (PA), Eshoo, Bustos, Courtney, Esty, Butterfield, Crowley, Farr, Capps, Cuellar, Fitzpatrick, Capuano, Cummings, Foster

Frankel (FL), LoBiondo, Richmond, Perry, Russell, Walberg, Fudge, Loeb sack, Ros-Lehtinen, Peterson, Salmon, Walden, Gabbard, Lofgren, Roybal-Allard, Pittenger, Walker, Gallego, Lowenthal, Ruiz, Schalkowsky, Sanford, Sanford, Walker, Garamendi, Lowey, Ruppertsberger, Pitts, Scalise, Walorski, Gibson, Lujan Grisham, Rush, Pompeo, Schweikert, Walters, Mimi, Graham, (NM), Ryan (OH), Posey, Scott, Austin, Weber (TX), Grayson, Luján, Ben Ray, Price, Tom, Sensenbrenner, Webster (FL), Green, Al, Lynch, Sánchez, Linda, Sessions, Wenstrup, Green, Gene, Maloney, Carolyn, Renacci, Shuster, Westmoreland, Grijalva, Maloney, Sean, Ribble, Simpson, Whitfield, Gutiérrez, Hahn, Matsui, Schiff, Rice (SC), Rigell, Smith (MO), Williams, Hanna, Heck (WA), McCollum, Serrano, Scott, David, Smith (NE), Wilson (SC), Wittman, Higgins, Himes, Hinojosa, McDer mott, Sewell (AL), Sherman, Sinema, Sires, Slaughter, Smith (NJ), Young (IN), Honda, Meehan, Meeke, Meng, Moore, Moulton, Murphy (FL), Nadler, Napolitano, Johnson (GA), Johnson, E. B., Jones, Nolan, Norcross, Nugent, O'Rourke, Pallone, Pascrell, Payne, Kind, Pelosi, Perlmutter, Kuster, Peters, Pingree, Larsen (WA), Pocan, Poliquin, Polis, Lee, Price (NC), Quigley, Rangel, Lieu, Ted, Lipinski, Rice (NY)

NOES—225

Abraham, Donovan, Jordan, Joyce, Kelly (MS), Kelly (PA), King (IA), King (NY), Kinzinger (IL), Kline, Knight, Labrador, Flores, Forbes, Fortenberry, Franks (AZ), Frelinghuysen, Boustany, Garrett, Long, Loudermilk, Love, Lucas, Luetkemeyer, Lummis, MacArthur, Mar chant, Massie, McCarthy, McCaul, McClintock, McHenry, McKinley, Hardy, Rodgers, McMorris, McSally, Meadows, Messer, Mica, Miller (FL), Miller (MI), Moolenaar, Mooney (WV), Mullin, Mulvaney, Murphy (PA), Neugebauer, Newhouse, Noem, Nunes, Olson, Palazzo, Palmer, Paulsen, Pearce

Thompson (CA), Bishop (UT), Dold, Thorin, Thompson (MS), Titus, Tonko, Torres, Tsongas, Van Hollen, Vargas, Veasey, Vela, Velázquez, Visclosky, Walz, Wasserman, Schultz, Waters, Maxine, Watson Coleman, Welch, Yarmuth, Dold, Foy, Fox, Hastings, Jolly, Marino, Takai, Poe (TX), Wilson (FL), Sanchez, Loretta

NOT VOTING—11

Stutzman, Takai, Wilson (FL)

□ 2229

Messrs. HANNA, GUTIÉRREZ, and FITZPATRICK changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. DOLD. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 417, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "no."

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. HIMES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. HIMES) 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 241, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 418]

AYES—183

Adams, Carney, Davis, Danny, Aguilar, Carson (IN), DeFazio, Ashford, Cartwright, DeGette, Bass, Castor (FL), Delaney, Beatty, Castro (TX), DeLauro, Becerra, Chu, Judy, Dent, Benishek, Cicilline, Deutch, Bera, Clark (MA), Dingell, Beyer, Clarke (NY), Doggett, Bishop (GA), Clay, Doyle, Michael F., Blumenauer, Cleaver, Bonamici, Clyburn, Duckworth, Cohen, Edwards, Connolly, Ellison, Brady (PA), Conyers, Engel, Brown (FL), Cooper, Eshoo, Brownley (CA), Costa, Esty, Bustos, Costello (PA), Farr, Butterfield, Courtney, Foster, Capps, Crowley, Frankel (FL), Cuellar, Cuellar, Fudge, Capuano, Davis (CA), Gabbard

Gallego Lofgren  
 Gibson Lowenthal  
 Graham Lowey  
 Grayson Lujan Grisham  
 Green, Al (NM)  
 Green, Gene Luján, Ben Ray  
 Grijalva (NM)  
 Guínta Lynch  
 Gutiérrez Maloney,  
 Hahn Carolyn  
 Hanna Maloney, Sean  
 Heck (WA) Matsui  
 Higgins McGovern  
 Himes McNerney  
 Hinojosa Meeks  
 Honda Meng  
 Hoyer Moore  
 Huffman Moulton  
 Israel Murphy (FL)  
 Jackson Lee Nadler  
 Jeffries Napolitano  
 Johnson (GA) Neal  
 Johnson, E. B. Nolan  
 Katko Norcross  
 Keating O'Rourke  
 Kelly (IL) Pallone  
 Kennedy Pascrell  
 Kildee Payne  
 Kilmer Pelosi  
 Kind Perlmutter  
 Kirkpatrick Peters  
 Kuster Peterson  
 Langevin Pingree  
 Larsen (WA) Pocan  
 Larson (CT) Poliquin  
 Lawrence Polis  
 Lee Price (NC)  
 Levin Quigley  
 Lewis Rangel  
 Lieu, Ted Rice (NY)  
 Lipinski Richmond  
 Loeb sack Roybal-Allard

NOES—241

Abraham Duffy  
 Aderholt Duncan (SC)  
 Allen Duncan (TN)  
 Amash Ellmers (NC)  
 Amodei Emmer (MN)  
 Babin Farenthold  
 Barletta Fincher  
 Barr Fitzpatrick  
 Barton Fleischmann  
 Bilirakis Fleming  
 Bishop (MI) Flores  
 Bishop (UT) Forbes  
 Black Fortenberry  
 Blackburn Franks (AZ)  
 Blum Frelinghuysen  
 Bost Garamendi  
 Boustany Garrett  
 Brady (TX) Gibbs  
 Brat Gohmert  
 Bridenstine Goodlatte  
 Brooks (AL) Gosar  
 Brooks (IN) Gowdy  
 Buchanan Granger  
 Buck Graves (GA)  
 Bucshon Graves (LA)  
 Burgess Graves (MO)  
 Byrne Griffith  
 Calvert Grothman  
 Carter (GA) Guthrie  
 Carter (TX) Hardy  
 Chabot Harper  
 Chaffetz Harris  
 Clawson (FL) Hartzler  
 Coffman Heck (NV)  
 Cole Hensarling  
 Collins (GA) Herrera Beutler  
 Collins (NY) Hice, Jody B.  
 Comstock Hill  
 Conaway Holding  
 Cook Hudson  
 Cramer Huelskamp  
 Crawford Huizenga (MI)  
 Crenshaw Hultgren  
 Culberson Hunter  
 Cummings Hurd (TX)  
 Curbelo (FL) Hurt (VA)  
 Davidson Issa  
 Davis, Rodney Jenkins (KS)  
 DeBene Jenkins (WV)  
 Denham Johnson (OH)  
 DeSantis Johnson, Sam  
 DesJarlais Jones  
 Diaz-Balart Jordan  
 Dold Joyce  
 Donovan Kaptur

Pittenger Ruiz  
 Pitts Ruppertsberger  
 Pompeo Russ  
 Posey Ryan (OH)  
 Price, Tom Sánchez, Linda  
 Ratcliffe T.  
 Reed Sarbanes  
 Reichert Schakowsky  
 Renacci Scott (VA)  
 Ribble Scott, David  
 Rice (SC) Serrano  
 Rigell Sewell (AL)  
 Roby Sherman  
 Roe (TN) Sinema  
 Rogers (AL) Sires  
 Rogers (KY) Slaughter  
 Rohrabacher Smith (WA)  
 Rokita Speier  
 Rooney (FL) Stefanik  
 Ros-Lehtinen Swalwell (CA)  
 Roskam Takano  
 Ross Thompson (CA)  
 Rothfus Thompson (MS)  
 Rouzer Titus  
 Royce Tonko  
 Russell Torres  
 DeSaulnier Tsongas  
 Foxx Van Hollen  
 Hastings Vargas  
 Veasey Veasey  
 Vela Waters, Maxine  
 Velázquez Watson Coleman  
 Walz Welch  
 Wasserman Wilson (FL)  
 Schultz Yarmuth

NO VOTING—9  
 Jolly Sanchez, Loretta  
 Marino Stutzman  
 Poe (TX) Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
 The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2231

So the amendment was rejected.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON  
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 173, noes 251, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 419]

AYES—173

Adams Castro (TX)  
 Agullar Chu, Judy  
 Ashford Cicilline  
 Bass Clark (MA)  
 Beatty Clarke (NY)  
 Becerra Clay  
 Bera Cleaver  
 Beyer Clyburn  
 Bishop (GA) Cohen  
 Blumenauer Connolly  
 Bonamici Conyers  
 Boyle, Brendan Courtney  
 F. Crowley  
 Brady (PA) Cueellar  
 Brown (FL) Cummings  
 Brownley (CA) Davis (CA)  
 Bustos Davis, Danny  
 Butterfield DeFazio  
 Capps DeGette  
 Capuano Delaney  
 Cárdenas DeLauro  
 Carney DeBene  
 Carson (IN) DeSaulnier  
 Cartwright Deutch  
 Castor (FL) Dingell

Visclosky Hoyer  
 Wagner Huffman  
 Walberg Israel  
 Walden Jackson Lee  
 Walker Jeffries  
 Walorski Johnson (GA)  
 Walters, Mimi Johnson, E. B.  
 Weber (TX) Kaptur  
 Webster (FL) Keating  
 Wenstrup Kelly (IL)  
 Westerman Kennedy  
 Westmoreland Kildee  
 Whitfield Kind  
 Williams Kirkpatrick  
 Wilson (SC) Kuster  
 Wittman Langevin  
 Womack O'Rourke  
 Woodall Larsen (WA)  
 Yoder Larson (CT)  
 Yoho Lawrence  
 Young (AK) Lee  
 Young (IA) Levin  
 Young (IN) Lewis  
 Zeldin Lieu, Ted  
 Zinke Lipinski  
 Maloney, Carolyn Velázquez  
 Maloney, Carolyn Quigley  
 Maloney, Carolyn Rangel  
 Maloney, Carolyn Roybal-Allard  
 Maloney, Carolyn Ruiz  
 Maloney, Carolyn Ruppertsberger  
 Maloney, Carolyn Rush  
 Maloney, Carolyn Ryan (OH)  
 Maloney, Carolyn Sánchez, Linda  
 Maloney, Carolyn T.  
 Maloney, Carolyn Sarbanes  
 Maloney, Carolyn Schakowsky

NOES—251

Abraham Kinzinger (IL)  
 Aderholt Emmer (MN)  
 Allen Farenthold  
 Amash Fincher  
 Amodei Fitzpatrick  
 Babin Fleischmann  
 Barletta Fleming  
 Barr Flores  
 Barton Forbes  
 Benishek Fortenberry  
 Bilirakis Foster  
 Bishop (MI) Franks (AZ)  
 Bishop (UT) Frelinghuysen  
 Black Garamendi  
 Blackburn Garrett  
 Blum Gibbs  
 Bost Gibson  
 Boustany Gohmert  
 Brady (TX) Goodlatte  
 Brat Gosar  
 Bridenstine Gowdy  
 Brooks (AL) Granger  
 Brooks (IN) Graves (GA)  
 Buchanan Graves (LA)  
 Buck Graves (MO)  
 Bucshon Griffith  
 Burgess Grothman  
 Byrne Guinta  
 Calvert Guthrie  
 Carter (GA) Hanna  
 Carter (TX) Hardy  
 Chabot Harper  
 Chaffetz Harris  
 Clawson (FL) Hartzler  
 Coffman Heck (NV)  
 Cole Hensarling  
 Collins (GA) Herrera Beutler  
 Collins (NY) Hice, Jody B.  
 Comstock Hill  
 Conaway Himes  
 Cook Holding  
 Cooper Hudson  
 Costa Huelskamp  
 Costello (PA) Huizenga (MI)  
 Cramer Hultgren  
 Crawford Hunter  
 Crenshaw Hurd (TX)  
 Culberson Hurl (VA)  
 Curbelo (FL) Issa  
 Davidson Jenkins (KS)  
 Davis, Rodney Jenkins (WV)  
 Denham Johnson (OH)  
 Dent Johnson, Sam  
 DeSantis Jones  
 DesJarlais Jordan  
 Diaz-Balart Joyce  
 Dold Katko  
 Donovan Kelly (MS)  
 Duffy Kelly (PA)  
 Duncan (SC) King (IA)  
 Duncan (TN) King (NY)

Renacci Schweikert Walberg  
 Ribble Scott, Austin Walden  
 Rice (NY) Sensenbrenner Walker  
 Rice (SC) Sessions Walorski  
 Rigell Shimkus Walters, Mimi  
 Roby Shuster Weber (TX)  
 Roe (TN) Simpson Webster (FL)  
 Rogers (AL) Smith (MO) Wenstrup  
 Rogers (KY) Smith (NE) Westerman  
 Rohrabacher Smith (NJ) Westmoreland  
 Rokita Smith (TX) Whitfield  
 Rooney (FL) Stefanik Williams  
 Ros-Lehtinen Stewart Wilson (SC)  
 Roskam Stivers Wittman  
 Ross Thompson (PA) Womack  
 Rothfus Thornberry Woodall  
 Rouzer Tiberi Yoder  
 Royce Tipton Yoho  
 Russell Trott Young (AK)  
 Salmon Turner Young (IA)  
 Sanford Upton Young (IN)  
 Scalise Valadao Zeldin  
 Schrader Wagner Zinke

McNerney Price (NC) Speier  
 Meehan Quigley Stefanik  
 Meeks Rangel Swalwell (CA)  
 Meng Richmond Thompson (MS)  
 Moolenaar Roybal-Allard Tonko  
 Moore Ruppertsberger Torres  
 Moulton Rush Tsongas  
 Murphy (FL) Ryan (OH) Upton  
 Nadler Sánchez, Linda  
 Napolitano T. Van Hollen  
 Neal Sarbanes Vargas  
 Norcross Schakowsky Veasey  
 O'Rourke Schiff Velázquez  
 Pallone Scott, David Wasserman  
 Pascrell Serrano Schultz  
 Payne Sewell (AL) Waters, Maxine  
 Pelosi Sherman Watson Coleman  
 Pingree Sires Wilson (FL)  
 Pocan Slaughter Yarmuth  
 Poliquin Smith (NJ)

Thompson (PA) Webster (FL)  
 Thornberry Welch  
 Tiberi Wenstrup  
 Tipton Westerman  
 Sensenbrenner Titus Westmoreland  
 Trott Whitfield  
 Turner Williams  
 Valadao Wilson (SC)  
 Vela Wittman  
 Visclosky Womack  
 Wagner Woodall  
 Walberg Yoder  
 Walden Yoho  
 Walker Young (AK)  
 Walorski Young (IA)  
 Walters, Mimi Young (IN)  
 Walz Zeldin  
 Weber (TX) Zinke

Schrader  
 Schweikert  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, Austin  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Sinema  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)

NOT VOTING—8

Foxx Marino Stutzman  
 Hastings Poe (TX) Takai  
 Jolly Sanchez, Loretta

NOES—282

Abraham Fleischmann  
 Adams Fleming  
 Aderholt Flores  
 Aguilar Forbes  
 Allen Portenberry  
 Amash Franks (AZ)  
 Amodei Frelinghuysen  
 Ashford Gabbard  
 Babin Gallego  
 Barr Garamendi  
 Barton Gibbs  
 Benishek Gohmert  
 Bilirakis Goodlatte  
 Bishop (GA) Gosar  
 Bishop (MI) Gowdy  
 Bishop (UT) Graham  
 Black Granger  
 Blackburn Graves (GA)  
 Blum Graves (LA)  
 Blumenauer Graves (MO)  
 Bonamici Griffith  
 Bost Grijalva  
 Boustany Grothman  
 Brady (TX) Guinta  
 Brat Guthrie  
 Bridenstine Hanna  
 Brooks (AL) Hardy  
 Brownley (CA) Harper  
 Buchanan Harris  
 Buck Hartzler  
 Bucshon Heck (NV)  
 Burgess Heck (WA)  
 Butterfield Hensarling  
 Byrne Herrera Beutler  
 Calvert Hice, Jody B.  
 Capps Hill  
 Carter (GA) Holding  
 Carter (TX) Honda  
 Chabot Hoyer  
 Chaffetz Hudson  
 Clawson (FL) Huelskamp  
 Cleaver Huffman  
 Coffman Huizenga (MI)  
 Cole Hultgren  
 Collins (GA) Hunter  
 Collins (NY) Hurd (TX)  
 Comstock Hurt (VA)  
 Conaway Issa  
 Connolly Jenkins (KS)  
 Cook Jenkins (WV)  
 Costa Johnson (OH)  
 Costello (PA) Johnson, Sam  
 Cramer Jones  
 Crawford Jordan  
 Crenshaw Joyce  
 Culberson Kaptur  
 Curbelo (FL) Kelly (MS)  
 Davidson Kelly (PA)  
 Davis (CA) Kildee  
 Davis, Rodney Kilmer  
 DeFazio King (IA)  
 DeGette King (NY)  
 DeBene Kinzinger (IL)  
 Denham Kirkpatrick  
 Dent Kline  
 DeSantis Knight  
 DesJarlais Labrador  
 Diaz-Balart LaHood  
 Dold LaMalfa  
 Duffy Lamborn  
 Duncan (SC) Larsen (WA)  
 Duncan (TN) Latta  
 Ellmers (NC) Lipinski  
 Emmer (MN) Long  
 Farenthold Loudermilk  
 Farr Love  
 Fincher Lowenthal

Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Lujan Grisham (NM)  
 Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
 Lummis  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Marchant  
 Massie  
 Matsui  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McCollum  
 McDermott  
 McHenry  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McSally  
 Meadows  
 Messer  
 Mica  
 Miller (FL)  
 Miller (MI)  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Mullin  
 Mulvaney  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Neugebauer  
 Newhouse  
 Noem  
 Nolan  
 Nugent  
 Nunes  
 Olson  
 Palazzo  
 Palmer  
 Paulsen  
 Pearce  
 Perlmutter  
 Perry  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Pittenger  
 Pitts  
 Polis  
 Pompeo  
 Posey  
 Price, Tom  
 Ratcliffe  
 Reed  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Ribble  
 Rice (NY)  
 Rice (SC)  
 Rigell  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita  
 Rooney (FL)  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Roskam  
 Ross  
 Rothfus  
 Rouzer  
 Royce  
 Ruiz  
 Russell  
 Salmon  
 Sanford  
 Scalise

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
 The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
 There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2239

Mr. GARRETT changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”  
 So the amendment was rejected.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER  
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.  
 A recorded vote was ordered.  
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 235, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 421]

AYES—190

NOT VOTING—9  
 Foxx Marino Sanchez, Loretta  
 Hastings Poe (TX) Stutzman  
 Jolly Richmond Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2236

So the amendment was rejected.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. NORCROSS  
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. NORCROSS) 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 143, noes 282, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 420]

AYES—143

Barletta Cuellar Himes  
 Bass Cummings Hinojosa  
 Beatty Davis, Danny Israel  
 Becerra Delaney Jackson Lee  
 Bera DeLauro Jeffries  
 Beyer DeSaulnier Johnson (GA)  
 Boyle, Brendan Deutch Johnson, E. B.  
 F. Dingell  
 Brady (PA) Doggett Keating  
 Brooks (IN) Donovan Kelly (IL)  
 Brown (FL) Doyle, Michael Kennedy  
 Bustos F. Kind  
 Capuano Duckworth Kuster  
 Cárdenas Edwards Lance  
 Carney Ellison Langevin  
 Carson (IN) Engel Larson (CT)  
 Cartwright Eshoo Lawrence  
 Castor (FL) Esty Lee  
 Castro (TX) Fitzpatrick Levin  
 Chu, Judy Foster Lewis  
 Cicilline Frankel (FL) Lieu, Ted  
 Clarke (MA) Fudge LoBiondo  
 Clarke (NY) Garrett Loebsack  
 Clay Gibson Lofgren  
 Clyburn Grayson Lowey  
 Cohen Green, Al Lynch  
 Conyers Green, Gene MacArthur  
 Cooper Gutiérrez Maloney,  
 Courtney Hahn Carolyn  
 Crowley Higgins McGovern

Adams Cohen Fudge  
 Aguilar Connolly Gabbard  
 Ashford Conyers Gallego  
 Bass Cooper Garamendi  
 Beatty Courtney Gibson  
 Becerra Crowley Graham  
 Bera Cummings Grayson  
 Beyer Curbelo (FL) Green, Al  
 Blumenauer Davis (CA) Green, Gene  
 Bonamici Davis, Danny Grijalva  
 Boyle, Brendan DeFazio Gutiérrez  
 F. DeGette Hahn  
 Brady (PA) Delaney Heck (WA)  
 Brown (FL) DeLauro Herrera Beutler  
 Brownley (CA) DeBene Higgins  
 Bustos DeSaulnier Himes  
 Butterfield Deutch Hinojosa  
 Capps Dingell Honda  
 Capuano Doggett Hoyer  
 Cárdenas Dold Huffman  
 Carney Doyle, Michael Israel  
 Carson (IN) F. Jackson Lee  
 Cartwright Duckworth Jeffries  
 Roskam Edwards Johnson (GA)  
 Castor (FL) Ellison Johnson, E. B.  
 Castro (TX) Ellison  
 Chu, Judy Engel Kaptur  
 Cicilline Eshoo Keating  
 Clark (MA) Esty Kelly (IL)  
 Clarke (NY) Farr Kennedy  
 Clay Fitzpatrick Kildee  
 Cleaver Foster Kilmer  
 Clyburn Frankel (FL) Kind



Kirkpatrick Nadler Scott (VA)  
 Kuster Napolitano Scott, David  
 Langevin Neal Serrano  
 Larsen (WA) Nolan Sewell (AL)  
 Larson (CT) Norcross Sherman  
 Lawrence O'Rourke Sinema  
 Lee Pallone Sires  
 Levin Pascrell Slaughter  
 Lewis Payne Smith (NJ)  
 Lieu, Ted Pelosi Smith (WA)  
 Lipinski Perlmutter Speier  
 LoBiondo Peters Swailwell (CA)  
 Loebbeck Pingree Takano  
 Lofgren Pocan Thompson (CA)  
 Lowenthal Poliquin Thompson (MS)  
 Lowey Polis Titus  
 Lujan Grisham Price (NC)  
 (NM) Quigley Tonko  
 Lujan, Ben Ray Rangel Torres  
 (NM) Reichert Tsongas  
 Lynch Rice (NY) Van Hollen  
 Maloney, Richmond Vargas  
 Carolyn Ros-Lehtinen Veasey  
 Maloney, Sean Roybal-Allard Vela  
 Matsui Ruiz Velázquez  
 McCollum Ruppertsberger Vislosky  
 McDermott Rush Walz  
 McGovern Ryan (OH) Wasserman  
 McNerney Sánchez, Linda Schultz  
 Meeks T. Waters, Maxine  
 Meng Sarbanes Watson Coleman  
 Moore Schakowsky Welch  
 Moulton Schiff Wilson (FL)  
 Murphy (FL) Schrader Yarmuth

NOES—235

Abraham Fincher Love  
 Aderholt Fleischmann Lucas  
 Allen Fleming Luetkemeyer  
 Amash Flores Lummis  
 Amodei Forbes MacArthur  
 Babin Fortenberry Marchant  
 Barletta Franks (AZ) Massie  
 Barr Frelinghuysen McCarthy  
 Barton Garrett McCaul  
 Benishek Gibbs McClintock  
 Bilirakis Gohmert McHenry  
 Bishop (GA) Goodlatte McKinley  
 Bishop (MI) Gosar McMorris  
 Bishop (UT) Gowdy Rodgers  
 Black Granger McSally  
 Blackburn Graves (GA) Meadows  
 Blum Graves (LA) Meehan  
 Bost Graves (MO) Messer  
 Boustany Griffith Mica  
 Brady (TX) Grothman Miller (FL)  
 Brat Guinta Miller (MI)  
 Bridenstine Guthrie Moolenaar  
 Brooks (AL) Hanna Mooney (WV)  
 Brooks (IN) Hardy Mullin  
 Buchanan Harper Mulvaney  
 Buck Harris Murphy (PA)  
 Bucshon Hartzler Neugebauer  
 Burgess Heck (NV) Newhouse  
 Byrne Hensarling Noem  
 Calvert Hice, Jody B. Nugent  
 Carter (GA) Hill Nunes  
 Carter (TX) Holding Olson  
 Chabot Hudson Palazzo  
 Chaffetz Huelskamp Palmer  
 Clawson (FL) Huizenga (MI) Paulsen  
 Coffman Hultgren Pearce  
 Cole Hunter Perry  
 Collins (GA) Hurd (TX) Peterson  
 Collins (NY) Hurt (VA) Pittenger  
 Comstock Issa Pitts  
 Conaway Jenkins (KS) Pompeo  
 Cook Jenkins (WV) Posey  
 Costa Johnson (OH) Price, Tom  
 Costello (PA) Johnson, Sam Ratcliffe  
 Cramer Jones Reed  
 Crawford Jordan Renacci  
 Crenshaw Joyce Ribble  
 Cuellar Katko Rice (SC)  
 Culberson Kelly (MS) Rigell  
 Davidson Kelly (PA) Roby  
 Davis, Rodney King (IA) Roe (TN)  
 Denham King (NY) Rogers (AL)  
 Dent Kinzinger (IL) Rogers (KY)  
 DeSantis Kline Rohrabacher  
 DesJarlais Knight Rokita  
 Diaz-Balart Labrador Rooney (FL)  
 Donovan LaHood Roskam  
 Duffy LaMalfa Ross  
 Duncan (SC) Lamborn Rothfus  
 Duncan (TN) Lance Rouzer  
 Ellmers (NC) Latta Royce  
 Emmer (MN) Long Russell  
 Farenthold Loudermilk Salmon

Sanford Thornberry Westerman  
 Scalise Tiberi Westmoreland  
 Schweikert Tipton Whitfield  
 Scott, Austin Trott Williams  
 Sensenbrenner Turner Wilson (SC)  
 Sessions Upton Wittman  
 Shimkus Valadao Womack  
 Shuster Wagner Woodall  
 Simpson Walberg Yoder  
 Smith (MO) Walden Yoho  
 Smith (NE) Walker Young (AK)  
 Smith (TX) Walorski Young (IA)  
 Stefanik Walters, Mimi Young (IN)  
 Takano Weber (TX) Zeldin  
 Thompson (CA) Stewarts Webster (FL)  
 Thompson (MS) Thompson (PA) Wenstrup Zinke

NOT VOTING—8

Foxx Marino Stutzman  
 Hastings Poe (TX) Takai  
 Jolly Sanchez, Loretta

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2242

So the amendment was rejected.  
 The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
 business is the demand for a recorded  
 vote on the amendment offered by the  
 gentleman from California (Mr.  
 HUFFMAN) on which further pro-  
 ceedings were postponed and on which  
 the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 184, noes 240,  
 not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 422]

AYES—184

Adams Courtney Hanna  
 Agullar Crowley Heck (WA)  
 Bass Cummings Higgins  
 Beatty Curbelo (FL) Himes  
 Becerra Davis (CA) Hinojosa  
 Bera Davis, Danny Honda  
 Beyer DeFazio Hoyer  
 Blumenauer DeGette Huffman  
 Bonamici Delaney Israel  
 Boyle, Brendan DeLauro Jeffries  
 F. DelBene Johnson (GA)  
 Brady (PA) DeSaunier Johnson, E. B.  
 Brown (FL) Deutch Jones  
 Brownley (CA) Dingell Kaptur  
 Bustos Doggett Keating  
 Butterfield Dold Kelly (IL)  
 Capps Doyle, Michael Kennedy  
 Capuano F. Kildee  
 Cárdenas Duckworth Kilmer  
 Carney Edwards Kind  
 Carson (IN) Ellison Kirkpatrick  
 Cartwright Engel Kuster  
 Castor (FL) Eshoo Langevin  
 Castro (TX) Esty Larsen (WA)  
 Chu, Judy Farr Larson (CT)  
 Cicilline Foster Lawrence  
 Clark (MA) Frankel (FL) Lee  
 Clarke (NY) Fudge Emmer (MN)  
 Clawson (FL) Gabbard Lewis  
 Clay Gallego Lieu, Ted  
 Cleaver Garamendi Lipinski  
 Clyburn Gibson Loebbeck  
 Cohen Graham Lofgren  
 Connolly Grayson Lowenthal  
 Conyers Grijalva Forbes  
 Cooper Gutierrez Lujan Grisham  
 Costa Hahn (NM)

Luján, Ben Ray Peters  
 (NM) Peterson  
 Lyndh Pingree  
 Maloney, Pocan  
 Carolyn Pollis  
 Maloney, Sean Price (NC)  
 Matsui Quigley  
 McCollum Rangel  
 McDermott Rice (NY)  
 McGovern Richmond  
 McNerney Ros-Lehtinen  
 Meeks Roybal-Allard  
 Meng Ruiz  
 Moore Ruppertsberger  
 Moulton Rush  
 Murphy (FL) Ryan (OH)  
 Nadler Sánchez, Linda  
 T.  
 Napolitano Sarbanes  
 Neal Schakowsky  
 Nolan Schiffr  
 Norcross Schrader  
 O'Rourke Scott (VA)  
 Pallone Pascarell  
 Pascrell Scott, David  
 Payne Sewell (AL)  
 Perlmutter Sherman  
 Sinema Sinema

NOES—240

Frelinghuysen McKinley  
 Garrett McMorris  
 Allen Gibbs Rodgers  
 Amash Gohmert McSally  
 Amodei Goodlatte Meadows  
 Ashford Gosar Meehan  
 Babin Gowdy Messer  
 Barletta Granger Mica  
 Barr Graves (GA) Miller (FL)  
 Barton Graves (LA) Miller (MI)  
 Benishek Graves (MO) Moolenaar  
 Bilirakis Green, Al Mooney (WV)  
 Bishop (GA) Green, Gene Mullin  
 Bishop (MI) Griffith Mulvaney  
 Bishop (UT) Grothman Murphy (PA)  
 Black Guinta Neugebauer  
 Blackburn Guthrie Newhouse  
 Blum Hardy Noem  
 Bost Harper Nugent  
 Boustany Harris Nunes  
 Brady (TX) Hartzler Olson  
 Brat Heck (NV) Palazzo  
 Bridenstine Hensarling Palmer  
 Brooks (AL) Herrera Beutler Paulsen  
 Brooks (IN) Hice, Jody B. Pearce  
 Buchanan Hill Perry  
 Buck Holding Pittenger  
 Bucshon Hudson Pitts  
 Burgess Huelskamp Poliquin  
 Byrne Huizenga (MI) Pompeo  
 Calvert Hultgren Posey  
 Carter (GA) Hunter Price, Tom  
 Carter (TX) Hurd (TX) Ratcliffe  
 Chabot Hurt (VA) Reed  
 Chaffetz Issa Reichert  
 Coffman Jackson Lee Renacci  
 Cole Jenkins (KS) Ribble  
 Collins (GA) Jenkins (WV) Rice (SC)  
 Collins (NY) Johnson (OH) Rigell  
 Comstock Johnson, Sam Roby  
 Conaway Jordan Roe (TN)  
 Cook Joyce Rogers (AL)  
 Costello (PA) Katko Rogers (KY)  
 Cramer Kelly (MS) Rohrabacher  
 Crawford Kelly (PA) Rokita  
 Crenshaw King (IA) Rooney (FL)  
 Cuellar King (NY) Roskam  
 Culberson Kinzinger (IL) Ross  
 Davidson Kline Rothfus  
 Davis, Rodney Knight Rouzer  
 Denham Labrador Royce  
 Dent LaHood Russell  
 DeSantis LaMalfa Salmon  
 DesJarlais Lamborn Sanford  
 Diaz-Balart Lance Scalise  
 Donovan Latta Schweikert  
 Duffy LoBiondo Scott, Austin  
 Duncan (SC) Long Sensenbrenner  
 Duncan (TN) Loudermilk Sessions  
 Ellmers (NC) Love Shimkus  
 Emmer (MN) Lucas Shuster  
 Farenthold Luetkemeyer Simpson  
 Fortenberry Lummis Smith (MO)  
 Franks (AZ) MacArthur Smith (NE)  
 (NM) Marchant Smith (NJ)  
 (NM) Marchant Smith (TX)  
 (NM) Massie Stefanik  
 (NM) McCarthy Stewart  
 (NM) McCaul Stivers  
 (NM) McClintock Thompson (PA)  
 (NM) McHenry

Thornberry Walorski Womack  
Tiberi Walters, Mimi Woodall  
Tipton Weber (TX) Yoder  
Trott Webster (FL) Yoho  
Turner Wenstrup Young (AK)  
Upton Westerman Young (IA)  
Valadao Westmoreland Young (IN)  
Wagner Whitfield Zeldin  
Walberg Williams  
Walden Wilson (SC) Zinke  
Walker Wittman

NOT VOTING—9

Foxx Marino Serrano  
Hastings Poe (TX) Stutzman  
Jolly Sanchez, Loretta Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2245

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 12 OFFERED BY MS. CASTOR OF  
FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CAS-  
TOR) on which further proceedings were  
postponed and on which the noes pre-  
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 186, noes 237,  
not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 423]

AYES—186

Adams Cummings Hoyer  
Aguilar Curbelo (FL) Huffman  
Bass Davis (CA) Israel  
Beatty Davis, Danny Jeffries  
Becerra DeFazio Johnson (GA)  
Bera DeGette Johnson, E. B.  
Beyer Delaney Kaptur  
Bishop (GA) DeLauro Keating  
Blumenauer DelBene Kelly (IL)  
Bonamici DeSaulnier Kennedy  
Boyle, Brendan Deutch Kildee  
F. Dingell Kilmer  
Brady (PA) Doggett Kind  
Brown (FL) Dold Kirkpatrick  
Brownley (CA) Doyle, Michael Kuster  
Buchanan F. Langevin  
Bustos Duckworth Larsen (WA)  
Butterfield Edwards Larson (CT)  
Capps Ellison Lawrence  
Capuano Engel Lee  
Cárdenas Eshoo Levin  
Carney Esty Lewis  
Carson (IN) Farr Lieu, Ted  
Cartwright Foster Lipinski  
Castor (FL) Frankel (FL) LoBiondo  
Castro (TX) Fudge Loebsack  
Chu, Judy Gabbard Lofgren  
Cicilline Gallego Lowenthal  
Clark (MA) Garamendi Lowey  
Clarke (NY) Graham Lujan Grisham  
Clawson (FL) Grayson (NM)  
Clay Grijalva Luján, Ben Ray  
Cleave Gutierrez (NM)  
Clyburn Hahn Lynch  
Cohen Hanna Maloney,  
Connolly Heck (WA) Carolyn  
Conyers Higgins Maloney, Sean  
Cooper Himes Matsui  
Courtney Hinojosa McCollum  
Crowley Honda McDermott

McGovern Quigley Smith (WA)  
McNerney Rangel Speier  
Meeks Rice (NY) Swalwell (CA)  
Meng Richmond Takano  
Moore Ros-Lehtinen Thompson (CA)  
Moulton Roybal-Allard Thompson (MS)  
Murphy (FL) Ruiz Titus  
Nadler Ruppersberger Tonko  
Napolitano Rush Torres  
Nolan Neal Ryan (OH)  
Norcross Sánchez, Linda  
Nugent T. Sarbanes  
O'Rourke Schakowsky  
Pallone Schiff  
Pascrell Schrader  
Pelosi Scott (VA)  
Perlmutter Scott, David  
Peters Serrano  
Pingree Sewell (AL)  
Pocan Sherman  
Poliquin Sinema  
Polis Sires  
Price (NC) Slaughter  
Smith (NJ) Smith

NOES—237

Abraham Gibson  
Aderholt Gohmert  
Allen Goodlatte  
Amash Gosar  
Amodei Gowdy  
Ashford Granger  
Babin Graves (GA)  
Barletta Graves (LA)  
Barr Graves (MO)  
Barton Green, Al  
Benishek Green, Gene  
Bilirakis Griffith  
Bishop (MI) Grothman  
Bishop (UT) Guinta  
Black Guthrie  
Blackburn Hardy  
Blum Harper  
Bost Harris  
Boustany Hartzler  
Brady (TX) Heck (NV)  
Brat Hensarling  
Bridenstine Herrera Beutler  
Brooks (AL) Hice, Jody B.  
Brooks (IN) Hill  
Buck Holding  
Bucshon Hudson  
Burgess Huelskamp  
Byrne Huizenga (MI)  
Calvert Hultgren  
Carter (GA) Hunter  
Carter (TX) Hurd (TX)  
Chabot Hurt (VA)  
Chaffetz Issa  
Coffman Jackson Lee  
Cole Jenkins (KS)  
Collins (GA) Jenkins (WV)  
Collins (NY) Jenkins (OH)  
Comstock Johnson, Sam  
Conaway Jones  
Cook Jordan  
Costa Katko  
Costello (PA) Kelly (MS)  
Cramer Kelly (PA)  
Crawford King (IA)  
Crenshaw King (NY)  
Cuellar Kinzinger (IL)  
Culberson Kline  
Davidson Knight  
Davis, Rodney Labrador  
Denham LaHood  
Dent LaMalfa  
DeSantis Lamborn  
DesJarlais Lance  
Diaz-Balart Latta  
Donovan Long  
Duffy Loudermilk  
Duncan (SC) Love  
Duncan (TN) Lucas  
Ellmers (NC) Luetkemeyer  
Emmer (MN) Lummis  
Farenthold MacArthur  
Fincher Marchant  
Fitzpatrick Massie  
Fleischmann McCarthy  
Fleming McCaul  
Flores McClintock  
Forbes McKinley  
Fortenberry McHenry  
Franks (AZ) McMorris  
Fringhuyzen Rodgers  
Garrett McSally  
Gibbs Meadows

Walden Westmoreland Yoho  
Walker Whitfield Young (AK)  
Walorski Williams Young (IA)  
Walters, Mimi Wilson (SC) Young (IN)  
Weber (TX) Wittman Zeldin  
Webster (FL) Womack Zinke  
Wenstrup Woodall  
Westerman Yoder

NOT VOTING—10

Foxx Marino Takai  
Hastings Poe (TX) Tiberi  
Jolly Sanchez, Loretta  
Joyce Stutzman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2249

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. HUFFMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from California (Mr.  
HUFFMAN) on which further pro-  
ceedings were postponed and on which  
the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 181, noes 244,  
not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 424]

AYES—181

Adams DeLauro Kildee  
Aguilar DelBene Kilmer  
Bass DeSaulnier Kind  
Beatty Deutch Kirkpatrick  
Becerra Dingell Kuster  
Bera Doggett Langevin  
Beyer Dold Larsen (WA)  
Blumenauer Doyle, Michael Larson (CT)  
Bonamici F. Lawrence  
Boyle, Brendan Duckworth Lee  
F. Edwards Levin  
Brady (PA) Ellison Lewis  
Brown (FL) Engel Lieu, Ted  
Brownley (CA) Eshoo Lipinski  
Bustos Esty Loebsack  
Butterfield Farr Lofgren  
Capps Foster Lowenthal  
Capuano Frankel (FL) Lowey  
Cárdenas Fudge Lujan Grisham  
Carney Gabbard (NM)  
Carson (IN) Gallego Luján, Ben Ray  
Cartwright Garamendi (NM)  
Castor (FL) Graham Lynch  
Castro (TX) Grayson Maloney,  
Chu, Judy Green, Al Carolyn  
Cicilline Grijalva Maloney, Sean  
Clark (MA) Gutiérrez Gutiérrez  
Clarke (NY) Clarke (NY) Hahn Matsui  
Clawson (FL) Clay Heck (WA) McCollum  
Cleave Higgins McDermott  
Clyburn Himes McGovern  
Cohen Hinojosa Meeks  
Connolly Honda Meng  
Conyers Hoyer Moore  
Cooper Huffman Moulton  
Courtney Israel Murphy (FL)  
Crowley Jackson Lee Nadler  
Cummings Jeffries Napolitano  
Curbelo (FL) Johnson (GA) Neal  
Davis (CA) Johnson, E. B. Nolan  
Davis, Danny Kaptur Norcross  
DeFazio Keating O'Rourke  
DeGette Kelly (IL) Pallone  
Delaney Kennedy Pascrell

Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Reichert  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)

Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
  
Foxy  
Hastings  
Jolly

Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
  
Marino  
Poe (TX)  
Sanchez, Loretta

Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke  
  
NOT VOTING—8  
  
Stutzman  
Takai  
  
Stewart  
Takai  
  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce

Pittenger  
Pitts  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce

Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trotter  
Turner  
Valadao  
Wagner

Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

NOES—244

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Ashford  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte

Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Gene  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rogers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin

Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Roskam  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte

Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
  
Foxy  
Hastings  
Jolly  
  
DesJarlais  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Franks (AZ)  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)

NOT VOTING—8  
  
Marino  
Poe (TX)  
Sanchez, Loretta  
  
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
The Acting Chair (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.  
  
□ 2252  
  
So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.  
  
AMENDMENT NO. 14 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF  
MISSOURI  
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH)  
on which further proceedings were  
postponed and on which the noes pre-  
vailed by voice vote.  
The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.  
The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.  
  
RECORDED VOTE  
The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.  
A recorded vote was ordered.  
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
minute vote.  
The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 208, noes 217,  
not voting 8, as follows:  
[Roll No. 425]  
AYES—208  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
Lamborn  
Latta  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
Marchant  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rogers  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Moolenaar  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pearce  
Perry

Adams  
Aguilar  
Ashford  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Calvert  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeGette  
DeLaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Dent  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donovan  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fitzpatrick  
Fortenberry  
Foster

Frankel (FL)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gibson  
Graham  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanna  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Joyce  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (NY)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kuster  
LaMalfa  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loeback  
Loftgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham  
(NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray  
(NM)  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney,  
Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meeks  
Meng

Miller (MI)  
Mooney (WV)  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascarella  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Reichert  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Kaptur  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sherman  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stefanik  
Lowe  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz

NOES—217

Wasserman Watson Coleman Yarmuth  
Schultz Welch  
Waters, Maxine Wilson (FL)

## NOT VOTING—8

Foxx Marino Stutzman  
Hastings Poe (TX) Takai  
Jolly Sanchez, Loretta

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2255

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER)  
on which further proceedings were  
postponed and on which the noes pre-  
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 175, noes 250,  
not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 426]

AYES—175

Abraham Goodlatte McMorris  
Aderholt Gosar Rodgers  
Allen Gowdy Meadows  
Amash Graves (GA) Messer  
Babin Graves (MO) Mica  
Barr Griffith Miller (FL)  
Barton Grothman Moolenaar  
Benishek Guinta Mooney (WV)  
Billirakis Guthrie Mullin  
Bishop (MI) Hardy Mulvaney  
Bishop (UT) Harper Neugebauer  
Black Harris Newhouse  
Blackburn Hartzler Olson  
Blum Heck (NV) Palazzo  
Boustany Hensarling Palmer  
Brady (TX) Hice, Jody B. Paulsen  
Brat Hill Pearce  
Bridenstine Holding Perry  
Brooks (AL) Hudson Pittenger  
Buchanan Huelskamp Pitts  
Buck Huizenga (MI) Poliquin  
Burgess Hultgren Pompeo  
Carter (GA) Hunter Posey  
Chabot Hurd (TX) Price, Tom  
Chaffetz Hurd (VA) Ratcliffe  
Clawson (FL) Issa Ribble  
Coffman Jenkins (KS) Rice (SC)  
Collins (GA) Jenkins (WV) Rigell  
Conaway Johnson, Sam Roe (TN)  
Cramer Jones Rohrabacher  
Crawford Jordan Rokita  
Culberson Joyce Rooney (FL)  
Davidson Kelly (MS) Roskam  
Davis, Rodney Kline Ross  
DeSantis Knight Rothfus  
DesJarlais Labrador Rouzer  
Duffy LaHood Royce  
Duncan (SC) Lamborn Russell  
Duncan (TN) Latta Salmon  
Emmer (MN) Long Sanford  
Farenthold Loudermilk Scalise  
Fincher Love Schweikert  
Fleischmann Luetkemeyer Scott, Austin  
Fleming Lummis Sensenbrenner  
Flores Marchant Sessions  
Forbes Massie Shuster  
Franks (AZ) McCaul Sinema  
Garrett McClintock Smith (MO)  
Gibson McHenry Smith (NE)  
Gohmert McKinley Smith (TX)

Stewart  
Thompson (PA)  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Turner  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker

## NOES—250

Adams  
Aguilar  
Amodi  
Ashford  
Barletta  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Bost  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brooks (IN)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bucshon  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Carter (TX)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cook  
Cooper  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Crenshaw  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Donovan  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Ellmers (NC)  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Fitzpatrick  
Fortenberry  
Foster

Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)

Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Noem  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Nugent  
Nunes  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Himes  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Roby  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Simpson  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stefanik  
Lipinski  
Stivers  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Thornberry  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Trott  
Tsongas  
Upton  
Valadao  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walorski  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)  
Young (IN)

## NOT VOTING—8

Foxx Marino Stutzman  
Hastings Poe (TX) Takai  
Jolly Sanchez, Loretta

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2258

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, during rollcall vote  
No. 426 on H.R. 5538, I mistakenly recorded  
my vote as "yes" when I should have voted  
"no."

AMENDMENT NO. 21 OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY  
LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN  
RAY LUJÁN) on which further pro-  
ceedings were postponed and on which  
the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 219, noes 207,  
not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 427]

AYES—219

Adams Crowley Higgins  
Aguilar Cuellar Hill  
Amash Cummings Himes  
Babin Davis (CA) Hinojosa  
Barr Davis, Danny Honda  
Barton DeFazio Hoyer  
Benishek DeGette Huffman  
Bera Delaney Israel  
Beyer DeLauro Jackson Lee  
Bishop (GA) DelBene Jeffries  
Bishop (UT) Dent Johnson (GA)  
Blumenauer DeSaulnier Johnson, E. B.  
Bonamici Deutch Jones  
Boyle, Brendan Dingell Kaptur  
F. Doggett Keating  
Dold Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Brady (PA) Donovan Kildee  
Brown (FL) Doyle, Michael  
Brownley (CA) F. Kilmer  
Buck Duckworth Kind  
Burgess Edwards King (NY)  
Bustos Ellison Kirkpatrick  
Butterfield Engel Kuster  
Capps Eshoo Lamborn  
Capuano Esty Langevin  
Cárdenas Farr Larsen (WA)  
Carney Fitzpatrick Larson (CT)  
Carson (IN) Fortenberry Lawrence  
Cartwright Foster Lee  
Castor (FL) Frankel (FL) Levin  
Castro (TX) Fudge Lewis  
Chaffetz Gabbard Lieu, Ted  
Chu, Judy Gallego Lipinski  
Cicilline Garamendi Loebsock  
Clark (MA) Gohmert Lofgren  
Clarke (NY) Gosar Love  
Clay Graham Lowenthal  
Clever Graves (LA) Lowey  
Clyburn Grayson Lujan Grisham  
Cohen Green, Al (NM)  
Connolly Green, Gene Luján, Ben Ray  
Conyers Grijalva (NM)  
Cooper Gutiérrez Lummis  
Costa Hahn Lynch  
Costello (PA) Heck (WA) Maloney,  
Courtney Herrera Beutler Carolyn

Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meeks  
Meng  
Mooney (WV)  
Moore  
Moulton  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (FL)  
Murphy (PA)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Newhouse  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree

Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Richmond  
Rohrabacher  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Salmon  
Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schradler  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sinema

Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Stewart  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

NOES—207

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amodei  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Bucshon  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Goodlatte  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)

Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Hice, Jody B.  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huisenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalifa  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall

Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Scalise  
Scott, Austin  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stivers  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall

Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)

Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin

Zinke  
Takai

NOT VOTING—7

Hastings  
Jolly  
Marino

Poe (TX)  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Stutzman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2302

Mr. SIRES and Ms. MCSALLY changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”  
So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MRS. DINGELL  
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL) 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.  
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 256, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 428]

AYES—170

Adams  
Aguiar  
Ashford  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
Lee  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch

Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Poster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kind  
Kirkpatrick  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis

Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham (NM)  
Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)

Sánchez, Linda  
T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sires  
Slaughter

Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas

Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Whitfield  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

NOES—256

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bera  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garamendi  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gibson  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy

Graham  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hanna  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Heck (WA)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huisenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kilmer  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kline  
Knight  
Kuster  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalifa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCauley  
McClintock  
McDermott  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse

Noem  
Nolan  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schradler  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stivers  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder

Yoho Young (IA) Zeldin  
 Young (AK) Young (IN) Zinke

NOT VOTING—7

Hastings Poe (TX) Takai  
 Jolly Sanchez, Loretta  
 Marino Stutzman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2305

So the amendment was rejected.  
 The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR.  
 CARTWRIGHT

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
 business is the demand for a recorded  
 vote on the amendment offered by the  
 gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.  
 CARTWRIGHT) on which further pro-  
 ceedings were postponed and on which  
 the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 195, noes 231,  
 not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 429]

AYES—195

Adams DeLauro Kilmer  
 Aguilar DeBene Kind  
 Ashford DeSaulnier Kirkpatrick  
 Bass Deutch Kuster  
 Beatty Dingell Langevin  
 Becerra Doggett Larsen (WA)  
 Bera Doyle, Michael Larson (CT)  
 Beyer F. Lawrence  
 Bishop (GA) Duckworth Lee  
 Blumenauer Edwards Levin  
 Bonamici Ellison Lewis  
 Boyle, Brendan Engel Lieu, Ted  
 F. Eshoo Lipinski  
 Brady (PA) Esty LoBiondo  
 Brown (FL) Farr Loeb sack  
 Brownley (CA) Fitzpatrick Lofgren  
 Bustos Foster Lowenthal  
 Butterfield Frankel (FL) Lowey  
 Capps Fudge Lujan Grisham  
 Capuano Gabbard (NM)  
 Cárdenas Gallego Luján, Ben Ray  
 Carney Garamendi (NM)  
 Carson (IN) Gibson Lynch  
 Cartwright Graham Maloney,  
 Castor (FL) Grayson Carolyn  
 Castro (TX) Green, Al Maloney, Sean  
 Chu, Judy Green, Gene Matsui  
 Cicilline Grijalva McCollum  
 Clark (MA) Gutiérrez McDermott  
 Clarke (NY) Hahn McGovern  
 Clay Heck (WA) McNeerney  
 Cleaver Higgins Meeks  
 Clyburn Himes Meng  
 Cohen Hinojosa Miller (MI)  
 Connolly Moore Moulton  
 Conyers Hoyer Moulton  
 Cooper Huffman Murphy (FL)  
 Costa Israel Nadler  
 Costello (PA) Jackson Lee Napolitano  
 Courtney Jeffries Neal  
 Crowley Johnson (GA) Nolan  
 Cuellar Johnson, E. B. Norcross  
 Cummings Jones O'Rourke  
 Curbelo (FL) Kaptur Pallone  
 Davis (CA) Katko Pascarell  
 Davis, Danny Keating Payne  
 DeFazio Kelly (IL) Pelosi  
 DeGette Kennedy Perlmutter  
 Delaney Kildee Peters

Pingree Schiff  
 Pocan Scott (VA)  
 Poliquin Scott, David  
 Polis Serrano  
 Price (NC) Sewell (AL)  
 Quigley Sherman  
 Rangel Sinema  
 Rice (NY) Sires  
 Richmond Slaughter  
 Ros-Lehtinen Smith (NJ)  
 Roybal-Allard Smith (WA)  
 Ruiz Speier  
 Ruppertsberger Stefanik  
 Rush Swailwell (CA)  
 Ryan (OH) Takano  
 Sánchez, Linda Thompson (CA)  
 T. Thompson (MS)  
 Sarbanes Titus  
 Schakowsky Tonko

NOES—231

Abraham Graves (MO)  
 Aderholt Griffith  
 Allen Grothman  
 Amash Guinta  
 Amodei Guthrie  
 Babin Hanna  
 Barletta Hardy  
 Barr Harper  
 Barton Harris  
 Benishek Hartzler  
 Bilirakis Heck (NV)  
 Bishop (MI) Hensarling  
 Bishop (UT) Herrera Beutler  
 Black Hice, Jody B.  
 Blackburn Hill  
 Blum Holding  
 Bost Hudson  
 Boustany Huelskamp  
 Brady (TX) Huizenga (MI)  
 Brat Hultgren  
 Bridenstine Hunter  
 Brooks (AL) Hurd (TX)  
 Brooks (IN) Hurt (VA)  
 Buchanan Issa  
 Buck Jenkins (KS)  
 Bucshon Jenkins (WV)  
 Burgess Johnson (OH)  
 Byrne Johnson, Sam  
 Calvert Jordan  
 Carter (GA) Joyce  
 Carter (TX) Kelly (MS)  
 Chabot Kelly (PA)  
 Chaffetz King (IA)  
 Clawson (FL) King (NY)  
 Coffman Kinzinger (IL)  
 Cole Kline  
 Collins (GA) Knight  
 Collins (NY) Labrador  
 Comstock LaHood  
 Conaway LaMalfa  
 Cook Lamborn  
 Cramer Lance  
 Crawford Latta  
 Creshaw Long  
 Culberson Loudermilk  
 Davidson Love  
 Davis, Rodney Lucas  
 Denham Luetkemeyer  
 Dent Lummis  
 DeSantis MacArthur  
 DesJarlais Marchant  
 Diaz-Balart Massie  
 Dold McCarthy  
 Donovan McCaul  
 Duffy McClintock  
 Duncan (SC) McHenry  
 Duncan (TN) McKinley  
 Ellmers (NC) McMorris  
 Emmer (MN) Rodgers  
 Farenthold McSally  
 Fincher Meadows  
 Fleischmann Meehan  
 Fleming Messer  
 Flores Mica  
 Forbes Miller (FL)  
 Fortenberry Moolenaar  
 Foxx Mooney (WV)  
 Franks (AZ) Mullin  
 Frelinghuysen Mulvaney  
 Garrett Murphy (PA)  
 Gibbs Neugebauer  
 Gohmert Newhouse  
 Goodlatte Noem  
 Gosar Nugent  
 Gowdy Nunes  
 Granger Olson  
 Graves (GA) Palazzo  
 Graves (LA) Palmer

Torres  
 Tsongas  
 Upton  
 Van Hollen  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—7

Hastings Poe (TX) Takai  
 Jolly Sanchez, Loretta  
 Marino Stutzman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2308

So the amendment was rejected.  
 The result of the vote was announced  
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MR. BECERRA  
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
 business is the demand for a recorded  
 vote on the amendment offered by the  
 gentleman from California (Mr.  
 BECERRA) 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 amend-  
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-  
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 190, noes 236,  
 not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 430]

AYES—190

Adams Doggett Lieu, Ted  
 Aguilar Doyle, Michael Lipinski  
 Ashford F. Loeb sack  
 Bass Duckworth Lofgren  
 Beatty Edwards Lowenthal  
 Becerra Ellison Lowey  
 Bera Engel Lujan Grisham  
 Beyer Eshoo (NM)  
 Bishop (GA) Esty Luján, Ben Ray  
 Blumenauer Farr (NM)  
 Bonamici Foster Lynch  
 Boyle, Brendan Frankel (FL)  
 F. Fudge  
 Brady (PA) Gabbard Carolyn  
 Brown (FL) Brown (FL) Maloney,  
 Gallego  
 Brownley (CA) Garamendi Sean  
 Bustos Gibson Matsui  
 Capuano Gibson McCollum  
 Cárdenas Graham McDermott  
 Carson (IN) Grayson McGovern  
 Cartwright Green, Al McNeerney  
 Castor (FL) Green, Gene Meeks  
 Castro (TX) Grijalva Meng  
 Chu, Judy Gutiérrez  
 Cicilline Hahn Moore  
 Clark (MA) Hanna Moulton  
 Clarke (NY) Heck (WA) Murphy (FL)  
 Clay Higgs Nadler  
 Cleaver Himes Napolitano  
 Clyburn Hinojosa Neal  
 Cohen Kaptur  
 Connolly Keating  
 Conyers Courtney Kelly (IL)  
 Cooper Crowley Kennedy  
 Costa Kuster  
 Cummings DeGette  
 Curbelo (FL) Delaney  
 Davis (CA) DeLauro  
 Davis, Danny DelBene  
 DeFazio DeSaulnier  
 DeGette Deutch  
 Delaney Dingell Lewis

Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires

NOES—236

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Dold  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)

NOT VOTING—7

Hastings  
Jolly  
Marino

Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speler  
Stefanik  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen

Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zinke

Takai  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Stutzman

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR  
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).  
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2311

Mr. CURBELO of Florida changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”  
So the amendment was rejected.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS  
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 244, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 431]

AYES—182

Adams  
Aguilar  
Bass  
Beatty  
Becerra  
Bera  
Beyer  
Blumenauer  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (FL)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capps  
Capuano  
Cárdenas  
Carney  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Ciilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
DeLaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Dold  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duckworth  
Edwards

Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Esty  
Farr  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Galleo  
Garamendi  
Gibson  
Graham  
Grayson  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hahn  
Hanna  
Heck (WA)  
Higgins  
Himes  
Hinojosa  
Honda  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Israel  
Jackson Lee  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kuster  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham  
Speier

Luján, Ben Ray (NM)  
Lynch  
Maloney, Carolyn  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McDermott  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Rangel  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez, Linda T.  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Serrano  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Speier

Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Ashford  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishek  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)

Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz

NOES—244

Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulvaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer

NOT VOTING—7

Poe (TX)  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Stutzman

Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2314

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”  
So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. PETERS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) 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 Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 241, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 432]

AYES—185

Adams	Edwards	Luján, Ben Ray
Aguilar	Ellison	(NM)
Ashford	Engel	Lynch
Bass	Eshoo	Maloney,
Beatty	Esty	Carolyn
Becerra	Farr	Maloney, Sean
Bera	Foster	Matsui
Beyer	Frankel (FL)	McCollum
Blumenauer	Fudge	McDermott
Bonamici	Gabbard	McGovern
Boyle, Brendan	Gallego	McNerney
F.	Garamendi	Meeks
Brady (PA)	Gibson	Meng
Brown (FL)	Graham	Moore
Brownley (CA)	Grayson	Moulton
Bustos	Green, Al	Murphy (FL)
Butterfield	Green, Gene	Nadler
Capps	Grijalva	Napolitano
Capuano	Gutiérrez	Neal
Cárdenas	Hahn	Nolan
Carney	Hanna	Norcross
Carson (IN)	Heck (WA)	O'Rourke
Cartwright	Higgins	Pallone
Castor (FL)	Himes	Pascrell
Castro (TX)	Hinojosa	Payne
Chu, Judy	Honda	Pelosi
Ciulline	Hoyer	Perlmutter
Clark (MA)	Huffman	Peters
Clarke (NY)	Israel	Peterson
Clay	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Cleaver	Jeffries	Pocan
Clyburn	Johnson (GA)	Polis
Cohen	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Connolly	Kaptur	Quigley
Conyers	Keating	Rangel
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Costa	Kennedy	Richmond
Courtney	Kildee	Ros-Lehtinen
Crowley	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Cummings	Kind	Ruiz
Curbelo (FL)	Kuster	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Langevin	Rush
Davis, Danny	Larsen (WA)	Ryan (OH)
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Sánchez, Linda
DeGette	Lawrence	T.
Delaney	Lee	Sarbanes
DeLauro	Levin	Schakowsky
DelBene	Lewis	Schiff
DeSaulnier	Lieu, Ted	Schrader
Deutch	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Loeb	Scott, David
Doggett	Lofgren	Serrano
Dold	Lowenthal	Sherman
Doyle, Michael	Lowey	Sinema
F.	Lujan Grisham	Sires
Duckworth	(NM)	Slaughter

Smith (WA)  
Speier  
Swailwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko

Torres  
Tsongas  
Van Hollen  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky

Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2317

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, 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. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO S. 764, NATIONAL SEA GRANT COLLEGE PROGRAM AMENDMENTS ACT OF 2015; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 304, MOTOR VEHICLE SAFETY WHISTLEBLOWER ACT; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(A) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. WOODALL, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 114-686) on the resolution (H. Res. 822) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the bill (S. 764) to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (S. 304) to improve motor vehicle safety by encouraging the sharing of certain information; and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 820 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 5538.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) kindly take the chair.

□ 2321

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole

NOES—241

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Babin  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Benishak  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Boustany  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Bridenstine  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Chaffetz  
Clawson (FL)  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crenshaw  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Marchant  
Massie  
Diaz-Balart  
Novovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Ellmers (NC)  
Emmer (MN)  
Farenthold  
Fincher  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Fleming  
Flores  
Forbes  
Fortenberry  
Foxo  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Garrett  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)

NOT VOTING—7

Hastings  
Jolly  
Marino

Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guinta  
Guthrie  
Hardy  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Heck (NV)  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Hill  
Holding  
Hudson  
Huelskamp  
Huizenga (MI)  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd (TX)  
Hurt (VA)  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger (IL)  
Kirkpatrick  
Kline  
Knight  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lummis  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Massie  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mica  
Miller (FL)  
Miller (MI)  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Mulyaney  
Murphy (PA)  
Neugebauer  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nugent  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo

Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Pitts  
Poliquin  
Pompeo  
Posey  
Price, Tom  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Ribble  
Rice (SC)  
Rigell  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney (FL)  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce  
Russell  
Salmon  
Sanford  
Scalise  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Westmoreland  
Whitfield  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Young (IN)  
Zeldin  
Zinke

Poe (TX)  
Sanchez, Loretta  
Stutzman

Takai



House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, with Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 31 printed in House Report 114-683 offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MR. BRAT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce contracts or other agreements under the Land and Water Conservation Fund program that were entered into with States or units of local government more than 20 years before the date of the enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BRAT. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to H.R. 5538, Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

Mr. Speaker, the Land and Water Conservation Fund requires property acquired and developed with the LWCF assistance to be retained and used for public outdoor recreation. Any property so acquired and/or developed may not be converted to other uses without approval of the National Park Service, NPS, indefinitely.

Federal funding through the LWCF grant shouldn't let the NPS enforce conditions on the use of State and local lands forever. A quid pro quo condition in exchange for funds for some period might be reasonable, but eventually federalism needs to kick in again.

This amendment would prevent the NPS from enforcing the conditions on an LWCF grant for a 20-year period. This allows the State or locality to use its property as it sees fit, without needing permission from the NPS.

After a generation or more, it is only reasonable for State and local governments to reassess land use on behalf of their citizens.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to put our constituents back in control of local matters.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment,

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment nullifies the terms of the Land and Water Conservation Fund contracts that are more than 20 years old.

When States, counties, and other municipal governments receive funds from the LWCF State assistance grant program, they do so with the understanding that the land acquired with these funds will be used for public recreation purposes in perpetuity. If they no longer need the land for this purpose, there is an established administrative process that allows for a simple conversion.

Since LWCF's establishment over 50 years ago, this conversion process has been successfully executed thousands of times. Under this amendment, however, any parcel acquired more than 20 years ago could be converted to private use or even sold on the open market without any compensation to the American taxpayer. This is a misguided outcome, Mr. Chairman. Our constituents deserve a fair return on their investment, and we shouldn't allow one town's unwillingness to play by the rules to upend 50 years of success.

I urge my colleagues to defend the integrity of the LWCF and reject this amendment.

I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I agree with the comments just made by the gentleman from New York.

The LWCF, these local communities know what they are entering into when they enter into it. And if they choose to do that, they have the right to do that and they have to live by the decisions that they have made.

We have a lot of LWCF projects in communities that I have lived in in Idaho, and they get the benefit of that LWCF.

I will tell you, if there is a local problem that the gentleman would like to deal with, I know that the committee and the chairman of the committee would be more than willing to work with you to try to address that and try to address the concerns that the local community has because there is a way that, yes, with the agreement of the Federal Government, they can get out of the deals that they have made.

I know, in my community, we had an indoor swimming pool that was actually built for our community. It was a great thing. It became very expensive when the price of energy went up. They wanted to take the roof off of the indoor swimming pool so it wasn't indoor anymore, and the Federal Government wouldn't let them. Now, we are glad they didn't. So these decisions are made for a very good reason.

I would oppose the amendment, and I agree with the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, the distinguished leader of the subcommittee,

the gentleman from Idaho, and the ranking member from Minnesota agree that this amendment would have a misguided outcome.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BRAT).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, add the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to enter into a cooperative agreements with or make any grant or loan to an entity to establish in any of Baca, Bent, Crowley, Huerfano, Kiowa, Las Animas, Otero, Prowers, and Pueblo counties, Colorado, a national heritage area, national heritage corridor, national heritage canal way, national heritage tour route, national historic district, or cultural heritage corridor.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to speak about this important amendment to the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

This amendment protects private property in southeast Colorado by prohibiting the use of funds for the creation or expansion of environmental or cultural protection areas. These zones, often known as national heritage areas, are just another backdoor method for the government to impose Federal zoning on private property.

The heritage areas amount to a forced conservation agreement for private landowners. An appointed management entity imposes its views and ideas on the property holders, changing the way they can use their property without compensating them.

Private property is an essential element of a free democracy. The citizens of Southeast Colorado have fought this government overreach for years now, desperate to save their farms and ranches that have been passed down for generations.

This amendment will ensure that private property rights are restored in southeast Colorado.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment stops the Department of the Interior from entering into cooperative agreements or providing financial assistance of any kind for the purpose of protecting natural, cultural, or historic resources in several counties in southeast Colorado.

It is my understanding that the sponsor aims to preemptively prevent an expansion of the Federal footprint in his district, specifically due to concerns with the application of Executive Order No. 13287.

I would remind the sponsor that the Preserve America Executive Order was issued by President George W. Bush, a Republican, and emphasizes private-public partnerships that limit, not expand, Federal ownership.

If there are specific concerns about Federal management in the region, the sponsor, I hope, would work with the authorizing committee to make sure they are addressed, not use the appropriations process to wall off a section of the country from partnering with the Federal Government to preserve its historic, cultural, and natural resources. That is why I oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, again, I would urge opposition to this amendment. There are opportunities for the gentleman to work with the authorizing committee. The Appropriations Committee should not be used as a vehicle to wall off sections of specific areas.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 2330

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 48 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to hire or pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Environmental Protection Agency under subsection (f) or (g) of section 207 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 209) who is not already receiving pay under either such subsection on the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I rise this evening to offer an amendment on an issue that I have worked on, as well as the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for the last 6 years.

In 2006, the Committee on Appropriations, without consultation with the Committee on Energy and Commerce, included a provision in the annual Interior-EPA appropriations bill to allow the Environmental Protection Agency to begin using a special pay program that was explicitly and exclusively authorized for use by the Public Health Service Administration under the Department of Health and Human Services.

This special pay mechanism allows a government employee to leave the normal GS pay scale and receive nearly uncapped compensation. This special provision was intended to be used only in unique circumstances for leaders in the healthcare industry who would never leave the private sector to work for the Federal Government but for special higher salaries. This justification can never be used at the EPA.

Indeed, some of the employees that the Environmental Protection Agency pays under title 42, the part of the U.S. Code that allows for this special pay, were previous government workers and were merely moved to the special pay scale because they wanted more money. The Environmental Protection Agency claims that, because the EPA is a health organization, it may use this statute to pay special hires; and the Committee on Appropriations has agreed to let them, despite the authorizing committee's objection.

Originally, the EPA was granted only a handful of slots to fill with title 42 hires. That number has now ballooned to over 50. The cost to the taxpayers for these employees is tens of millions of dollars. That is unconscionable.

This amendment would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from hiring any new employees under title 42 or transferring any current employees from the GS scale to title 42. It would not affect current employees being paid by this provision. This would give the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the authorizing committee, the time it needs to address whether the EPA truly deserves this special pay consideration.

The General Accountability Office looked into HHS' abuse of title 42 several years ago and found problems with the implementation of the program. That is within the Department of Health and Human Services, where it arguably could be allowed. Why would Congress ever allow the Environmental Protection Agency to implement the same problematic pay structure?

In multiple hearings in the Committee on Energy and Commerce, both Administrator Lisa Jackson and Gina McCarthy refused to give specifics regarding the program. A Freedom of Information Act request by the EPA

union, the American Federation of Government Employees, sent to my office showed that title 42 hires at EPA are sowing dissent among the workers, with the union asking the Congress stop this abusive and unfair hiring technique.

Both Chairman Emeritus BARTON and I have introduced legislation further clarifying that the Public Health Services Act, written for HHS, does not permit the EPA to use this language to hire employees under a special pay structure. I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, title 42 authority is a flexible hiring mechanism that allows agencies to attract and retain staff with outstanding scientific, technical, and clinical skills. It is not always easy for the Federal Government to attract high-level professionals who have invested many years in school and can easily make more in private practice or even in academia, and that is why the Federal Government needs to allow these agencies to provide some additional incentives to recruit these employees.

With our Nation facing so many crises like Zika, we really should be investing in our scientists. This amendment unfairly attacks Federal employees who devote their life to public service. I urge defeat of this amendment.

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON).

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time remains. The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. BARTON. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from Tarrant County and Denton County for offering this amendment. I am a cosponsor.

It is unconscionable that we are using a provision in Federal law that was first passed during World War II to give a handful of elite medical professionals the capability to get a little bit more than the average Federal pay scale. This has ballooned over at the EPA, and, as has been pointed out, as far as we know, there are in the neighborhood of 50 people who are now getting this above-average pay.

We ought to be eliminating the program. We ought to be just putting the nail through the coffin in this program at EPA. Instead, because of the generosity of my good friend, Dr. BURGESS, he is just saying don't hire any more. Surely this House of Representatives, with a \$500 billion budget deficit, can see it within our heart to accept the Burgess amendment and let us in the

authorizing committee hold hearings and hopefully next year pass a law that puts an end to this program.

I rise in strong support of the Burgess amendment and would ask for its adoption.

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, we have such an array of public health and science emergencies: we have Zika; we have Ebola; we have public health emergencies; we have pandemics, epidemics. Now is the time for us to recruit the best and the brightest in the scientific community. Title 42 gives us the ability to do that. This amendment would undermine that ability, and it should be defeated.

Mr. BARTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ISRAEL. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BARTON. Does the gentleman understand that we are talking about people at EPA? We are not talking about public health in the HHS. We are talking about EPA.

Mr. ISRAEL. Reclaiming my time, the EPA uses scientists engaged in research on pesticides. It uses scientists engaged in other health-related emergencies. We have a difference of opinion as to how to deploy those scientists, where to deploy those scientists. I, as a Member of Congress, don't want to make that decision. I want to make sure that the Federal Government is deploying the scientific community across a broad range of challenges, which is why I oppose this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose or develop legislation to redirect funds allocated under section 105(a)(2)(A) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to introduce this amendment, along with two of my colleagues, Representatives CHARLES BOUSTANY and GARRET GRAVES, both of Louisiana.

My straightforward amendment would prohibit any effort to redirect funds allocated under the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, also referred to as GOMESA. GOMESA was passed in 2006 and created a revenue-sharing agreement for offshore oil revenue between the Federal Government and four States in the Gulf of Mexico: Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama.

Under GOMESA, a certain percentage of the revenues generated from selected oil and gas lease sales in the Outer Continental Shelf of the Gulf of Mexico are returned to the Gulf States. This money must be used in coastal areas for important purposes like coastal restoration and hurricane preparedness.

There is a reason the law was structured this way. These Gulf States not only provide a significant share of the infrastructure and workforce for the industry in the Gulf, but they also have inherent environmental and economic risks. Unfortunately, in his budget proposal this year, President Obama recommended the money be taken away from the Gulf States and instead be spread around the country to implement his radical climate agenda.

Not only does this proposal directly contradict the current Federal statute, it vastly undermines the purpose of this law: to keep revenues from these lease sales in the States that supply the workforce and have the inherent risk of a potential environmental disaster.

This is not the first time the President has made this proposal, and so far Congress has stood strong in opposition. I hope we will do so again today.

My simple amendment will support our coastal communities on the Gulf Coast while preserving the rule of law. We should not allow the President to turn our revenue-sharing agreements into a slush fund for politically driven climate projects.

I urge my colleagues to support this straightforward amendment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simply an overreaction to a policy proposal in the administration's fiscal year 2017 budget request. The budget request proposed to redirect funds currently allocated to payments to States and shift them toward Federal programs that serve the Nation more broadly.

□ 2340

The proposal wasn't included in the bill because the Committee on Appropriations rejected it. The appropriation process is just that, it is a process.

The administration submitted a proposal, the committee evaluated it, and the power to accept or reject the proposal lay with the committee.

This amendment would unnecessarily stifle any proposal to amend the current formula, which is unnecessary, because Congress would need to enact legislation before any changes could be made to the formula. The Department of the Interior does not have the authority to change the formula through rulemaking or other administrative action.

Basically, Mr. Chairman, this would prohibit the Department from even suggesting an idea for Congress to consider. I urge my colleagues to preserve the integrity of the appropriations process and the Committee on the Appropriations and oppose this amendment.

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

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to provide some context here.

Under the Mineral Leasing Act, States shared in 50 percent of the revenues from production of energy on Federal lands—in the State of Alaska, it is actually 90 percent of the revenues—up until 2006, when we reached a bipartisan agreement to share not 50 percent, not 90 percent, but 37½ percent of the revenues associated with offshore energy production. 2006. The revenue sharing, in effect, doesn't actually turn on until next year.

These funds in the State of Louisiana are dedicated by our constitution to restoring the coast, restoring our coastal wetlands, improving the sustainability of our communities that have been pounded by hurricanes in recent years.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment is actually designed to save taxpayers dollars to restore our coastal ecosystem that has been destroyed. And to allow the administration year after year to come in and create this air of uncertainty by attempting to rescind these funds and treating us differently than they treat all the other States that produce onshore is simply bad policy and it creates uncertainty for efforts to restore coastal Louisiana, which has lost 1,900 square miles as a result of Federal actions in the State of Louisiana.

I urge adoption of this amendment.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, this administration has been reversed by the United States Supreme Court more than any other administration in the history of the United States of America. There is nothing that this administration won't do to further its radical agenda, including going against the clear statement of a statute of the United States Congress.

So we have to have language that affirmatively tells them they can't spend this money. Otherwise, they will take the radical step of going against a Federal statute and cynically wait on the United States Supreme Court to tell them they can't do it.

So that is why we have to have this. This is very important not just to the Gulf States, but to the rule of law in the United States of America.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, there is nothing radical about any administration, Democrat or Republican, making a decision, making a rule that would shift funds from specific States to broader national purposes.

I understand the gentleman's and his colleagues' concern for this particular policy, but this is an overreach, Mr. Chairman. This amendment would prohibit the Department from even suggesting an idea for Congress to consider.

This is not worthy of the appropriations process. It ought to be considered as part of a broader approach by the gentleman, not in this bill, and I urge defeat of this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk related to the National Ocean Policy.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR EXECUTIVE ORDER RELATING TO STEWARDSHIP OF OCEANS, COASTS, AND THE GREAT LAKES

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce Executive Order No. 13547 (75 Fed. Reg. 43023, relating to the stewardship of oceans, coasts, and the Great Lakes), including the National Ocean Policy developed under such Executive Order.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to introduce this amendment with two of my colleagues, Representative BILL FLORES of Texas and Representative JOHN FLEMING of Louisiana.

Mr. Chairman, I represent coastal Alabama, and I have spent my entire life living on the Gulf Coast. Like many of my friends and neighbors, my family has always enjoyed fishing, swimming, boating, and spending time in the Gulf of Mexico. It is safe to say that living on the Gulf becomes a way of life.

For some people, the Gulf also provides for economic well-being, whether

through the commercial seafood industry, tourism, or something else.

No one is a better steward of the shores and our waters than those of us who live and work in the Gulf. Since the water provides our way of life and our economic well-being, we are going to do everything we can to protect and preserve our resources. We don't need the Federal Government to tell us what to do.

That is why I am so concerned by the National Ocean Policy, which was created under President Obama's Executive Order No. 13547 in 2010. The policy requires that various bureaucracies work together to "zone the ocean" and the sources thereof, largely affecting the ways in which we utilize our ocean resources.

The National Ocean Policy is executive overreach at its very worst. The policy not only restricts ocean and inland activities, but it redirects Federal money away from congressionally directed priorities for over 20 Federal agencies that meet as part of the National Ocean Council, tasked with implementing the National Ocean Policy—a council that has no statutory authority to exist and no congressional appropriation.

Numerous and varied industries will suffer as a result of this well-meaning but ill-conceived policy, including but not limited to agriculture, energy, fisheries, mining, and marine retail enterprises, just to name a few.

Those who are affected most by the policy don't have a say or any representation in the rulemaking process. There is no current system of oversight in place for the regional planning agencies created as an arm of the National Ocean Council.

I urge my colleagues to stand up for our coastal communities, say no to more executive overreach, and support this amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Byrne-Flores amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I disagree with my colleague. I think that the National Ocean Policy is a vital tool that we have to help ensure that our coastal communities and their stakeholders work together and coordinate their ideas and make plans to achieve local goals. I think as a Congress we need to recognize the importance of our oceans and ocean planning.

Unfortunately, each year, we come to the floor of this body on various appropriations bills to defend the vital work of the National Ocean Policy. We have debated over 15 riders on this issue in the past two Congresses. Instead, we ought to be talking about the progress that our local communities are making on ocean planning. In New England, we are actually making progress. And this year, we have the New England regional ocean plan to be proud of.

No process is perfect, I will give you that, but at least we have begun the discussion. Fisherman, lobstermen, and other community leaders have been included in the development of these voluntary regional ocean plans.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this misguided attempt to stop the National Ocean Policy and the important work it does.

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chairman, we have heard the phrase "land grab." This is an ocean grab. There is no cooperation here. This is dictation by the Federal Government to people that live along the coast of the United States of America.

It is time to take our oceans and the water of the United States back, not for the bureaucrats in Washington, but for the people of the United States. That is who actually owns this water, not some faceless bureaucrat in Washington who wants to tell us what to do.

So I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment and take back control of our oceans for the people of the United States and not allow it to be directed by bureaucrats in Washington who couldn't care less what we feel like on the coast.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), my good friend and colleague.

□ 2350

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment, and in support of the National Ocean Policy established by President Obama, an issue also championed by our junior Senator from Rhode Island, Senator SHELDON WHITEHOUSE.

Far from being government overreach, National Ocean Policy is an excellent example of how government engages and partners with our States and local communities.

In the Northeast, we recently celebrated the release of the draft Northeast Ocean plan for management of Federal waters off the coast of New England.

Since 2012, the Regional Planning Body has worked with our constituents to build a plan that will be responsive to our region's needs. This type of collaboration would not have been possible without the implementation of the National Ocean Policy, which requires agencies to work together in a more efficient and collaborative manner.

Due to this important program, we are now moving toward a more effective use of our common ocean resources.

Mr. Chairman, our oceans are enjoyed and utilized by beachgoers, commercial fishermen, boaters, recreational anglers, wind farms, and others. With proper collaboration, these mixed uses can thrive.

So I ask all of my colleagues to oppose this amendment. By supporting National Ocean Policy, we can continue to engage our citizens, effectively use our resources, and ensure that our ocean is sustainable for years to come.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, would you please give me a sense of how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Maine has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from Rhode Island for once again describing what is a very important policy.

I have to disagree with my colleague from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE). I do not think that this is Federal top-down. In fact, I think this is better decision-making, bottoms-up, not top-down. It gives opportunities for local communities to have an input.

I want to unequivocally state that we spend no money on ocean planning. The NOP does not create any Federal regulations or supersede any local or State regulations. But what it does do is it leverages taxpayer dollars to reduce duplication between Federal, State and local agencies, to streamline data collection, and to strengthen public involvement. That is exactly what we want to have happen in our coastal communities.

Our oceans and coasts support 3 million ocean-related jobs, generate \$360 billion through tourism, development, commercial fishing, recreational fishing, boating, energy, shipping, and other activities. This is a very effective planning tool to reconcile and coordinate those activities. It does not prevent them.

And just in closing, I will say that my colleague from Alabama may look at this one way, but I represent the State of Maine, which has a tremendous amount of coastline. I represent about half the coastline off the coast of Maine, and I have also represented many coastal communities prior to coming to Congress as a State legislator.

I live on an island. I take a ferry for 1 hour to get home, unlike virtually any other Member of Congress. Everybody in my community is dependent on the ocean. Every island I represent is dependent on the ocean.

Every coastal community has to have a working waterfront, fishermen. It has to have tourism, fishing, all of them working together. I don't think that in the State of Maine we don't understand ocean planning.

We know our oceans are desperately troubled. They are in danger. They need our attention, and Congress has to pay attention to that. We can't do this in a haphazard way. We have to have it coordinated.

So I ask my colleagues to oppose this rider, as we have many, many times, and to support National Ocean Policy.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. CRAMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop, propose, finalize, implement or enforce the rule entitled "Management of Non-Federal Oil and Gas Rights" and published by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service on December 11, 2015 (80 Fed Reg. 77200), or any rule of the same substance.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Dakota.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, in February of 2014, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service issued an advance notice of proposed rulemaking called—and it is important to know what it is called—Management of Non-Federal Oil and Gas Rights. In December of last year, the proposed rule was posted and comments were due in February of this year.

Mr. Chairman, States—States, not the Federal Government, States—largely regulate oil and gas operations except in circumstances where the Federal Government has ownership of the mineral rights. That obviously is not the case in this rule, given its title.

Where there is Federal ownership, it is the Bureau of Land Management that has regulatory authority. And for an agency that has hundreds of personnel and decades of experience, even they have a hard time keeping up with the workload and maintaining adequate expertise in their agency.

But, Mr. Chairman, not only do States have the authority and the expertise to regulate oil and gas industry, they have the most natural and obvious incentive to do it well. The State regulators live in the States where the minerals reside.

Now, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service does not have the personnel or the expertise to regulate oil and gas operations, as demonstrated by GAO recommendations. Concerns outlined by the Fish and Wildlife Service are concerns that are addressed by several other regulatory bodies, including State regulators and, therefore, any at-

tempt by Fish and Wildlife Service to also regulate would be redundant and duplicative. Enough already with redundant and duplicative regulations.

The added regulation will only serve to increase the delays and the costs to U.S. energy producers and, consequently, ultimately to the consumers.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply prevents funding to move this job-killing rule any further, and I encourage my colleagues to support jobs by voting "yes" on my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, this new rule updates 50-year-old regulations that govern the exercise of non-Federal oil and gas rights within refuge units. The objectives of this new rule are to improve the effectiveness of the regulations so that they can protect refuge resources and values, and provide clarity for both operators and for the service.

Updating this regulation avoids regulatory uncertainty, providing more clarity and guidance to oil and gas operators and refuge staff, instituting a simple process for compliance, and incorporating technological improvements in exploration and drilling technology, ensures that non-Federal oil and gas operations are conducted in a manner that avoids or minimizes impacts to refuge resources.

This amendment prohibits the service from making positive advances and allowing non-Federal oil and gas operations to occur on refuge lands, while protecting these natural habitats for the benefit of future generations. I strongly oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAMER. Mr. Chairman, I would just respond to my colleague's concern by stating that the concerns that he raises, that the Fish and Wildlife Service raises, are legitimate concerns. But they are concerns that are already being addressed by other regulatory bodies, including the States who have both the legal authority and the expertise as well as, as I said earlier, the natural incentive to do it well. It is where they live.

I think it is also important to understand that it is sort of private property law 101, that the minerals are often bifurcated from the surface, and that is the case we are talking about. And in that case, at least in North Dakota, the minerals supersede, actually, the surface rights. So this rule conflicts with not only common sense, but even with basic private property law.

I, again, urge a "yes" vote, and assure my colleagues that the concerns raised are being addressed by other regulatory bodies. Duplication is not necessary.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I would just point out that what this rule is

about is non-Federal operators operating on refuge lands, and I think part of our job should be to make sure that the Fish and Wildlife Service can do their job.

I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Dakota (Mr. CRAMER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. CRAWFORD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 52 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, before the short title, insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to enforce the requirements of part 112 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations, with respect to any farm (as that term is defined in section 112.2 of such title).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

□ 0000

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment in defense of agricultural producers across the country who continue to face the heavy hand of EPA regulations.

The EPA's Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule for on-farm fuel storage requires farmers and ranchers to make costly infrastructure improvements to their oil storage facilities to reduce the possibility of an oil spill.

These regulations fail to take into account, however, the relative risk of oil spills on farms, and they do not recognize the simple fact that family farmers are already careful stewards of the land and water. It is clear that no one has more at stake in the health of their land than those who work on the ground from which they derive their livelihoods. Even if EPA wants to resist common sense, USDA actually studied risk of oil spills on farms. It determined that more than 99 percent of farmers have never experienced a spill.

In the 2014 Water Resources Development Act, we made modifications to the exemption threshold and required EPA to go back to the drawing board and conduct a study to determine how to balance the needs of financial resources of small producers with their assessed spill risk. Instead, the EPA defied Congress' wishes and hastily put together a study without evaluating risk specific to agriculture. It offered the same unsubstantiated conclusions

that it found in the original SPCC rule and could not cite a single incident of a spill on a farm.

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits the EPA from enforcing its Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure rule against farms, giving special interest to one industry. The EPA's spill rule is not based upon the type of facility or type of operations, but upon the storage of oil or petroleum products.

If you store greater than 1,320 gallons and if a discharge from aboveground storage would reach waterways, you fall under these regulations and must develop and implement a spill prevention plan. Now, some large farm operations store up to 60,000 gallons of fuel in one location, and it is reckless to not require them to have some sort of spill response plan.

EPA has already made efforts to accommodate farms and made compliance with the rule easier. The Agency amended its rule to provide a self-certification option for the facilities, including farms that store under 10,000 gallons of oil, thereby avoiding the expense of a professional engineer. EPA also provided a template for a spill control plan for farmers to use.

Compliance with this rule is not difficult or costly. In fact, about 95 percent of farms subject to the rule are eligible to self-certify their spill prevention plans.

This amendment could have devastating consequences and harmful impacts on our Nation's waterways. Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to join me in opposing this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, to require that all of our producers make a significant investment to prevent such an unlikely event seems out of touch with reality and disregards the already overwhelming number of safeguards our farmers already employ.

My amendment would restrict the EPA's ability to enforce SPCC regulations on farms so that farmers and ranchers can go about their business of producing America's food and fiber without having to worry about unnecessary compliance costs and red tape.

Let me say that on three separate occasions, the House unanimously passed my bipartisan legislation, the FUELS Act, which rolled back these same SPCC regulations on farms. We passed this same amendment during last year's consideration of the Interior and environmental appropriations bill.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to again support our farmers and ranchers and vote "yes" on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I once again reiterate my opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. CRAWFORD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 1913 of title 18, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, first let me start by thanking the gentleman from Washington for joining me as a cosponsor of this amendment.

Our amendment is simple. It prohibits the EPA and other agencies from using funds in violation of a long-standing law, formally known as the Anti-Lobbying Act. Earlier this year, the Government Accountability Office ruled that the EPA violated the law by engaging in grassroots solicitation intended to urge the public to support the waters of the United States rule, a vast expansion of Federal jurisdiction. The GAO found that EPA went to unprecedented lengths using social media and other online tools to manufacture public support for the rule and to sway the opinions of Members of Congress. GAO cited two specific violations by the EPA that occurred during the critical time when the Agency was preparing the final WOTUS rule.

The first violation was an effort through an Internet tool called Thunderclap which enabled the EPA to reach 1.8 million people who simultaneously shared a message supporting the WOTUS rule. Not only did EPA write the message itself, but it disseminated the message covertly, failing to identify itself as the author.

Secondly, the GAO found that EPA violated the law by hyperlinking its own Web site to an outside advocacy group's grassroots campaign effort. The site asked members of the public to take action by contacting their Members of Congress using a form letter written in support of the WOTUS rule.

These unprecedented actions were crafted by the EPA in a deliberate effort to undermine Congress and advance its extremist environmental agenda. Even though the independent, nonpartisan GAO ruled EPA's actions

clearly violated the law, nobody at EPA was ever held accountable, and no appropriate remedial action has been taken to prevent this from happening again.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, maybe the gentleman is aware, or maybe perhaps you are not aware, that there is an existing prohibition on lobbying that applies to all Federal employees that has been in place since 1919. I can cite it for you. So, in my opinion, this is unnecessary and redundant.

I would also remind my colleagues that Federal employees are not prohibited from providing information to Congress on legislation, policies, or programs. But there must be an open dialogue between legislative and executive branches to ensure laws are being implemented appropriately and that programs achieve their intended goals. We cannot, or we should not, operate in an information vacuum.

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

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Chairman, as I indicated before, the GAO cited two specific violations by the EPA that did, in fact, violate the Anti-Lobbying Act that was mentioned by my colleague from Minnesota. That occurred during a critical time, as I indicated before.

The Anti-Lobbying Act allows agencies to promote their own policies, but it prohibits them from engaging in covert propaganda efforts intended to influence the American public. Our amendment simply reinforces this important law. It will prevent agencies like the EPA from undermining Congress through the use of publicity and propaganda tools that interfere with the lawmaking process. The amendment serves as another important reminder to executive agencies of its proper constitutional role.

Congress, not unaccountable Agency bureaucrats, is responsible for writing the laws that our citizens must live by.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, there is an existing prohibition on lobbying. We have agreed with that. It applies to all Federal employees, and it has been in place since 1919. If a Federal employee breaks that, then a Federal employee needs to be held accountable.

So, in closing, Mr. Chairman, I believe we do not need an extraneous, redundant provision to a bill that is already overburdened with harmful legislative riders. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. CRAWFORD).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. RODNEY DAVIS OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 54 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ (a) None of the funds made available by this Act under the heading "Environmental Programs and Management" may be used for the Office of Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations of the Environmental Protection Agency.

(b) The amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Environmental Programs and Management" is hereby reduced by \$4,235,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, it is truly unfortunate that I actually have to offer this amendment. You would think an Office of Congressional Affairs that was set up to specifically deal with Members of Congress, our staff, and the different committees that all of us populate would be able to respond to simple questions.

I had a very eloquent speech put together, but it is getting very late out here in Washington, D.C., so I am going to condense it.

The bottom line is, Mr. Chairman, over 2 years ago, I offered language in the farm bill to create a specific committee on the Science Advisory Board to deal with agriculture to make sure that somebody in a concrete building out here in Washington, D.C., was able to actually be at the table when the EPA came up with a rule to regulate milk spills like oil spills.

□ 0010

I wish somebody would have raised their hands and said, Which one can you clean up with cats?

Mr. Chairman, since the public comment deadline ended on September 8, 2015, the EPA has failed to appoint one single person. Also, over 30 questions were submitted by Republicans and Democrats from the House Agriculture Committee in February after Gina McCarthy, the Administrator of the EPA, came to testify at a hearing, and we have yet to get a single response.

Time and time again, Mr. Chairman, I have asked the same questions over and over to many people at the EPA in numerous committees that I serve on, and time and time again, we get nothing. We get crickets.

It is an unfortunate situation that we have to go to this extreme, but it is the only way that we can send a message to an office in an agency that is completely unresponsive to this institution and our constitutional responsibilities of oversight. It is wrong. Their lack of responsiveness is not only disrespectful, it is unconstitutional.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I want the gentleman to know that I, at times, have shared his frustration with getting answers back from the administration. His amendment, I think, is going to get everybody's attention. Unfortunately, his amendment seeks to restrict the information provided from the EPA by just eliminating the funding for the Office of Congressional/Legislative Affairs.

I use that office quite a bit. Sometimes I agree with them, sometimes I don't, but we have a dialogue going forward. In order to make educated and informed decisions on environmental legislation, I believe Congress should have all of the material available, including from the administration.

What I am hearing from the gentleman is that they are not responding to him in an adequate fashion. I hear his passion in this and, at times, I have shared his frustration.

I would suggest that we work together to figure out ways to improve communication dialogue and hold them accountable when they don't get it—put a bright spotlight on it—but I oppose eliminating it.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague. I appreciate her frustration. I hope she would advocate on behalf of not just me, but the entire House Agriculture Committee, that gets zero response. It is not just the House Ag Committee, it is our House T&I Committee. It is individual congressional offices that don't have that interaction. There is such a lack of action that I didn't take this amendment lightly. We came here to the floor tonight this late because there is a lack of respect and constitutional responsibility coming from this agency of the executive branch.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter to the EPA dated June 14, 2016.

JUNE 14, 2016.

Hon. GINA MCCARTHY,  
Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR ADMINISTRATOR MCCARTHY, We are frustrated and concerned that in over two years, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has failed to create the Agriculture-Related Committee within its Science Advisory Board (SAB). On February 7, 2014, the Agricultural Act of 2014 was signed into law

(Pub.L. 113-79). Section 12307 of the Act directed the EPA to “establish a standing agriculture-related committee” to provide farmers a stronger voice in the federal rule making process regarding regulations which impact agriculture.

On December 10, 2014, nearly one year after this provision was signed into law, the EPA released a Federal Register Notice announcing its establishment of the SAB Agricultural Science Committee and set a deadline of January 26, 2015, to nominate members. On January 26, 2015, the EPA extended the nomination deadline to March 30, 2015. Eventually, on August 19, 2015, after creating a list of 88 potential candidates, the EPA invited public comment on the candidates.

Since the public comment deadline on September 8, 2015, the EPA has failed, despite numerous requests, to keep Members, who supported this important provision, informed of meaningful actions or updates regarding the process. Our questions regarding the implementation of the committee have been met with empty responses, which point to a further delayed implementation process.

To our knowledge, all other components of the Act have been successfully implemented. Unfortunately, the EPA’s inability to timely execute the creation of the Agriculture Science Committee, pursuant to Section 12307, has only fueled the growing disconnect between the agriculture community in rural America and the EPA.

To bridge this gap, it is vital the EPA establish the Agriculture Science Committee. Please respond to this request providing when you anticipate publishing the final candidate list. Thank you for your consideration of this request and we look forward to your prompt reply.

Sincerely,

Rodney Davis; Suzan DelBene; Mike Conaway; Collin C. Peterson; David Rouzer; Kurt Schrader; Tim Walz; Randy Neugebauer; Mike Bost; Doug LaMalfa; Austin Scott; Vicky Hartzler; Frank Lucas; Dan Newhouse; Trent Kelly; Bob Goodlatte; Scott DesJarlais, M.D.; Brad Ashford; David Scott; Cheri Bustos; Bob Gibbs; Ted S. Yoho, DVM; Steve King; Jackie Walorski; Glenn “GT” Thompson; Filemon Vela; Ann Kirkpatrick; Mike D. Rogers; Ralph Abraham, MD; Ann McLane Kuster; Richard M. Nolan; Michelle Lujan Grisham; John Moolenaar; Gwen Graham.

Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have got 11 people on this letter wondering why they haven’t appointed a single person to the Science Advisory Board Committee that is supposed to deal with agricultural issues that was written in the farm bill that passed in 2014.

I hate to do this amendment, but it is the only way we can send a message to the EPA and to the specific office that Congress means business in actually implementing our oversight responsibilities that the Constitution gives us that our Forefathers gave us.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “yes” vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RODNEY DAVIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment Nos. 55 and 56 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 57 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to take any of the actions described as a “backstop” in the December 29, 2009, letter from EPA’s Regional Administrator to the States in the Watershed and the District of Columbia in response to the development or implementation of a State’s watershed implementation and referred to in enclosure B of such letter.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, this evening, I rise to urge support for my amendment which would reaffirm and preserve the rights of the States to write their own water quality plans.

My amendment simply prohibits the EPA from using its Chesapeake Bay total maximum daily load and the so-called watershed implementation plans to hijack States’ water quality strategies.

Over the last several years, the EPA has implemented a total maximum daily load, or TMDL, blueprint for the six States in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, which strictly limits the amount of nutrients that can enter the Chesapeake Bay. Through its implementation, the EPA has basically given every State in the watershed an ultimatum—either the State does exactly what the EPA says, or it faces the threat of an EPA takeover of its water quality programs.

Congress intended that the implementation of the Clean Water Act be a collaborative approach through which the States and the Federal Government work together. This process was not meant to be subject to the whims of politicians and bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. Therefore, my amendment instructs the EPA to respect the important role States play in implementing the Clean Water Act.

I want to make it perfectly clear that my amendment would not stop the EPA from working with the States to restore the Chesapeake Bay, nor would it undermine the cleanup efforts already underway. My language only removes the ability of the EPA to take over a State’s plan or to take retaliatory actions against a State if it does not meet EPA-mandated goals. Again, it ensures States’ rights remain intact and not usurped by the EPA.

It is important to point out the correlation between the EPA’s outrageous waters of the United States rule and

the bay TMDL. At the heart of both issues is the EPA’s desire to control conservation and water quality improvement efforts throughout the country and to punish all those who dare to oppose them.

Mr. Chairman, the bay is a national treasure, and I want to see it restored. But we know that in order to achieve this goal, the States and the EPA must work together. The EPA cannot be allowed to railroad the States and micro-manage the process. With this amendment, we are simply telling the EPA to respect the important role States play in implementing the Clean Water Act and preventing another Federal power grab by the administration.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would allow those that pollute the Chesapeake Bay to ignore the Environmental Protection Agency’s water quality standards.

We finally have an administration that has made the Chesapeake Bay a priority by establishing mandatory water quality standards and providing financial assistance to help States, localities, and businesses actually meet the new standards.

This amendment also would put the funding in this bill for the Chesapeake at risk. The Federal funding is tied to the requirements for results. So how long do you think the States and localities will meet their obligations that they agreed to this past December in an historic agreement if the Federal financial assistance goes away?

If this amendment were to become law, it would block EPA’s ability to enforce the court ordered settlement requiring the farm community and agribusiness to meet watershed specific pollution limits. It would not, however, relieve the farms and agri-businesses from the requirements in this settlement.

In the end, operators should be responsible for controlling the pollution that they dump into our rivers and streams across this country, both for the Chesapeake and elsewhere. The courts have already sided with the EPA on this matter.

Again, I urge defeat of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON), chairman of the Agriculture Subcommittee.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank the gentleman for his leadership with this amendment.



This amendment is meant to address the overreach, a punitive approach that the EPA is taking, intervening itself within a process that the States are taking the leadership of cleaning up a treasure—the Chesapeake Bay. We are not talking about taking away funding. As chairman of the Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee, there are significant conservation dollars that go into cleaning watersheds. Watersheds are part of the jurisdiction of the subcommittee that I chair in this House on the Agriculture Committee.

This amendment is identical to one approved by the House last year in consideration of the Interior appropriations bill, Mr. Speaker. I have been hearing since 2009 from my constituents, many of which own farms, about the significant challenges and the costs of the Chesapeake Bay total maximum daily load, or TMDL, mandate.

□ 0020

These significant concerns also extend to the State and local governments because of the billions of dollars in direct costs and new regulatory burdens the TMDL imposes. The Agriculture Committee's Conservation and Forestry Subcommittee, which I have the honor of chairing, has also listened to the concerns of stakeholders over the past few Congresses. While each and every one of these witnesses wholeheartedly supports the restoration of the Chesapeake Bay, there remains great concern over the lack of consistent models, the heavy-handed approach of the TMDL, and the lack of needed flexibility while implementing the watershed implementation plans, or WIPS. This amendment is needed in order to allow for that flexibility at the State and local levels.

Pennsylvania has been very innovative in our efforts to do our part with the bay restoration, and that restoration will continue into the future. However, rather than acting punitive, the EPA must work collaboratively with the States.

I strongly support this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I am going to repeat what I said earlier. My amendment does not remove the TMDL or the watershed implementation plans. It only removes the retaliatory actions threatened by the EPA.

Those who oppose this amendment are right in that the States have made great improvements. The States have made great strides in cleaning up the bay; so why continue to threaten them with an EPA takeover of their water quality plans?

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chair, in closing, I will say a few things. One, our country has some extraordinary gems, and the Chesapeake Bay is one of them.

This language, as was rightfully pointed out, was part of a bill last year, but that language was removed in conference. Part of the reason it was removed in conference is that this is part of a court-ordered settlement in which water quality standards were established, and financial assistance was tied to results. If this amendment were to pass, I think it would put in jeopardy that funding, and it would put in jeopardy one of our Nation's true gems.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 58 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the draft technical report entitled "Protecting Aquatic Life from Effects of Hydrologic Alteration" published by the Environmental Protection Agency and the United States Geological Survey on March 1, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 10620).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer a simple amendment that will protect private water rights and prohibit the EPA's attempt to expand Clean Water Act regulation beyond what Congress has intended.

This amendment prohibits the use of funds to carry out the draft EPA-USGS technical report, entitled, "Protecting Aquatic Life from Effects of Hydrologic Alteration," which is agency guidance that aims to expand the scope of the Clean Water Act and Federal control over waters currently under the jurisdiction of States.

A March 1, 2016, Scientific Investigations Report from the Environmental Protection Agency argues that the Clean Water Act gives the EPA the authority to regulate not just the quality of waters of the U.S. but also the quantity, or amount, of water in the Nation's river and water systems.

The management of water rights and allocation quantities from all natural

streams, lakes, and other collections is an authority that is enshrined in State constitutions and compacts across the West—legal protections that are explicitly designed to exclude interference from the Federal Government. Under the expanded scope of the authority, the EPA suggests in their report that the Federal Government could require an individual private water owner or a local municipality to obtain a Federal permit any time it alters the amount of water available in streams or other water systems.

In their comments on the draft report, the Family Farm Alliance stated, "The report relies heavily on concepts rather than real science" and that the legal strategies advocated in the report "could embolden some regulators and special interest groups to seek flow requirements on water projects, even if doing so has no support in Federal or State law."

Unfortunately, this is par for the course for the Obama administration to push an economically disastrous agenda at the expense of science, the rule of law, and basic common sense.

In their statement endorsing my amendment, Americans for Tax Reform explained, "American citizens cannot afford more economic hurdles and the commandeering of State powers over precious water supplies from an overzealous, unaccountable Federal Government. States, local governments, and private water rights holders should not be subjected to such costly and burdensome Federal overreach."

In addition, the Family Farm Alliance, the Americans for Tax Reform, and dozens of national, regional, and local organizations have endorsed my amendment to rein in this Federal overreach and have expressed serious concerns regarding the EPA's dubious report.

In their comments on the draft report, the U.S. Chamber of Commerce stated, "The Chamber is concerned that the agencies will use these arguments to further expand Federal jurisdiction over land and water features without proper constitutional authority."

The National Association of Conservation Districts echoed that very same sentiment, stating, "NACD believes that the report attempts to expand the Clean Water Act beyond Congress' original intent."

The American Petroleum Institute stated, "The draft report constitutes rulemaking in the guise of guidance. The draft report is vague and ambiguous, and owing to these concerns, EPA and USGS should withdraw the draft report and not finalize it."

In my home State, the Arizona Farm Bureau Federation stated, "Not only is this Federal overreach, but it becomes a bureaucratic and logistical nightmare for individuals and businesses."

I think the Mohave Livestock Association summed up the issue best when they stated, "The last thing our producers need is another layer of costly

and time-consuming permitting. The States understand water use in their respective ecological territories better than any centralized bureaucracy from Washington, D.C.”

I am honored that this amendment is supported by the American Farm Bureau Federation, Americans for Limited Government, the American Public Power Association, Americans for Tax Reform, the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, the Family Farm Alliance, the National Association of Conservation Districts, the National Water Resources Association, and countless other organizations and individuals throughout the country.

My amendment prohibits the EPA from implementing, administering, or enforcing their misguided attempt to usurp States’ rights and control the quantity of water used by individual owners and local municipalities. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their good work on this bill.

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

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chair, this amendment would prohibit funding to implement, administer, or enforce the draft technical report, entitled, “Protecting Aquatic Life from Effects of Hydrologic Alteration,” published by the EPA and by the USGS on March 1, 2016.

This draft technical report is not a policy. It is not guidance. It is not a criteria document. It shows no advocacy. It doesn’t require States to do anything. This technical document provides information to help States and tribes and territories and water resource managers and other stakeholders actually understand how water flows impact water quality, and it gives examples of what some States have chosen to do to address flow concerns.

The EPA and the USGS collaborated to develop this report in response to State and EPA regional requests. The draft report had a 105-day comment period, which closed on June 17, 2016, and it received more than 100 submissions from Federal and State partners, watershed groups, mining and farming associations, and other highly engaged stakeholders. Now that the comment period has ended, the EPA and the USGS will consider the comments and revise the document and then publish a final document, which will serve as a source of technical information for States, tribes, territories, and other stakeholders.

Why would we prohibit producing a resource document? The EPA is targeting the release date for the final publication as September 30, 2016, which is the end of fiscal year 2016, meaning the final report will supersede

the prohibition on the draft technical report in the fiscal year 2017 bill.

This draft technical document received extensive internal and external technical peer review by scientists with expertise in environmental flow. If the report is not finalized, States will not be able to benefit from critical scientific information or from the effective solutions shared by other States.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, as I have said, it is well-established legal doctrine that the Constitution and the Clean Water Act strictly limit the Federal Government’s authority to usurp State water rights and compacts.

I urge my colleagues to join me in protecting State authority, private property rights, and in reining in yet another EPA Federal overreach. I urge a “yes” vote on Gosar amendment No. 58.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chair, again, I will just say in closing that this is a draft technical report that doesn’t set policy, that doesn’t set guidance, that doesn’t have advocacy, that doesn’t require States to do anything. This is a resource document, and I don’t know why we would prohibit producing a resource document.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment Nos. 59 and 60 will not be offered.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 61 printed in House Report 114–683.

□ 0030

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. JENKINS OF WEST VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 62 printed in House Report 114–683.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise to offer my amendment, No. 62, as printed in the rule.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to develop, finalize, promulgate, implement, administer, or enforce any rule under section 112 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7412) that applies to glass manufacturers that do not use continuous furnaces.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, my amendment to the bill today is very straightforward. What it would do is preserve our Nation’s specialty glass manufacturers from EPA overregulation.

Specialty glass manufacturers, these are the small businesses. These are facilities typically employing less than 50 employees. Yet, they produce the stained glass windows that adorn our churches, decorative vases, commemorative and artisan products.

West Virginia has a proud tradition of specialty glass manufacturing. In fact, one of the oldest companies is Blenko Glass in Milton, West Virginia, which is in my district. Its limited edition pieces are prized by collectors and have been handed down through generations.

Let me give my colleagues a sense of where some of the Blenko Glass is today: Colonial Williamsburg, Westminster Abbey—the replacement glass for antique windows at the White House is from Blenko Glass. Jackie Kennedy actually used Blenko Glass at the White House—the Cadet Chapel at the Air Force Academy in Colorado, St. Patrick’s Cathedral in New York City. And that beautiful award from the Country Music Association that is given out to the recipient, it is a piece of Blenko Glass.

This is proud American tradition, and that tradition is now in jeopardy. Blenko, like all other specialty glass manufacturers in the Nation, is facing changes to the standards that would make it harder to make glass. The EPA is considering revising the current regulation to make it harder for these small businesses to simply make glass.

My amendment would simply protect specialty glass manufacturers that use noncontinuous furnaces for their glass-making. The rules for continuous furnaces for the bigger glass-producing facilities, which produce items like glass bottles, cookware, and windows, would still apply under current regulation.

I urge my colleagues’ support for this amendment to protect our Nation’s small, specialty, and often family-owned, glass manufacturers.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Speaker, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Washington is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would impede the EPA’s ability to regulate toxic air pollutants from glass manufacturers. EPA currently requires glass manufacturers to limit their air toxic emissions, which contain carcinogenic heavy metals like arsenic and lead.

My good friend, Mr. JENKINS’, amendment seeks to block these requirements from refined glass manufacturers that do not use continuous furnaces or that produce less than 50 tons of glass per year.

I point out at the present time there are no Federal air toxic emission regulations that cover those types of glass

facilities. So this amendment tries to fix a problem that doesn't really exist, and in the process, it would hamstring the EPA's ability to protect public health.

Just this year, we saw that glass manufacturers who do not use a continuous furnace may also pose a significant health risk to neighboring communities in Oregon, just to the south of me. Air monitoring data showed that glass manufacturers using a batch process were emitting high levels of arsenic and chromium. The EPA has been investigating the situation to ensure that other communities are not exposed to these harmful contaminants.

While these manufacturers are only a small portion of the market, reports have shown that these facilities can be alarmingly close to homes and even to schools, having serious implications for the health of nearby families and kids. We should be shielding these communities from these toxic air emissions instead of limiting the EPA's ability to take necessary action to protect public health, as this amendment would do.

This amendment preempts regulation and carves out an exemption for one particular industry. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, again, let me make reference to what the existing EPA regulations do. There are current regulations, but the exemptions from the current regulation, as it stands right now, are for those glass manufacturers that are noncontinuous furnaces and produce under a certain amount of tonnage of glass each year.

The EPA is looking at changing those regulations. We are not trying to carve-out a new exemption. We are just trying to sustain and contain in the current law the exemptions for the noncontinuous furnaces and those under a certain amount of tonnage. So we are not making any changes. We are simply trying to maintain the current exemption because we see the EPA out looking to make changes to eliminate the current exemptions that exist in the law.

Once again, another step of the EPA overreach that will be jeopardizing the small glass manufacturers that mean so much to not only our employment base, but also our heritage.

I encourage support for my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I would just say, again, in closing, I have seen much of this glasswork. It is really impressive. But, as impressed and grateful as I am for that artistry, I also care a lot about kids and making sure that they are not exposed to toxic air pollutants. With that, I oppose this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MS. GRAHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 63 printed in House Report 114-683.

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from Florida (Mr. JOLLY), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to research, investigate, or study offshore drilling in any portion of the Eastern Gulf of Mexico Planning Area of the Outer Continental Shelf that under section 104 of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note) may not be offered for leasing, preleasing, or any related activity.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GRAHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Chair, I would like to recognize my colleagues, Mr. JOLLY and Mr. CLAWSON, who are my good friends and cosponsors of this amendment.

Second, I would also like to remind my colleagues that this amendment passed by voice during last year's debate, and I am hopeful we can do the same again this year.

As many of my colleagues know from across the country, who have visited Florida at some point and have enjoyed our beautiful beaches, sunshine, water, white sand—and I don't mean to brag, but we really do live in a paradise. That is why for years we have fought oil drilling off of our beaches, and, thankfully, the Federal Government has listened to the people of Florida and banned drilling in the eastern Gulf of Mexico.

This amendment would strengthen that ban and our commitment to protect Florida's beaches by prohibiting exploration and testing for oil in the eastern Gulf. Our military opposes it, conservationists oppose it, and Florida's tourism industry opposes it.

I am proud to work with Mr. JOLLY and Mr. CLAWSON on this important amendment for Florida, and I hope my colleagues will join us in supporting this amendment to protect Florida's Gulf beaches.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. I understand this amendment dovetails with the current congressional moratorium that exists through 2022. Therefore, the amendment isn't necessary for this year. I urge a "no" vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Chair, as I previously said, the purpose of this is to strengthen the ban. And, again, I was on the beaches following the BP oil spill and saw the tar washing up on the shores. I am proud to represent many military installations in the State of Florida and in north Florida, and they don't wish to have this either for training purposes for our military.

□ 0040

I would like to just reiterate this is something that, in a bipartisan nature, has been approved of. It was just approved last year, and I would just like to respectfully request that it be approved again this year by voice vote.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to the amendment. I urge a "no" vote. We already have a moratorium in effect.

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

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I will just close by reminding my colleagues that this has been a longstanding, bipartisan consensus that, for military as well as economic reasons, should be strengthened, and we should not be drilling in the eastern Gulf. I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GRAHAM).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. KING OF IOWA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 64 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act, including the amendments made by this Act, may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the prevailing rate of wage requirements in subchapter IV of chapter 31 of title 40, United States Code (commonly referred to as the Davis-Bacon Act).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is an amendment that I have brought in past years. What it

does, it says none of the funds made available by this act, including the amendments made by this act, may be used to implement, administer, or enforce a prevailing rate of wage requirements in subchapter 4, which is basically referred to normally as the Davis-Bacon Act.

The Davis-Bacon Act is a bill that was passed back in the early 1930s. The purpose of it was to lock the labor out from Alabama that was going, during the Depression years, up into New York to build Federal buildings and competing with the labor unions up there that happened to be locking Black workers out of the workforce in New York. It was brought to us by a Senator and by a House Member from New York—both Republicans, by the way. It is the remaining Jim Crow law that I know of on the books, and it imposes what is called a prevailing wage on all contractors doing Federal contracts that are \$2,000 or more.

King Construction has been in business since 1975. That is 41 years. We have dealt with this Davis-Bacon wage scale for a long time. Not only is it expensive, and it costs the taxpayers extra money on every single project on which it is imposed, but it also brings about inefficiencies that are brought about because of the reporting requirements, the confusion that is there.

We happen to have seen on our jobs people that jump from machine to machine to try to get to the highest paying machine, not the most efficient one. That is just one picture of what Davis-Bacon does. There are many others. Our numbers from our company are someplace between 8 and 35 percent, depending on your project, that the cost of these projects are increased unnecessarily. It does not reflect prevailing wage. It reflects an imposed union scale.

This is something that this Congress has to come to grips with if we are going to ever get to balance and be responsible with the taxpayer dollars. I urge its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, over the past few years, we have taken several votes on whether or not we should waive prevailing wage requirements that are contained in Davis-Bacon. In each and every instance, the Congress has rejected these efforts because there is strong bipartisan support for fair labor standards for construction contracts.

Davis-Bacon is a pretty simple contract, and it is a fair one. What the Davis-Bacon Act does is it protects the government as well as workers in carrying out a policy of paying a decent wage on government contracts. Davis-Bacon simply requires workers on federally funded construction projects be

paid no less than the wages paid in the community for similar work. I want to stress this again—Federal construction projects to be paid no less than wages paid in communities for similar work.

It requires every contractor for which the government is a party in excess of \$2,000 contain a provision defining minimum wages paid to various classes of laborers and mechanics. This law has helped workers in all trades all over the Nation, and there is no need to abandon those workers today. I urge my colleagues to oppose the King amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I would say in response to the gentlewoman from Minnesota that the actual application of the Davis-Bacon wage act is not what we would call a fair labor standard, not when you have some hacks that sit in a room once a year and decide whether and who gets how much of a raise. It is not free enterprise. It is not merit. It is based on backroom deals. It is based on imposing union scale and making the taxpayers pay for that.

If I don't hear that this year, it is the first year I haven't heard it, and that is the argument that the quality of the work isn't there. Well, the honor of our employees for 41 years, and many other merit shop employees, is on the line. We meet plans and specifications. They are Federal projects. They are inspected, and the standard of the work is indiscernible, except that we don't happen to have union squabbles on our jobs, and we pay the wage that is necessary to keep good help, and we have had some of the lowest unemployment rates that anybody has had. In fact, my rates were zero because we kept our people on year round. We take care of our employees. We provide a benefits package. So do the merit shop people I know.

So often I hear from the other side of the aisle that the Federal Government has no business interfering in a relationship between two or more consenting adults, and this is one of those cases. It is a contract of labor between the employer and the employee. The Federal Government needs not be involved in that. When they are, it invariably costs the taxpayers more money.

We can dredge five harbors instead of four. We can repair five locks and dams instead of four if we pass this amendment. Why would we, with the starvation of resources to our interior, why would we deny those resources the most efficient application?

I urge the adoption of my amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 3½ minutes remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment because I support Davis-Bacon. Studies have shown that Davis-Bacon actually doesn't increase the cost to taxpayers, but what happens is that, if this amendment were to pass, you would see a reduction in wages. You would see an increase with these protections from Davis-Bacon being pulled away, an increase in on-the-job injuries. You would have fewer workers with health benefits.

Davis-Bacon is about preventing wage exploitation. It is about preventing, undercutting local wages.

I will tell you this. This is about ensuring that when the Federal Government builds a project with taxpayer money that it is not just about building a road or a bridge or a facility. It is about building the middle class, and it is about building the next generation of workers. It is about providing training and providing a good wage for people to be able to live and earn a good living and live with dignity.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I have to say in contradiction to the gentleman who just spoke, on-the-job injuries, I don't know what would support that, whether or not there is a Davis-Bacon wage scale on that. That has to do with your safety policy on the job. It has to do with the culture of the company, and it has to do, to a degree, with the culture of the projects that you are on.

The fewer benefits side of this thing, I think it goes the other way, because Davis-Bacon requires that you add dollars into this Federal-mandated union scale to pay benefits; and when that happens, you are paying a benefit figure on a dollar figure to the employees rather than, say, a health insurance package that is going to take care of them far better and in the long term.

I point out also today that we had testimony from the Secretary of Transportation from the State of Oklahoma, Secretary Gary Ridley, who said that they run into the inefficiencies driven by Davis-Bacon where you have as many as three or more different pay scales on a single project that might stretch out over 6, 8, or 10 miles. They end up in different wage scales. So the contractors have to keep track of who crosses that line in what machine. The confusion of all that adds to the inefficiencies as well.

The most important thing is this: the taxpayers are paying an unnecessary premium for projects that we could be far ahead of where we are right now if we hadn't had all these years of this Davis-Bacon wage scale. I would reiterate: it is ironic that it is the Democrats who are always on the floor defending the last Jim Crow law on the books.

It is time to get rid of the last Jim Crow law on the books. Let free enterprise prevail. Let the taxpayers be the beneficiaries of this. I urge the adoption of my amendment.

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

□ 0050

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, while I would just like to point out that corporate interests and their advocates often claim that Davis-Bacon increases taxpayers costs, there isn't a study that proves that. In fact, a study of school construction costs in the Great Plains States shows that prevailing wage laws did not only not raise constructions costs, but also that repealing such wage laws hurt taxpayers and workers.

After Kansas' prevailing wage law was repealed, wages fell 11 percent, training programs declined by 28 percent, and job site injuries rose 19 percent. Highway construction costs are actually higher when workers are paid less, according to an analysis of the Federal Highway Administration data by the Construction Labor Research Council. The studies showed that the cost to build 1 mile in States average \$17.65 per hour, compared with low wages of \$9.97 per hour, on average. Money was actually saved, on average, by higher productivity. Better productivity, better wages.

In Wisconsin, a study of the State's prevailing wage laws shows that potential savings from wage cuts were never outweighed by the cost of income to communities. Annual costs of repealing the law has estimated between \$123 million in lost income and net tax revenues to a loss of \$6.8 million. In Missouri, a similar study showed a loss to the State of \$380 million to \$384 million. Cost overruns are more likely without prevailing wages.

As a member of the Democratic-Farmer-Labor Party, I urge my colleagues to oppose the King amendment and pay people in the community a prevailing wage under Davis-Bacon.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING).

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 65 printed in House Report 114-683.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 66 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the final rule entitled "Hydraulic Fracturing on Federal and Indian Lands" as published in the Federal Register on March 26, 2015 and March 30, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 16127 and 16577, respectively).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Chairman, the process of hydraulic fracturing, often used in combination with horizontal drilling, has unlocked vast new American energy resources, making the United States the largest energy producer in the world. This creates tens of thousands of good-paying jobs and lower energy prices for consumers.

Despite this technological advancement, the Obama administration, acting through the Bureau of Land Management, has sought to regulate it out of existence by trying to institute new, onerous regulations regarding well construction and water management for hydraulic fracturing operations that take place on Federal and Indian lands.

Thankfully, the U.S. District Court in Wyoming recently struck down BLM's hydraulic fracturing rule, finding that the BLM lacks authority from Congress to regulate the process of fracking, and was acting contrary to law. As expected, the Obama administration has filed an appeal to the Tenth Circuit Court.

Despite being illegal, these burdensome regulations simply do not recognize the extensive work done by the States to regulate hydraulic fracturing within their borders.

The Natural Resources Committee has heard from numerous witnesses from Utah, Wyoming, Colorado, and other States, who have testified to the tireless process these States went through to draft and implement their regulations—regulations that are very successful.

My home State of Colorado has been safely using hydraulic fracturing for over 40 years, and has the toughest Hydraulic Fracturing Disclosure Rule in the Nation. Even our Democratic Governor, John Hickenlooper, who has actually drunk hydraulic fracturing fluid to show that it is safe, believes it is the State's responsibility to regulate industry. And this amendment will do exactly that by ensuring that States like Colorado can continue to safely regulate energy production based on local geology and conditions without unnecessary and unlawful interference from the Federal Government.

One size does not fit all and the States frequently—I think always—know better than the Federal bureaucrats in Washington do what their geology is like, what their water is like, and so on.

So I ask that you support my amendment and allow the current energy renaissance to continue ensuring a stable supply of affordable and reliable energy. This will help drive down prices for gasoline, electricity, and home heating.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. This amendment would prohibit the Bureau of Land Management from implementing a uniform national standard for hydraulic fracking on public lands. This amendment would prohibit the BLM from implementing a uniform national standard for hydraulic fracking on public lands. Public lands only. Such a standard is necessary to ensure that operations on public and tribal lands are safe and environmentally responsible.

Of the 32 States with potential for oil and gas development on federally managed mineral resources, only slightly more than half have rules in place to address hydraulic fracturing. And those that do have rules vary greatly in their requirements.

So BLM continues to offer millions of acres of public land for conventional and renewable energy production, and it is critical that the public have confidence and transparency that effective State and environmental protections are in place.

So, as I said before, there are 32 States, and half of them don't even have anything in place that BLM could use. BLM is looking to have an implementation of a rule in State offices, and they are in the process of meeting with their State counterparts, undertaking State-by-State comparisons and regulatory requirements. I believe what the gentleman has told me about Colorado; it looks like that would be best practices and something BLM would want to look at and maybe model under.

So they are trying to establish memorandums of understanding. Unfortunately, what your amendment does is stop that from going forward. I think that, for right now, BLM needs to come up with a transparent standard so that when people are interacting with BLM State by State and when the taxpayers are looking at what BLM is doing, there is transparency, there is clarity, and there is uniformity.

Unfortunately, I have to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, the gentlewoman has raised an interesting point. On the surface, there is some merit to what she says. However, there is one big flaw. She wasn't aware because she wasn't in the hearing, but when BLM came and spoke to our committee, I said to them: States like Colorado are doing a good job already.

Why don't you just regulate the States that don't have their own regulation?

Well, they said: No. We want to regulate everybody.

They really didn't care whether States had good regulations in place or not. So I think they gave away the game. They just wanted to put more regulation on industry. What that means is that you have two sets of regulations to have to wade through, and that is going to shut out marginal plays, it is going to shut out jobs of people that would have been in those marginal plays.

So BLM really wasn't interested in listening to the States. They rejected that suggestion, and they just want to regulate everybody.

Let's let the States do what they do best. They know their territory, they know their water, they know their geology. They are doing a great job already. No one ever raised any examples of where the States had not done a good job.

So let's pass this amendment and BLM can manage the land and not do what the States are already doing. That is the way it should be.

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

□ 0100

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman for an interesting discussion, but here is the challenge I see: 32 States with the potential of oil and gas development on federally managed lands, only slightly more than half have rules in place. So then, if the Federal Government is considering possible development on its own land and it is in a State that doesn't have a rule, they need to have a rule. They need to have transparency. They need to have accountability to the taxpayer, to our constituents.

So they are trying to form rules and regulations, and I am hopeful that BLM—and I will make some inquiries—is in the process of meeting with their State counterparts and taking best practices to develop rules, to develop transparency, to develop accountability in the States where no rules exist.

At this current time, I really have to oppose the gentleman's amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 67 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or en-

force the threatened species or endangered species listing of any plant or wildlife that has not undergone a review as required by section 4(c)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)(2) et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is straightforward. It simply ensures that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is following current law, specifically, section 4(c)(2) of the Endangered Species Act, by conducting a review of all threatened and endangered plants and wildlife at least once every 5 years.

Time after time, the Federal Government refuses to follow the Endangered Species Act. The government designates land as critical habitat, despite not meeting the ESA, Endangered Species Act, definition; and the government consistently refuses to remove plants and animals from threatened or endangered status, even when these species are flourishing and are no longer in need of ESA protections.

But you may ask yourself: How does the government know when the species should be removed from the endangered or threatened list? How does the government know if a species is recovering?

The answer can be found in the ESA and its requirement that the Federal Government reviews all plants or species that are currently listed as endangered or threatened every 5 years.

Under the act, the purpose of a 5-year review is to ensure that threatened or endangered species have the appropriate level of protection. The reviews assess each threatened and endangered species to determine whether its status has changed since the time of its listing, or its last status review, and whether it should be removed from the list, delisted; reclassified from endangered to threatened, which is downlisted; reclassified from threatened to endangered, uplisted; or just maintain the species' current classification, the status quo.

And because the act grants extensive protection to a species, including harsh penalties for landowners and other citizens, it makes sense to regularly verify if a plant or animal is being properly classified or should be delisted. Despite this commonsense requirement, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has acknowledged that it has neglected its responsibility to conduct the required reviews for hundreds of listed species.

For example, in Florida alone, it was found that 77 species, out of a total of 124 protected species in the State, were overdue for a 5-year review. In other words, the government had not followed the law for a staggering 62 percent of species in that State.

In California, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service acknowledged that it had failed to follow the law for roughly two-thirds of the State species listed under the Endangered Species Act and was forced by the courts to conduct the required reviews of 194 species.

By enforcing the 5-year review, my amendment will ensure that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is using the best available scientific information in implementing its responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act, including incorporating new information through public comment and assessing ongoing conservation efforts.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in ensuring that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service follows the Endangered Species Act and that we do not provide money in this bill that would violate current law. I ask you to support my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the service attempts to comply with the statutory mandate to review the status of listed species every 5 years to determine whether or not the classifications of threatened or endangered are still appropriate, and you gave some eloquent answers.

However, the service has a backlog of such reviews due to the funding limitation, such as the 30 percent listing reduction contained in this bill—\$3 million less than they had last year. This has been cumulative time and time again.

So if you don't have the resources, if you don't have the staff, if you don't have the wherewithal to get out in the field and do the job, a backlog occurs. The reason why, that they are behind with the backlog on this, is because they don't have the resources to do their job.

And whose responsibility is that?

It is Congress' responsibility to make sure that they have the funding necessary to get up, go to work in the morning, and get rid of this backlog and do their job. We have a responsibility to put the tools in the toolbox for them to be able to do their job properly; and this Congress, and this piece of legislation, fails to give them the tools in the toolbox, and so the backlog will continue.

So I oppose the gentleman's amendment because it is not U.S. Fish and Wildlife's lack of wanting to do their job. It is their lack of ability, through the lack of funding, to do the job the way that they would like to do it.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, depending on how you look at the budget, we are talking about, like, let's say \$11 billion, and they just have to do a better job of prioritizing their work. It is not our fault that they are not doing

the required 5-year species review. I think we agree that that should be done.

So sometimes you just have to tell the bureaucracy that they need to get on the ball and do the right thing, and that's all this amendment does. And they just have to have a better set of priorities. If they are not following the current law, they just need to get up and do it.

So let's pass this amendment. Let's make them follow the law. It is better for all the species involved if we know whether they are being conserved and the efforts behind them are working or not. We need to know that.

So let's pass this amendment, make them follow the law.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Once again, I thank the gentleman for being here because I think we have had some discussions about the work that needs to be done on the policy committees and some of the challenges that we have in this bill with our limited resources.

As my grandmother would say, and maybe you had a grandparent who had a similar saying: You can't get water out of a rock.

We keep asking the Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park Service, all kinds of wonderful people who get up every morning wanting to do the best job possible and protecting our natural resources, to do more and more and more and more with less. At some point, they just can't do any more because they don't have the full-time equivalents. They don't have the scientists that they can hire. They don't have the resource managers who can get out and work in the local community. They are hamstrung.

So for only that reason, I oppose the gentleman's amendment. If they were fully funded and I could look them in the eye and say, "You have all the tools in the toolbox; get the job done," I would be with you, sir. But they do not have all the tools in the toolbox, and this Congress has underfunded them repeatedly, and that is why we have the backlog. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 0110

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 68 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the threatened species listing of the Preble's meadow jumping mouse under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is my third and last amendment on this bill, and I am hopeful that maybe this is one we can agree on.

Mr. Chairman, the Preble's meadow jumping mouse is a tiny rodent with a body approximately 3 inches long, a 4- to 6-inch long tail, and large hind feet adapted for jumping. This largely nocturnal mouse lives primarily in stream side ecosystems along the foothills of southeastern Wyoming south to Colorado Springs in my district along the eastern ridge of the Front Range of Colorado.

To evade predators, the mouse can jump like a miniature kangaroo up to 18 inches high using its long, whip-like tail as a rudder to switch directions in mid-air. But the little acrobat's most famous feat was its leap onto the Endangered Species list in May, 1998, a move that has hindered development from Colorado Springs, Colorado, to Laramie, Wyoming.

Among projects that have been affected: the Jeffco Parkway southeast of Rocky Flats, an expansion of Chatfield Reservoir, and housing developments in El Paso County along tributaries of Monument Creek. Builders, landowners, and local governments in affected areas have incurred hundreds of millions of dollars in added costs because of this mouse. And protecting the Preble's mouse has even been placed ahead of protecting human life.

On September 11, 2013, Colorado experienced a major flood event that damaged or destroyed thousands of homes, important infrastructure, and public works projects. As a result of the Preble's mouse's listing as an endangered species, many restoration projects were delayed as Colorado sought a waiver. In fact, FEMA was so concerned that they sent out a notice that stated: "Legally required review may cause some delay in projects undertaken in the Preble's mouse habitat." It goes on to warn that "local officials who proceed with projects without adhering to environmental laws risk fine and could lose Federal funding for their projects."

While a waiver was eventually granted, the scientific evidence simply does

not justify these delays or the millions of taxpayer dollars that go toward protecting a mouse that is actually part of a larger group that roams throughout half of the North American continent.

Scientific studies have concluded that the Preble's mouse does not warrant protection because it isn't a subspecies at all, and is actually related to the Bear Lodge jumping mouse. Even the scientist that originally classified this mouse as a subspecies has since recanted his work. Moreover, the Preble's mouse has a low conservation parity score—meaning the hundreds of millions of dollars already spent on protection efforts could have been better spent on other, more fragile species.

My amendment would correct the injustice that has been caused by the inaccurate listing of the Preble's meadow jumping mouse and refocus the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's efforts on species that have been thoroughly scientifically vetted and that should be managed by the Endangered Species Act.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit Fish and Wildlife from implementing or enforcing a threatened species listing of the Preble's meadow jumping mouse under the Endangered Species Act.

On April 11, 2016, the service announced the availability of a draft recovery plan for the Preble's meadow jumping mouse which the public could review and comment on until June 10, 2016.

Now the service is currently reviewing and considering all the comments that they received, so nothing is final yet. So this is premature. You are predicting an outcome that I don't know whether or not you would agree with. So under this amendment, the service would not be able to continue to recover this species because the Endangered Species Act would still apply. The service would not be able to work with agencies. It would not be able to work with developers. It would not be able to work with landowners in order to abide ESA compliance.

Additionally, the amendment will also limit the service from undertaking required status reviews of the subspecies from being able to implement any rulemaking down-listing or delisting the species if they thought it was appropriate after they were done with their review.

Sadly, the gentleman's amendment would undermine the service's ability to work collaboratively with States, local governments, communities, and landowners to conserve this imperiled species, and the amendment would create uncertainty for landowners and

also make them vulnerable to lawsuits. So I think we should be supporting Fish and Wildlife to finish doing the job that it started and not blocking it from doing the job it is currently getting ready to do when it comes to this species.

So because nothing is final yet, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point out that this species should have never been listed in the first place. It is highly disputed and contentious science that it was ever even listed at all.

So on the previous amendment I think we discussed how the Fish and Wildlife Service is already too busy in your State and they don't have enough money to do what they need to do right now. Let's free up a lot of their workload and take this one off the table because it shouldn't have been listed in the first place. Then they will have more time to do everything else that they claim to want to do.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for an "aye" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. LOUDERMILK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 69 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Medium- and Heavy-Duty Engines and Vehicles-Phase 2" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on July 13, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 40138 et seq.), with respect to trailers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, under the Clean Air Act, Congress directed the EPA to regulate "any air pollutant from any class or classes of

new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines, which may be reasonably anticipated to endanger public health or welfare."

Congress further defined "motor vehicle" as a "self-propelled vehicle designed for transporting persons or property on a street or highway."

Mr. Chairman, any reasonable person would understand that self-propelled vehicle means a vehicle that can propel itself of its own initiative. One would think of pickup trucks, semis, vans, or cars. One thing that does not come to mind is the back portion of a tractor trailer being the trailer portion which has no way of self-propelling itself.

Unfortunately, the EPA doesn't seem to see it that way. In last year's proposed rules for greenhouse gas emissions and fuel efficiency standards for on-road heavy-duty vehicles and engines, the EPA attempted to regulate truck trailers as self-propelled vehicles.

Furthermore, the EPA has a voluntary program called SmartWay that provides engineering guidelines for aerodynamics and reduced truck weight. SmartWay, which is voluntary, is intended to improve fuel efficiency for combined tractor trailers.

However, SmartWay only improves fuel efficiency when tractor trailers are traveling at highway speeds of more than 50 miles per hour. SmartWay provides no benefits whatsoever when the tractor trailers are traveling at less than 50 miles per hour around towns which are where most of the tractor trailers are used in the United States. But EPA wants to mandate all trailers to be governed by SmartWay, even those that travel less than 50 miles per hour.

In fact, if the government manipulates the weight of trailers, cargo gets displaced which results in more tractor trailers on the road, higher consumer prices, and more greenhouse gas emissions just to meet current freight demands.

Mr. Chairman, the trailers that EPA is proposing to regulate are highly customized to the individual specifications of each customer. Trailer manufacturers should not be forced to comply with a one-size-fits-all standard especially when given that so many trailers do not gain any fuel efficiency benefits from SmartWay.

My amendment would prevent the EPA from using any funds in the bill to regulate trailers under the greenhouse gas rule. Not only should these guidelines remain voluntary because they only benefit some trailers, EPA has no business regulating trailers under the Clean Air Act given that they are not self-propelled.

This proposed regulation by the EPA is another example of a Federal agency overstepping its bounds and attempting to enact a regulation that benefits some parts of the economy but harms others.

□ 0120

If this attempted overreach by the EPA is enforced, it will be costly and

counterproductive because the private sector is moving faster to improve fuel efficiency and reduce air pollution than the EPA can move.

Congress would be wise to stop this regulation and keep the SmartWay program voluntary and let trailer manufacturers do what they know is best for their individual customers.

I urge all Members to support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the fuel standards for the trailers that they are studying were jointly proposed by the EPA and the Department of Transportation.

Does the gentleman have a rider in anything from the Department of Transportation to prohibit their funding?

Mr. LOUDERMILK. We do not at this time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. That answers part of my question, because even if he was to be successful with his amendment in the way the amendments are going—I am kind of predicting that he might be on a voice vote—it would still be moving forward under the Department of Transportation.

The standards that they are looking at are to help achieve greenhouse gas emissions and reductions. In my opinion, that is a good thing to do. The amendment would prohibit the EPA from finalizing, implementing, or enforcing its greenhouse gas rules by carving out this exemption for trailers.

Now, the other reason why I am opposing the amendment, and I am being consistent with this, is the proposed regulation is still currently open for public comment. We don't know what the final comment is going to be. We don't know what is going to happen in the future, so I don't think we should be interfering with a rulemaking process on an appropriations bill.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, once again, as we have seen with the agencies, there is a lot of overreach. Quite often, if you give them an inch, they take a mile.

I think it is imperative that we be proactive in this issue to ensure that we protect an industry that has done a good job of regulating itself.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MRS. LUMMIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.



The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Health and Environmental Protection Standards for Uranium and Thorium Mill Tailings" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on January 26, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 4156 et seq.), or any rule of the same substance.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, I would like to observe that I am the third of three daughters, and my father used to always say nothing good ever happens after midnight, which is why he gave us a midnight curfew. I am hoping he was talking about mountain daylight time instead of eastern daylight time, especially with regard to my amendment.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is intended to prohibit funding to complete EPA's proposed rule for environmental protection standards for uranium and thorium mill tailings.

The rule is intended to protect groundwater from potential future contamination due to in situ uranium production. The intent is not bad, but EPA officials acknowledge there is no evidence in situ uranium recovery, a process that has been used for more than four decades, has ever caused an adverse impact to adjacent, nonexempt aquifers.

Also, the EPA lacks jurisdiction to impose these standards. The EPA has general standard setting authority; but Congress has designated the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and its agreement states, as the lead when it comes to implementation and enforcement, a concern raised by the NRC's general counsel.

Now, the uranium industry has offered to work with the EPA to review existing data and conduct additional sampling, if warranted. The industry made this offer in May 2015, and the EPA never responded, which is a problem, which has been acknowledged earlier this evening with regard to an amendment about inquiries by stakeholders and Congress regarding the EPA. They are so busy making rules that they forget to respond to stakeholders and Members of Congress.

American uranium production already faces intense competition from overseas production and Federal uranium sales, where our stockpile is being sold onto the market, depressing domestic prices and causing additional importation of uranium into the U.S. The U.S. imports upwards of 90 percent of the uranium we need for our power plants.

The proposed rule's 30-year postproduction monitoring requirements will present a significant burden on already struggling producers in Texas, Wyoming, and the West, and it could lead to more mining bankruptcies. Employment in the industry has already dropped by 21 percent. Why are we putting miners out of work and employing them in other countries where we import the same product?

The EPA recently said the agency planned to finalize this rule before the end of the Obama administration is on track. This amendment may be Congress' last chance to stop the rule and save the domestic uranium industry. For that reason, Mr. Chairman, I offer and support amendment No. 70 to H.R. 5538 and ask for its adoption.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, once again, my primary reason for getting up and opposing the amendment is it blocks the EPA from finalizing regulations. The amendment would ensure that there are no public health or environmental standards tailored specifically to address the technologies and challenges associated with this most widely used method of uranium recovery.

What the EPA is looking at doing is establishing requirements for leaching, which is a mining process in which boreholes are drilled into a deposit of uranium, and liquid solution is injected into the holes to absorb the uranium deposits to make sure that the aquifers are protected.

I believe that the EPA should be looking at standards that will establish requirements to ensure that groundwater is restored to pre-mine levels, that restoration is stable before a site is abandoned, and that these rules should be, moving forward, being finalized.

To the gentlewoman from Wyoming—and I don't say this on the floor very often, and I think she knows this—who I consider a dear friend and I will miss upon her not running for reelection, I am concerned when I hear my colleagues say that they are not hearing back from people in a timely fashion. So I am going to be looking into that. But right now, at this particular time, because we are in the process of finalizing regulations and we don't know what they are going to look like as of right now, I have to oppose this amendment.

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

Mrs. LUMMIS. Mr. Chairman, with great respect for the gentlewoman from Minnesota with whom I have had the privilege to serve for these past 8 years and whom I admire for her diligence and thoughtful representation of her constituents and our country, I

would assert that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and its agreement states, are the lead when it comes to implementation and enforcement, and even the NRC's general counsel has raised this issue. The States and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission are in control of this issue. It is adequately regulated. It is appropriately regulated in a manner that protects groundwater. The injection wells and the recovery wells are from nonpotable water sources, and there are no instances where a nonpotable aquifer has contaminated a potable water aquifer.

□ 0130

For those reasons, I believe that this amendment is appropriate, and I encourage its adoption.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 71 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds in this Act may be used to enforce permit requirements pursuant to part 14 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, with respect to the export of squid, octopus, and cuttlefish products.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise on behalf of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MACARTHUR).

Prior to 2008, squid, octopus, and cuttlefish exports were permitted exclusively by the FDA as fish intended for human consumption. In 2008, the Fish and Wildlife Service also began regulating these species as protected species even though they are not. This allows them to charge excessive fees to seafood processors and to delay perishable shipments.

This amendment will prohibit funding from going to the Fish and Wildlife Service to inspect squid, octopus, and cuttlefish. The FDA will still regulate these products for food safety, as they do other fishery products that are meant to be consumed as food. It is a simple amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, Fish and Wildlife inspections serve an important role for ensuring sustainability in regularly harvested species, which is essential to preserving the economic interests of the industry as well as the ocean ecosystems.

The Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee has been discussing the perishability of ecoderms for many years. Yet it has not had any other in-depth discussions about any other species.

I know the authorizing committee has been looking at this issue, and I would suggest that they are the proper committee to address any changes to permanent requirements that are requested in this amendment—permanent requirements.

Unlike the ecoderms, it is my understanding that these species are frozen seafood products instead of fresh.

Is it true they are frozen seafood products instead of fresh?

I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas so he may answer that question.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I believe these are fresh products.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, in reclaiming my time, it is my understanding that they are frozen. Therefore, they are not perishable as are the other ecoderms we had been speaking to.

I would ask that Members oppose this amendment and consider any legislation produced from the House Natural Resources Committee as the appropriate vehicle to resolve this issue.

I asked the gentleman a question about whether they are frozen seafood products or not. That seems to be in doubt. I have it under good information that they are. The gentleman is not sure. Therefore, I think it is really appropriate that this amendment be tabled, or voted down, until the proper committee has had a chance to review it, because what we are about to engage in here is a radical, radical change in what current law is.

I oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, these harmless seafood products are treated as if they were listed under the Endangered Species Act or listed as injurious under the Lacey Act or in violation of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species, which these products are not. They are being regulated by both the Fish and Wildlife and the FDA, and they will still be regulated under the FDA.

I encourage a positive vote on this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, without doing inspections, we have no way of knowing whether or not these are potentially endangered species. They are not. They would be exempted from the

Lacey Act. That is why I am saying that this amendment is so radical in its nature of changing what current practice is.

I am pretty confident that these are frozen seafood products. What we were looking to address in the report language in the discussions that we have had in the committee is, for example, sea urchins, which are highly perishable, and that you have to have a quick turnaround in working with Fish and Wildlife to make sure that those inspections are taking place like that so that the fishermen and -women aren't put at an economic disadvantage.

I am very strongly in opposition to this amendment. I think the gentleman is going to go forward with it, but I really wish this could be tabled so that we could have a full discussion about what we are talking about. I think, with the best of intentions, the gentleman will go someplace, and I am not sure we will fully understand what the final product will be at the end. I oppose the amendment strongly.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. MURPHY OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 72 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out seismic airgun testing or seismic airgun surveys in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area, the Straits of Florida Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area, or the South Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area located within the exclusive economic zone (as defined in section 107 of title 46, United States Code) bordering the State of Florida.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their hard work in staying up so late and doing our business here.

I rise to offer the Murphy-Jolly-Castor-Clawson-Deutch-Graham-Hastings-Posey-Ros-Lehtinen-Wilson amendment to block the use of seismic airgun testing off Florida's coasts.

As you can see from the list of co-sponsors, offshore drilling is not a partisan issue. In our State of Florida, the health of our economy relies on clean waters and beaches. Seismic testing

puts the health of our environment and, by extension, our economy at risk. Blasting seismic waves into the waters off our coasts is the first step in the wrong direction.

Oil and gas exploration off the coasts of Florida poses too great a risk to our environment and to our economy. Seismic testing can have negative impacts on marine life, including endangered whales and dolphins, by disrupting their ability to communicate and navigate to find food as well as to locate mates and their young. It can also have negative effects on sea turtles, such as the endangered loggerhead, that have key nesting grounds along the Treasure Coast and Palm Beaches in the district I am so proud to represent.

Additionally, this practice has the potential to displace commercial and recreational fishing stocks. Estimates are that this practice can reduce catch rates in Atlantic cod, haddock, rockfish, herring, sand eel, and blue whiting by anywhere between 40 and 80 percent. This is unacceptable for Florida's fishing industry and the very livelihoods it sustains.

Floridians from every political persuasion do not want to risk an oil spill off our coasts, as we are home to more coastline than any other State in the continental United States. That is why 30 cities from both the left-leaning and right-leaning parts of our State have passed resolutions that ban seismic testing. Those closest to the ground know seismic testing is bad for business in a State with over 280,000 jobs that are supported by healthy ocean ecosystems. Protecting our shores is not a Republican or a Democratic issue. It is a Florida issue, both environmentally and economically.

I am proud that our delegation continues to stand strong against efforts to open the door to offshore drilling by working to block seismic testing off our shores. I ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to trust our State and our delegation. The Sunshine State is united. We do not want this. Support this bipartisan amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, this administration has already developed the most restrictive policies for the use of seismic airguns for offshore exploration to date. We do not need to place a moratorium on the use. The gentleman specifies two planning areas off the Florida coasts, but the amendment affects many other States than just his own. As such, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. GRAHAM), another champion for the environment and a champion for Florida.

□ 0140

Ms. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. MURPHY for yielding. I appreciate this opportunity of speaking for the same purpose I spoke to about an hour ago, but a different amendment.

I would just like to say, living in north Florida, I have seen firsthand the devastation that the BP oil spill created for our coastal communities. There are communities in my district that have still not recovered. I support energy independence, but Florida's beaches add billions of dollars to our economy. Drilling off our coast is not worth the risk to our environment or our economy.

This amendment reaffirms the current drilling ban by preventing seismic testing off Florida's beaches. I am proud to support it with my fellow Floridians in a bipartisan nature, and I hope my colleagues will join us in protecting Florida's beaches.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the chairman's hard work on this bill, and I hope he will take a moment to consider the united front that we stand in Florida on a bipartisan measure to be against this. But we oppose this practice because of its many impacts on the State and the animals that move around. They are not simply off our shore. They are all over the place. I hope the gentleman considers that.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MURPHY).

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

Mr. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 73 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to treat any gray wolf in any of the 48 contiguous States or the District of Columbia as an endangered species or threatened species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) after June 13, 2017.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that would prohibit the Department of the Interior and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service from using any funds to continue treating the gray wolf under ESA after June 13, 2017—providing these agencies with funding to continue managing the gray wolf for nearly a year—more than half enough time to work with States to develop and implement individual State management plans that would go into effect when Federal management ends.

Mr. Chairman, this is an issue of extreme importance to my home State of Washington where the gray wolf is listed in the western two-thirds of the State but is delisted in the eastern third. This fragmented listing means there are no geographic barriers to prevent wolves from traveling between listed and delisted areas, posing a risk to people's lives, farming, and ranching in the region.

Unfortunately, this issue should already be settled. On June 13, 2013, the Service published a proposed rule to remove the gray wolf from the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife. It made this determination after evaluating "the classification status of gray wolves currently listed in the contiguous U.S." and found the "best available scientific and commercial information indicates that the currently listed entity is not a valid species under the Act."

The statutory purpose of ESA is to recover a species to the point where it no longer is considered endangered or threatened. The gray wolf is currently found in nearly 50 countries around the world, and the Wolf Specialist Group at the International Union for Conservation Nature has placed the species in the category of "least concern globally" for risk of extinction.

Mr. Chairman, the gray wolf population has grown substantially across its range and is now considered to be recovered, and, therefore, it no longer merits protection under ESA. However, my amendment does not delist the gray wolf but encourages the Service to move forward with its proposed delisting rule.

It restricts funding for Federal management after June 13, 2017—4 years after the original delisting rule was first published—providing more than enough time for the Service to finalize the rule, as well as to work with individual States to develop and implement their respective State management plans. This approach will support an orderly transition to State-level management and allow State wildlife officials to more effectively manage wolf populations, which has proven successful in States such as Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Minnesota, Wisconsin, and Michigan.

My amendment is simple. It provides Interior and the Service with an incentive to move forward with the delisting

that the agency itself said is necessary and supported by the best available science evidence and data.

I urge my colleagues to support this commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, as the gentleman pointed out, the wolf is an animal which exists in the great State of Minnesota, where I am from. This is not an issue that I am unfamiliar with, having worked on it in the State house when the Federal Government and the State were coming to fruition on how to protect this iconic American species.

But this amendment is an attack on that species. The work of the Keystone species, as we both know, plays a vital role in keeping our ecosystem healthy. Deer populations, the gentleman and I, being familiar with that, know how important they are to the entire ecosystem. It is also an animal to my Native American brothers and sisters in Minnesota and the surrounding area that have a deep kinship and bond with. In fact, at a wolf roundtable I had, I heard directly from many tribal leaders that the protections that are afforded under the Endangered Species Act for gray wolves is the only way in which they have been able to keep wolf hunts away or out of the tribal reservation boundaries.

I understand many of my colleagues have very strong feelings about listing and delisting and the way it affects their States, but currently, this is in the courts right now. We don't know how the courts are going to come down on its ruling, so I think we should not interfere in what is a court process.

The Endangered Species Act also exists to offer necessary protections and ensures species survival, which the majority of my constituents and constituents all across the United States support.

And this is the same law that helped successfully restore another iconic American system: the bald eagle.

This amendment would restrict the Department of the Interior's ability to implement the Endangered Species Act. However, it does not alter the protection for the endangered wolves in the State. Regardless of one's position on species protections, the amendment is problematic.

Its restrictions will ultimately hurt farmers, ranchers, landowners, and business owners because under this amendment the Fish and Wildlife Service would not be able to offer any exemptions or permits for incidental killings of wolves to landowners, ranchers, and other parties who might need them. Right now, the way the law stands, they can do that. If this amendment were to pass, they would not be able to do that.

The prohibition against accidental kills or takes would remain, and it would still be legally enforceable. Constituents in these States would either have to stop any activity that led to the taking of wolves or they would be put in harm's way to lawsuits and heavy penalties.

So I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the gentlewoman's knowledge and work on this issue in her home State of Minnesota.

However, I think it is time that we in this country declare a success, declare a win when it comes to the gray wolf. There are at least 6,000 wolves in the Great Lakes States, the Rocky Mountain States, the Pacific and Northwest States; 14,000 in the whole United States. As I said before, this is no longer an endangered species. It does not fit the criteria for endangered species.

□ 0150

My own State Fish and Wildlife Department 3 years in a row has sent letters to Congress asking and pointing out the reasons why the wolf could be, should be delisted.

You talk about coexisting with other species. If you look at the elk population of Yellowstone, in the 10 years between 1996 and 2006, the population has been decimated by 50 percent. If you look at the Shiras moose population of Utah, it has been decimated by 90 percent because of these healthy populations of wolves. I think there are issues that we are experiencing because of being unable to manage them in ways that States have proven that they are capable of doing.

It does not take away the ability for States to do those kind of things. The Federal Government fully has, until June 30 of 2017, to continue managing the wolf in the way it does now. This just sets a timeline, provides an incentive for the agency to move forward with its own rule and the process that has been in place.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I thank the gentleman. I think we just disagree on the timing of this amendment and what this amendment would actually lead to have happen in our States and our communities. It is in the courts right now. The courts could very well rule in a way that you would be very pleased and very satisfied with, and I think we should let the court procedure take place.

Simply put, in my opinion, this amendment is bad for wolves, bad for our ecosystem, bad for business, and my constituents think it would be a really bad thing to have move forward. I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gen-

tleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 74 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to issue any regulation under the Solid Waste Disposal Act (42 U.S.C. 6901 et seq.) that applies to an animal feeding operation, including a concentrated animal feeding operation and a large concentrated animal feeding operation, as such terms are defined in section 122.23 of title 40, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that I know the gentlewoman from Minnesota will like on an issue critical to livestock farmers, not just in my State and district, but across the country.

In 2013, the Environmental Protection Agency approached four dairies in Washington State about high nitrate levels in nearby wells, suspecting semi-permeable manure lagoons may be the cause. The dairies entered into a consent decree with EPA to identify and treat the cause if it was, in fact, stemming from the dairies.

Disturbingly, an environmental group FOIA'd the information the dairies provided to EPA and used it to file a citizen suit under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act of 1976, or RCRA, against the dairies.

Unfortunately, in early 2014 a Federal judge ruled with the environmental group, asserting that dissolved nitrates constituted a solid waste under the law, and high nitrate levels constituted open dumping.

There are a number of problems with this case. However, the biggest one by far is the very law used to file the lawsuit. To be clear, there are a number of laws and regulations both at the State and the Federal level which apply to nutrient management, such as the Safe Drinking Water Act or the Clean Water Act. The problem is, Congress never intended RCRA to be used to regulate ag-

riculture. In fact, EPA expresses that RCRA does not apply to agricultural waste, including manure and crop residue, returned to the soil as fertilizers or soil conditioners.

I don't know how you can get much clearer than nutrient management was not intended to be governed under this law; and, unfortunately, this ruling has left agriculture producers in a legal gray area trying to figure out exactly how to comply with the law that was not intended to regulate them.

All this decision has done is to create a culture of fear and distrust between farmers and regulatory agencies. If you are a good steward and come forward to proactively address problems, all you are doing is making yourself a target for lawsuits. Also, it creates a fear that a judge could capriciously decide that you are subject to a law despite clear intent that the law does not apply to you. Mr. Chairman, farmers rely on the land and water being clean and want to be good environmental stewards, and this self-defeating culture is not one we want to cultivate.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment does nothing to prevent EPA from enforcing current regulations under RCRA. It does nothing to prevent EPA from issuing or enforcing Clean Water Act or Safe Drinking Water Act rules. All my amendment does is prevent EPA from issuing and expanding new regulations under RCRA that would reflect this poor interpretation of current law.

While I am not aware of a desire by EPA to do this, unfortunately, there have been a number of other recent legal precedents directing EPA to take actions they didn't want to take. This amendment will ensure EPA's current regulations stand until Congress has the ability to weigh in and reassert its intent.

Mr. Chairman, no one is saying livestock producers, like all Americans, do not share in the responsibility of good environmental stewardship. They certainly do. But there already exists appropriate laws and regulations intended to govern these activities, and there are ones that are not intended to. We, as Members of Congress, have a responsibility to make that clarification, which is what my amendment takes steps to do.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes in opposition.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, to my colleague, I think we both would agree that drinking water is critical and limited in some of our rural communities, and we need to work together to address real threats to those sacred and precious resources. We should be protecting those communities from irresponsible factory farms rather than shielding large corporations from liability when their actions do make people sick. I think we probably both agree on that.

But your amendment isn't about drinking water. It is about RCRA. Your amendment prohibits the EPA from, maybe in the future, regulating an animal feed operation under RCRA, which is the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act.

Right now, the EPA does not regulate animal feeding operations, and the Agency has no immediate plans to develop or issue such regulations, so this amendment is unnecessary, and I strongly oppose it because it also gets involved in blocking the EPA Administrator from working on possibly anything else in the future that we might agree that would affect drinking water, which I don't think is part of this.

So the fact that RCRA does not regulate animal feeding operations underneath this statute and the Agency has no immediate plans to do it, and the way that the defunding is happening, I just have to oppose this amendment at this time.

Mr. Chair, if I could just say something about some of these amendments, I understand that sometimes people are fearful of what may or may not happen in the future, and so we have had many amendments that have either interjected before a court has ruled or interjected before a final rule-making has taken place or interjected before all the public comment has been taken in consideration.

I just think that the authorizing committee needs to be looking at what happens in public comment, and then if the Congress disagrees with a rule that comes out, that is when our role is most appropriate. I don't think we should have a role in predicting the future. I oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the gentlewoman's statement that we must work together to protect critical resources, and that is exactly why I am presenting this amendment for our consideration, so that dairies that want to do a good job know which rules they need to follow. Is it the Clean Water Act, is it the Safe Drinking Water Act or is it the RCRA rules? They need to know, and they can't be brought to court, being sued under rules that they didn't realize that they were supposed to be following.

It is like if you are driving down the freeway going 70 miles an hour, and the State patrolman pulls up and says, I am sorry, sir, today the speed limit is only 45. How are you supposed to know that if it is not posted? That is the kind of simplistic direction certainty that we are trying to give farmers across the country, so that is the reason for the amendment.

Certainly, I agree, EPA is not making plans to use RCRA to promulgate new rules, which is exactly why it shouldn't be a problem for us to be able to put that forward, because they are not. It shouldn't be a problem, so we are not going to be standing in their way.

□ 0200

Dairies are being sued by environmental groups, and judges are making rulings using RCRA rules as a basis for the decisions. And so that is why I think it is important for us to reassert Congress' original intention as well as EPA's clear regulations. We have to reassert that to keep clarity and certainty for our farmers and ranchers so that they can better protect our natural resources.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MR. NEWHOUSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 75 printed in House Report 114-683.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. For "United States Fish and Wildlife Service-Resource Management" to reinstate the wolf-livestock loss demonstration program as authorized by Public Law 111-11, there is hereby appropriated, and the amount otherwise provided by this Act for "Environmental Protection Agency-Environmental Programs and Management" is hereby reduced by, \$1,000,000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I rise this morning to offer an amendment that would restore funding for the Wolf Livestock Loss Demonstration Program.

This program assists livestock producers in undertaking proactive, non-lethal activity to reduce the livestock loss from predation by wolves, and addresses livestock losses caused by wolves.

Mr. Chairman, this demonstration program was authorized in 2009 under a Democratic administration, and \$1 million in funding was appropriated in the FY 2010 Interior and Environment Appropriations Act.

Since its inception, the Wolf Livestock Demonstration Program has played a critical role in minimizing conflicts with wolves while providing ranchers with much-needed support for non-lethal activities and another tool to minimize their livestock losses from wolves.

Grants provided by this program go to 10 States with significant wolf populations, including my home State of Washington, and support each State's highest priority needs in assisting live-

stock producers in dealing with predation by wolves. The grants provided by this program are administered by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and stipulates that the Federal cost share not exceed 50 percent.

Mr. Chairman, this program has been funded every year since 2010. My amendment would continue this funding at the 2010 level, respecting our country's current fiscal situation and tight budgetary guidelines.

The Wolf Livestock Loss Demonstration Program encourages the wider use of nonlethal programs by livestock owners and ranchers who frequently rely on lethal control methods to address livestock-wolf conflict.

As wolf populations continue to grow across the Lower 48, it is vital that we continue this demonstration program in order to benefit livestock producers willing to take proactive measures to protect not only their livestock, but wolves as well.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to be very clear. I think people who lose livestock to wolf predation should be reimbursed. I want to be very, very clear about that. I supported that as a State legislator, and I support it now. However, in 2014, this program for recouping farmers and ranchers is in the Agriculture bill. The Agriculture bill hasn't come to the floor yet.

EPA has been cut enough. We aren't doing enough for clean drinking water. You have seen the cuts that have been on the floor to fund other programs today.

We have funded this out of Fish and Wildlife, and now you are taking the funds for the Fish and Wildlife out of the Environmental Protection Agency. This belongs in the Agriculture bill.

And so, in effect, what you are doing—because you continue to fund it out of the Interior bill, we are going to have a significant reduction to the EPA. The EPA was already reduced \$164 million below 2016. These deep reductions impact the ability of the EPA to protect human health and the health of our environment. It jeopardizes our ability to ensure that there is clean air and clean water for families today and for future generations.

I just cannot support reducing the EPA any longer. I will join you on an amendment to fund this out of where it belongs—from the 2014 Agriculture bill—but I cannot support it coming out of the EPA. It belongs in the Agriculture bill, where it is authorized.

For that reason, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Chairman, I would just remind the gentlewoman

that the original program, the demonstration program, was authorized in 2009, and then \$1 million was appropriated in the 2010 Interior and Environment Appropriations Act. And so it is just being consistent with what we have done as a Congress before I got here.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEWHOUSE. I yield to the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. In 2009. We passed a law in 2014. The legislation that is in charge of this program now, in 2014, current law, is not in this bill anymore. It is in the Agriculture bill.

And I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Reclaiming my time, I believe that that is authorizing legislation and this is appropriating legislation. So that would be the only difference that I could see.

I certainly respect the gentlewoman has much more experience than I have, but I would still offer this amendment. It has been a good program in helping livestock producers as well as also being safer for the wolf population.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support of the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE).

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE) having assumed the chair, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, 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. 5538) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. JOLLY (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of a death in the family.

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today until 10 p.m. on account of official business.

#### SENATE CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. Con. Res. 44. Concurrent resolution recognizing the sunflower as the flower for military caregivers; to the committee on Armed Services.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Wednesday, July 13, 2016, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5988. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Rear Admiral (lower half) Timothy G. Szymanski, United States Navy, to wear the insignia of the grade of rear admiral, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5989. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing Brigadier General Douglas M. Gabram, United States Army, to wear the insignia of the grade of major general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec. 509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5990. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter notifying Congress that the report on the inventory of the activities performed during the preceding fiscal year should be submitted by August 2016, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2330a(c)(1); Public Law 107-107, Sec. 801(c); (115 Stat. 117); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5991. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting the National Guard Youth Challenge Program Annual Report for Fiscal Year 2015, pursuant to 32 U.S.C. 509(k); Public Law 105-85, Sec. 1076(a); (111 Stat. 1914); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5992. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Transition Assistance Program (TAP) for Military Personnel [Docket ID: DOD-2013-OS-0236] (RIN: 0790-AJ17) received July 11, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5993. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Record Retention Requirements (RIN: 3064-AE25) received July 11, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5994. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's interim final rule — Rules of Practice and Procedure (RIN: 3064-AE43) received July 11, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5995. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Treatment of Financial

Assets Transferred in Connection With a Securitization or Participation (RIN: 3064-AE38) received July 11, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5996. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Medication Assisted Treatment for Opioid Use Disorders (RIN: 0930-AA22) received July 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5997. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; NC; Fine Particulate Matter National Ambient Air Quality Standards Revision [EPA-R04-OAR-2016-0106; FRL-9948-95-Region 4] received July 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5998. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Washington; Spokane Second 10-Year Carbon Monoxide Limited Maintenance Plan [EPA-R10-OAR-2016-0290; FRL-9948-97-Region 10] received July 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

5999. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Iowa's Air Quality Implementation Plans; Polk County Board of Health Rules and Regulations, Chapter V, Revisions [EPA-R07-OAR-2016-0045; FRL-9948-84-Region 7] received July 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6000. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Determination of Attainment; Atlanta, Georgia; 2008 Ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards [EPA-R04-OAR-2015-0839; FRL-9948-93-Region 4] received July 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6001. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Expedited Approval of Alternative Test Procedures for the Analysis of Contaminants Under the Safe Drinking Water Act; Analysis and Sampling Procedures [EPA-HQ-OW-2016-0281; FRL-9948-54-OW] received July 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6002. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutant Emissions: Petroleum Refinery Sector Amendments [EPA-HQ-OAR-2010-0682; FRL-9948-92-OAR] (RIN: 2016-AS83) received July 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6003. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Quality Designations for the 2010 Sulfur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) Primary

National Ambient Air Quality Standard — Round 2 [EPA-HQ-OAR-2014-0464; FRL-9948-87-OAR] received July 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6004. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Cordele, Georgia) [MB Docket No.: 16-123] (RM-11766) received July 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6005. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i), Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments, Television Broadcast Stations (Tolleson, Arizona) [MB Docket No.: 16-93] (RM-11764) received July 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6006. A letter from the Chief Executive Officer, U.S. Anti-Doping Agency, transmitting the Agency's 2015 Annual Report and Financial Audit, pursuant to 21 U.S.C. 2002(b); Public Law 109-469, Sec. 702(b); (120 Stat. 3534); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6007. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendments to Existing Validated End-User Authorization in the People's Republic of China: Advanced Micro Devices, Inc. [Docket No.: 160303186-6186-01] (RIN: 0694-AG91) received July 5, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6008. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary General License: Extension of Validity [Docket No.: 160106014-6530-03] (RIN: 0694-AG82) received July 5, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6009. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Office of the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting informing the Congress of the Department's intent to sign a Memorandum of Understanding with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Transmittal No. 19-16, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2767(f); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 27(f) (as amended by Public Law 113-27 6, Sec. 208(a)(4)); (128 Stat. 2993); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

6010. A letter from the Director, Office of Economic Impact and Diversity, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's FY 2015 No FEAR Act report, pursuant to Public Law 107-174, 203(a); (116 Stat. 569); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6011. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of the designation of acting officer and change in previously submitted reported information, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6012. A letter from the Senior Vice President and Chief Financial Officer, Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco, transmitting the Federal Home Loan Bank of San Francisco 2015 Annual Report and management statement on the system of internal

controls, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 9106(a)(1); Public Law 97-258 (as amended by Public Law 101-576, Sec. 306(a)) (104 Stat. 2854); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6013. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting a list of activities performed by federal government sources for the executive agency that are not inherently governmental functions, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); ; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

6014. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Oil and Gas and Sulfur Operations on the Outer Continental Shelf — Requirements for Exploratory Drilling on the Arctic Outer Continental Shelf [Docket ID: BSEE-2013-0011; 16XE1700DX EX1SF0000.DAQ000 EEEE500000] (RIN: 1082-AA00) received July 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6015. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; Closure of the Nantucket Lightship North Access Area to General Category Individual Fishing Quota Scallop Vessels [Docket No.: 151210999-6348-02] (RIN: 0648-XE681) received July 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6016. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, transmitting the annual report entitled, "PRO IP Act FY 2015", pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 3713d(a); Public Law 110-403, Sec. 404(a); (122 Stat. 4274); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6017. A letter from the Shareholder, Elliott Davis Decosimo, LLC, transmitting the annual 2015 financial report for the Congressional Medal of Honor Society of the United States of America, in accordance with Public Law 88-504, (36 U.S.C. 1101); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6018. A letter from the President, National Council on Radiation Protection and Measurements, transmitting the Council's 2015 Annual Report, pursuant to 36 U.S.C. 10101(b)(1) and 150909; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

6019. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Ocean Disposal; Amendments to Restrictions on Use of Dredged Material Disposal Sites in the Central and Western Regions of Long Island Sound; Connecticut [EPA-R01-OW-2016-0068; FRL-9948-61-Region 1] received July 7, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6020. A letter from the Office Program Manager, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary (00REG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's direct final rule — Authority to Solicit Gifts and Donations (RIN: 2900-AP75) received July 8, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

6021. A letter from the Federal Register Certifying Officer, Office of the Chief Counsel, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's final rule — Sale and Issue of Marketable Book-Entry Treasury Bills, Notes, and Bonds received July 11, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law

104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

6022. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Legislation, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the metrics for achieving widespread electronic health record interoperability, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 1395w-4 note; Public Law 114-10, Sec. 106(b)(1); (129 Stat. 138); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 5421. A bill to amend the Securities Act of 1933 to apply the exemption from State regulation of securities offerings to securities listed on a national security exchange that has listing standards that have been approved by the Commission (Rept. 114-684). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 3394. A bill to amend the Terrorism Risk Insurance Act of 2002 to allow for the use of certain assets of foreign persons and entities to satisfy certain judgments against terrorist parties, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 114-685). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Ms. FOXX: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 822. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the bill (S. 764) to reauthorize and amend the National Sea Grant College Program Act, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (S. 304) to improve motor vehicle safety by encouraging the sharing of certain information; and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 114-686). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois (for himself, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. YOUNG of Indiana, Mr. NUNES, Mr. SHIMKUS, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. MILLER of Florida, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. OLSON, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. HUNTER, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. CULBERSON, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. CRAMER, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. MESSER, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, and Mr. KING of New York):

H.R. 5727. A bill to impose sanctions on persons that threaten the peace or stability of Iraq or the Government of Iraq; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. CUELLAR):

H.R. 5728. A bill to prohibit scheduled passenger air transportation between the United States and Cuba until a study has been completed regarding security measures and equipment at Cuba's airports, to amend title

49, United States Code, to clarify the role of the Secretary of Homeland Security regarding security standards at foreign airports, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H.R. 5729. A bill to prohibit the Secretary of the Treasury from issuing certain licenses in connection with the export or re-export of a commercial passenger aircraft to the Islamic Republic of Iran, to require annual reports by the Secretary of the Treasury and the Export-Import Bank on financing issues related to the sale or lease of such a commercial passenger aircraft or spare parts for such an aircraft, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MESSER (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. HURD of Texas):

H.R. 5730. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude room and board costs and certain research expenses from gross income of certain students; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 5731. A bill to establish SAVE UP Accounts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ENGEL (for himself, Mr. ROYCE, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. MESSER, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. BEYER, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 5732. A bill to halt the wholesale slaughter of the Syrian people, encourage a negotiated political settlement, and hold Syrian human rights abusers accountable for their crimes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 5733. A bill to amend the Agricultural Act of 1961 to modify the limitations applicable to qualified conservation loan guarantees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. CARTER of Texas (for himself, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. JONES, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. NEUGEBAUER, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. HURD of Texas, Mr. FARENTHOLD, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. OLSON, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. YOUNG of Iowa, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. COOK, Mr. GIBSON, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. ZINKE, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina, Mrs. BLACK, Mr. SENBRENNER, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. LONG, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. MARINO, Mr. FORBES, Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. YOHO, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. WOMACK, Mr. FLORES, Mr. HANNA, Mr. KILMER, Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. COLE, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr.

BABIN, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. MACARTHUR, and Mr. WEBER of Texas):

H.R. 5734. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to provide for an operation on a live donor for purposes of conducting a transplant procedure for a veteran, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 5735. A bill to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to prioritize efforts to support access to primary and secondary education for displaced children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida (for himself and Ms. GRAHAM):

H.R. 5736. A bill to direct the Commissioner of Internal Revenue to conduct a study on the feasibility of notifying a taxpayer that a tax return has been filed in the taxpayer's name; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. McDERMOTT, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 5737. A bill to ensure that foster children are able to use their Social Security and Supplemental Security Income benefits to address their needs and improve their lives; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 5738. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish the Stronger Together Program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GALLEGO (for himself, Mr. HONDA, Ms. LEE, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. CAPUANO):

H.R. 5739. A bill to prohibit the transfer, loan, or other disposition of a machinegun or semiautomatic assault weapon to an individual under 16 years of age; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5740. A bill to hold war crimes suspects and Nazi war criminals accountable by encouraging foreign governments to more efficiently prosecute, extradite, deport, or accept for deportation such war crimes suspects and Nazi war criminals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas (for herself, Mr. GUINTA, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. ROKITA):

H.R. 5741. A bill to amend title 44, United States Code, to require the Director of the Government Publishing Office to distribute the Federal Register to Congressional offices only in an electronic format, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 5742. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the admission of certain sons and daughters of citizens of the United States, which citizens served on active duty in the Armed Forces of the United States abroad, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. PASCRELL, and Mr. REICHERT):

H.R. 5743. A bill to require adequate reporting on the Public Safety Officers' Benefit program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself and Mr. GALLEGO):

H.R. 5744. A bill to amend the FAA Modernization and Reform Act of 2012 with respect to categorical exclusions granted for next generation flight procedures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ROYCE, and Mr. MEEKS):

H. Res. 821. A resolution urging the Government of Gabon to respect democratic principles during the August 2016 presidential elections; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. FOXX (for herself, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONNOLLY, and Mr. WHITFIELD):

H. Res. 823. A resolution condemning in the strongest terms the terrorist attacks in Istanbul, Turkey, on June 28, 2016, that resulted in the loss of at least 44 lives; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. NORTON:

H. Res. 824. A resolution expressing support for dancing as a form of valuable exercise and of artistic expression, and for the designation of July 30, 2016, as National Dance Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

281. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Hampshire, relative to House Concurrent Resolution 40, requesting the Congress of the United States call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

282. Also, a memorial of the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 7, urging the President and the Congress of the United States to preserve the tax-exempt status of municipal bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

283. Also, a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Louisiana, relative to House Concurrent Resolution No. 12, to memorialize the United States Congress to take such actions as are necessary to review and consider eliminating provisions of federal law which reduce Social Security benefits for those receiving pension benefits from federal, state, or local government retirement or pension systems, plans, or funds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. KINZINGER of Illinois:

H.R. 5727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 5728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18—To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United



States or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. PITTENGER:

H.R. 5729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 5730.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I:

By Mr. CROWLEY:

H.R. 5731.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 Section 8 of Article I:

The Congress shall have the power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. ENGEL:

H.R. 5732.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. BOST:

H.R. 5733.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution, which provides Congress with the ability to enact legislation necessary and proper to effectuate its purpose in taxing and spending.

By Mr. CARTER of Texas:

H.R. 5734.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution, which grants Congress the power to provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States.

By Mr. CHABOT:

H.R. 5735.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Congress has the ability to authorize the Secretary of State and the Administrator of the United States Agency for International Development to advance ongoing efforts for programs that are in the best interest of the United States.

By Mr. CURBELO of Florida:

H.R. 5736.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois:

H.R. 5737.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I of the Constitution and its subsequent amendments and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Ms. FUDGE:

H.R. 5738.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. GALLEGO:

H.R. 5739.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. ISRAEL:

H.R. 5740.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8.

By Ms. JENKINS of Kansas:

H.R. 5741.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18.

“To make all Law which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers . . .”

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 5742.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8, Clause 4.

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 5743.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 5744.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

- H.R. 112: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
- H.R. 213: Ms. SPEIER.
- H.R. 379: Mr. DEFAZIO and Mr. MCKINLEY.
- H.R. 465: Mr. ROSKAM.
- H.R. 499: Mr. COFFMAN.
- H.R. 508: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. DELANEY.
- H.R. 546: Mr. RUIZ.
- H.R. 816: Mr. DAVIDSON.
- H.R. 825: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
- H.R. 835: Mr. LUCAS.
- H.R. 842: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
- H.R. 863: Mr. MULLIN and Mr. PETERS.
- H.R. 997: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
- H.R. 1220: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
- H.R. 1343: Ms. HAHN.
- H.R. 1347: Mr. COHEN and Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H.R. 1459: Mr. TAKANO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. KIND, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. FOSTER.
- H.R. 1545: Mr. MCKINLEY.
- H.R. 1559: Mr. POLIQUIN.
- H.R. 1859: Mr. ZINKE.
- H.R. 1943: Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H.R. 1961: Ms. CLARKE of New York.
- H.R. 2103: Mr. HONDA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. LANGEVIN, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
- H.R. 2156: Mr. CALVERT.
- H.R. 2216: Mr. MURPHY of Florida.
- H.R. 2274: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.
- H.R. 2315: Mr. SENSENBRENNER and Mrs. BLACK.
- H.R. 2403: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
- H.R. 2404: Mr. KENNEDY.
- H.R. 2663: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. DELANEY.
- H.R. 2680: Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 2694: Mr. COOPER and Mr. FOSTER.
- H.R. 2726: Mr. HARPER, Mr. HECK of Nevada, Mr. RENACCI, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. LARSEN of Washington.
- H.R. 2737: Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
- H.R. 2739: Mr. MCKINLEY and Ms. EDWARDS.
- H.R. 2883: Mr. CURBELO of Florida and Mr. DELANEY.
- H.R. 2903: Mr. VALADO and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
- H.R. 2931: Mr. JOLLY.

- H.R. 3012: Mr. ISSA.
- H.R. 3051: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
- H.R. 3229: Mr. MEADOWS.
- H.R. 3294: Mr. GIBSON.
- H.R. 3323: Mr. ZINKE.
- H.R. 3411: Ms. MENG.
- H.R. 3437: Mr. BRAT.
- H.R. 3564: Mr. HUFFMAN.
- H.R. 3683: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
- H.R. 3742: Mrs. BLACKBURN and Mr. ROKITA.
- H.R. 3765: Mr. BOUSTANY.
- H.R. 3799: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.
- H.R. 3815: Mr. MARINO and Mr. POLIS.
- H.R. 3817: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 3886: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 3892: Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN.
- H.R. 3926: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. SERRANO.
- H.R. 4143: Mr. BRAT.
- H.R. 4155: Mr. PETERS.
- H.R. 4177: Mr. COHEN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KIND, Mr. CARDENAS, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. COOPER.
- H.R. 4184: Mr. THOMPSON of California.
- H.R. 4214: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. GRAYSON.
- H.R. 4223: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
- H.R. 4247: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona.
- H.R. 4298: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
- H.R. 4310: Mr. BRAT.
- H.R. 4365: Mrs. ELLMERS of North Carolina.
- H.R. 4428: Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
- H.R. 4442: Mr. PETERS.
- H.R. 4479: Mr. SERRANO.
- H.R. 4481: Mr. CROWLEY.
- H.R. 4559: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. HURT of Virginia, Mr. COLE, Mr. FLEMING, Mr. KLINE, and Mr. BABIN.
- H.R. 4567: Mr. GIBSON.
- H.R. 4584: Mr. REICHERT.
- H.R. 4597: Mr. BRAT.
- H.R. 4602: Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, and Mr. NADLER.
- H.R. 4603: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi and Mr. CUMMINGS.
- H.R. 4625: Mr. MACARTHUR.
- H.R. 4760: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
- H.R. 4762: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.
- H.R. 4764: Mr. COHEN.
- H.R. 4795: Mr. WENSTRUP.
- H.R. 4816: Mr. ROUZER and Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia.
- H.R. 4828: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mrs. LOVE, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.
- H.R. 4867: Mr. MCKINLEY.
- H.R. 4932: Mr. RANGEL.
- H.R. 4959: Mr. CROWLEY, Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. ZINKE.
- H.R. 5014: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
- H.R. 5015: Mr. DUFFY.
- H.R. 5064: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.
- H.R. 5067: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BEYER, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 5090: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. HANNA, Mr. UPTON, and Mr. WILLIAMS.
- H.R. 5167: Mr. EMMER of Minnesota.
- H.R. 5177: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. DELANEY.
- H.R. 5180: Mr. WOODALL, Mr. STEWART, Mr. BABIN, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
- H.R. 5182: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. ASHFORD, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.
- H.R. 5187: Mr. BOST and Mr. LUCAS.
- H.R. 5195: Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Ms. HAHN.
- H.R. 5230: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.
- H.R. 5282: Mr. TAKANO and Mrs. NAPOLITANO.
- H.R. 5292: Mr. PETERS, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. PAYNE.
- H.R. 5324: Mr. ROKITA.
- H.R. 5351: Mr. ROYCE.
- H.R. 5372: Miss RICE of New York.
- H.R. 5428: Mr. KNIGHT, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, and Mr. GIBSON.

- H.R. 5436: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. POCAN.  
 H.R. 5457: Mr. BOST.  
 H.R. 5466: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
 H.R. 5488: Mr. FRANKEL of Florida and Miss RICE of New York.  
 H.R. 5489: Mr. PETERSON, Mrs. WALORSKI, and Mr. BLUM.  
 H.R. 5506: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
 H.R. 5560: Ms. LEE, Mr. RANGEL, and Mr. POCAN.  
 H.R. 5568: Mr. MOULTON.  
 H.R. 5577: Mr. BOUSTANY, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. FLEMING, and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 5578: Ms. KUSTER.  
 H.R. 5587: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. HUFFMAN.  
 H.R. 5589: Mr. SESSIONS.  
 H.R. 5593: Mr. HONDA and Mr. ROUZER.  
 H.R. 5600: Mr. MOULTON.  
 H.R. 5608: Mr. DESJARLAIS.  
 H.R. 5614: Mr. RANGEL.  
 H.R. 5625: Mr. CARNEY and Miss RICE of New York.  
 H.R. 5628: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama.  
 H.R. 5631: Mr. SCALISE, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. SESSIONS, Mrs. MILLER of Michigan, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. ROYCE, Mr. NUNES, Mr. THORNBERRY, and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.  
 H.R. 5646: Mr. PITTINGER and Mr. SMITH of Texas.  
 H.R. 5654: Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. BOST, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Mr. TOM PRICE of Georgia, Mr. AMODEI, and Mr. SESSIONS.  
 H.R. 5659: Mr. ROSKAM.  
 H.R. 5666: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. ROUZER.
- H.R. 5683: Mr. MOULTON.  
 H.R. 5686: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
 H.R. 5691: Mr. SWALWELL of California.  
 H.R. 5695: Mr. VEASEY.  
 H.R. 5697: Mr. MULVANEY, Mrs. NOEM, and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
 H.R. 5715: Mr. POMPEO, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. TIBERI, Mr. HOLDING, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.  
 H.R. 5722: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. KILMER, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. BOUSTANY, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. SMITH of Missouri, Mr. SCALISE, Mr. WENSTRUP, Ms. MOORE, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. KILDEE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. MULVANEY, Mr. MESSER, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. CONNOLLY.  
 H.J. Res. 22: Mr. CASTRO of Texas and Mr. COOPER.  
 H. Con. Res. 40: Ms. PLASKETT and Mr. PIERLUISI.  
 H. Con. Res. 51: Mr. CICILLINE.  
 H. Con. Res. 114: Mr. DESJARLAIS.  
 H. Con. Res. 140: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas.  
 H. Con. Res. 141: Mr. GIBSON, Mr. JONES, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. BILIRAKIS.  
 H. Con. Res. 143: Mr. BEYER and Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H. Res. 28: Mr. MOULTON and Mr. DENHAM.  
 H. Res. 94: Mr. WALZ.  
 H. Res. 112: Mr. CARNEY.  
 H. Res. 402: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.  
 H. Res. 467: Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. HAHN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. CARNEY, Mr. BECERRA, and Mr. SCHIFF.  
 H. Res. 567: Mr. MCCLINTOCK.  
 H. Res. 590: Mr. MESSER.  
 H. Res. 625: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.  
 H. Res. 683: Ms. ESHOO.  
 H. Res. 728: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Ms. HAHN.  
 H. Res. 729: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. STUTZMAN, Mr. MEEHAN, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. PITTS, Ms. ADAMS, and Mr. HULTGREN.  
 H. Res. 776: Mr. KIND, Mr. POCAN, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, and Ms. ESTY.  
 H. Res. 795: Mr. WALZ.  
 H. Res. 807: Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
 H. Res. 808: Mr. HUFFMAN.  
 H. Res. 810: Mr. MILLER of Florida and Mr. POCAN.  
 H. Res. 811: Mr. DEFAZIO.  
 H. Res. 817: Mr. MCCLINTOCK and Mr. BYRNE.

---

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 5545: Mr. POLIS.