

ask that my colleagues support the amendment and heap a little more trouble on the EPA, as they are heaping the trouble on the constituents that I am privileged to represent.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

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

Mr. PERRY. 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.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. RATCLIFFE) assumed the chair.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate agrees to the conference report accompanying the bill (S. 524) "An Act to authorize the Attorney General and Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to address the prescription opioid abuse and heroin use crisis, and for other purposes."

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. 81 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. PALMER). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 81 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. PERRY. 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 shall be used to give formal notification under, or prepare, propose, implement, administer, or enforce any rule or recommendation pursuant to, section 115 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7415).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

Mr. Chairman, this amendment will prevent funds from being used to expand the EPA authority pursuant to section 115 of the Clean Air Act.

The Clean Air Act, which has served us well since 1973, hasn't needed to be expanded, it has been used over and over again to make sure that we clean up our act.

Section 115 of the Clean Air Act allows the EPA to mandate State emission levels to whatever amount the Agency deems appropriate if they find two things. Listen to that again. The Clean Air Act, section 115, allows the EPA—the Federal Government—to mandate all 50 of our States' emission levels to whatever amount the Agency deems appropriate—whatever amount—if they find two things. This has been there since 1973. It hasn't been relevant, but it is now. If the EPA finds that U.S. emissions endanger a foreign nation and the endangered nation has a reciprocal agreement to prevent or control emissions in their own nation.

□ 1915

Now, where that comes into play is the Paris climate agreement. It was just signed, and even though it is not a treaty, because we have the Clean Air Act and section 115, it is now operative or potentially operative.

Many believe and have argued that the U.N. Paris climate agreement meets these requirements and, once again, would allow the Federal Government to mandate our State emission levels to whatever amount the agency deems appropriate, period.

The President has proven time and time again that he has no problem circumventing Congress and working unilaterally to achieve his policy priorities. I suspect since he is in favor of the Paris climate agreement, that this is one of his policies.

With the Clean Power Plan caught up in the courts as the President's administration comes to an end, there is a serious concern and a legitimate concern that he will act unilaterally to cement his environmental legacy by enforcing section 114 in this way.

This amendment would block this attempt to delegate nearly unlimited power and authority over the energy sector in each one of our States to unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats at the EPA. Such expansive authority of the EPA would be economically devastating and could threaten the reliability and viability of our Nation's energy sector.

I know the President has got 5, 6 months left to go, and he would like to get as many regulations on the books as possible. We simply cannot let this happen, and we cannot leave it to chance.

I would urge my colleagues to an affirmative vote on this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, as has been pointed out, this would block the

EPA from regulating air pollution under section 115 of the Clean Air Act.

Section 115 deals with international pollution and allows the United States to work with other countries in transboundary pollution issues. As we know, pollution doesn't stop at a border. It moves. And it is moving around the planet.

This amendment is a transparent attempt to clearly stop the Paris climate change agreement reached in December 2015. The Paris climate agreement is a milestone in the global effort to combat climate change, something which my constituents feel is very clear, very present, and is a huge problem of which the United States should show leadership in.

More than 190 nations have made commitments to limit their climate-damaging pollution, including all the largest developed and developing countries.

Future U.S. administrations could use section 115 to help ensure that the United States does its part and to provide that other countries do their part too.

The Perry amendment would prohibit the EPA and the White House from even developing a well-considered recommendation or whether or not to use this authority. Congress should not take a tool out of the toolbox for a future administration's climate change mitigation toolbox.

This is a matter of global leadership. The United States needs to meet its Paris climate commitment and, subsequently, any commitment to act in the future.

Congressman PERRY's amendment and similar efforts to thwart the progress on climate change could—I would say "would"—undermine our ability to achieve needed pollution reductions and hit our Paris targets.

This amendment is the latest in a long line of Republican attacks on the Clean Air Act and the EPA's authority to respond to the urgent threat of climate change. A vote for this amendment is another vote, in my opinion, for those who deny climate change is real and to block action to curb the carbon pollution that is driving dangerous climate change.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, this is not to deny climate change. This is about authority. Whose authority? The United States and the individual States don't need foreign governments through the Federal administration telling us, telling them how to run their railroads and their businesses and how much they regulate their own clean air pursuant to the 1973 Clean Air Act. That is why we have the Federal Government, and that is why it collaborates with the State.

This agreement is not a treaty ratified by the United States Senate. This is an agreement between individuals that potentially gives the power to the Federal Government to regulate in an unlimited fashion every one of our States.

No one in the States signed up for this. No one in the United States Senate voted on this. This is an agreement between individuals, and it should not be left to stand in this fashion.

This amendment just says that we are going to follow the Clean Air Act, passed in 1973, just like we have been. Nothing has changed. Nothing has changed for the States. It has changed between individuals in this administration and people all around the globe that wish to limit the United States' productivity through regulation.

That is why this amendment is important, and that is why I hope Members will support it.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I had the opportunity recently to be in China, and because of our administration and as the Chinese people and government saw, our bold leadership in standing up and saying that the United States was going to play its role in reducing the harmful effects of climate change, China came to the table for the first time ever and said: You know, we are going to do something about it too.

Now, the gentleman keeps saying that the Senate never voted on it. This has never happened. Well, the Clean Air Act is a law and climate change is real.

This is not 1972, 1973, when I graduated from high school back many years ago. The planet, the climate, the oceans, the ice shelves are all changing. The legacy that we leave for our children and for future generations will be: What does the United States, what does our country do? How do we stand up and show leadership?

So this amendment clearly is an attempt to stop the Paris climate change agreement reached in 2015, something that I say with great pride my constituents in the State of Minnesota think is a good idea and something that we need to move forward on.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, no one denies that the 1973 Clean Air Act isn't law. No one denies that. But what we are pointing out is that, with the Paris accord, it activates section 115 in a way never perceived that to happen in 1973 when the law was passed. They didn't think that other governments were going to control the United States State by State by State. But that is indeed what can happen here—and probably what will happen here.

Pursuant to the agenda of the administration to reduce CO₂ produced by United States by 80 percent, I know that the air was dirtier in 1973, as you said, when you were in high school or what have you, but what this is going

to do is take us back to the 1900s, before the time of cars and X-rays and refrigerators and everything that makes a 21st century life livable for us. That is what this is going to do, if we allow the President's agenda to role forward with the Paris climate accord enshrined and then enacted through the Clean Air Act and section 115.

All this amendment wishes to do and seeks to do is make sure that that statute isn't enacted, per the Paris climate agreement—not a treaty, an agreement—between individuals, not between our countries.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, the debate couldn't be clearer here right now. Either you believe that climate change is real and it presents a clear and present danger—if you read some of the reports from the Department of Defense, they are very concerned about what is going on in the world with food scarcity, with rising sea levels, with all kinds of potential things that could bring real security risks to our Nation. Do we as a country stand up and do something about it and bring other countries with us? My State is not going to be compelled by a foreign government. My State is part of the United States of America, where we will work together under leadership to do something about climate change. Or do we continue to deny that climate change is real? We ignore what the Department of Defense is saying, and the United States doesn't play a clear leadership role in moving forward and bringing people with us on this issue that affects today, tomorrow, future generations and what this planet will be like for our children.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MR. POMPEO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 82 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. POMPEO. 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 finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Accidental Release Prevention Requirements: Risk Management Programs Under the Clean Air Act" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on March 14, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 13638 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman

from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funds for the EPA's proposed Risk Management Plan rulemaking for the remainder of this year.

This RMP is the EPA's program implementing section 112(r) of the 1990 Clean Air Act that requires facilities that use certain materials to develop a plan to prevent accidental releases.

Safety is at the very core of the chemical industry, and industry stakeholders have worked cooperatively with the EPA to achieve a dramatic 60 percent reduction in accidental releases in the 20 years of the RMP program, to date.

While the EPA has proposed several changes, many of the new regulations they have put forward are highly problematic and could actually lead to an increased likelihood of an incident.

The EPA has raced ahead of the other agencies participating in the Federal interagency working group created to improve chemical safety and security, and it is no longer working in coordination with the other Federal agencies involved in this process.

Yet the EPA is moving to finalize the rule, even though changes planned to OSHA's similar program, the process safety management program, are still in their early stages. This lack of coordination has the potential to create duplicative rules for individuals and companies struggling to comply with multiple Federal oversight programs.

I urge Members to adopt my amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this amendment would block the EPA from finalizing or implementing a proposed rule that establishes accidental release prevention requirements.

Earlier this year, the EPA issued a proposed rule to amend its risk management program regulations response to a 2013 executive order on improving chemical safety. The proposed rule seeks to improve chemical process safety, assist local emergency authorities in planning and responding to accidents, and improve public awareness to chemical hazards at regulated sources.

This is an important regulation and its need was underscored in the tragedy like the one that occurred in 2013 in west Texas, where a massive explosion in a fertilizer plant killed 15 people and injured more than 160.

This amendment would needlessly and recklessly block efforts to further improve chemical safety and security

in coordination with owners and operators, and I strongly oppose that.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. POMPEO).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. CALVERT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 820, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 83, 86, 107, 118, 127, and 129 printed in House Report 114-683, offered by Mr. CALVERT of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MR. TOM PRICE OF GEORGIA

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 any rule issued after the date of the enactment of this Act that is a major rule described in subparagraph (A) of section 804(2) of title 5, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

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 make grants pursuant to section 6 of the National Environmental Education Act (20 U.S.C. 5505).

AMENDMENT NO. 107 OFFERED BY MR. YOHO OF FLORIDA

Page 8, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 118 OFFERED BY MR. DUNCAN OF TENNESSEE

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 destroy any buildings or structures on Midway Island.

AMENDMENT NO. 127 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN OF ARKANSAS

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 Department of the Interior for the purpose of destroying any records regarding, related to, or generated by the Inorganic Section of the United States Geological Survey Energy Geochemistry Laboratory in Lakewood, Colorado.

AMENDMENT NO. 129 OFFERED BY MR. ROHRBACHER OF CALIFORNIA

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 consult with the National Science Foundation with respect to section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 or section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 with respect to any Environmental Impact Statement prepared pursuant to the “Notice of Intent to Prepare an Environmental Impact Statement and Initiate Section 106 Consultation for Proposed Changes to Arecibo Observatory Operations, Arecibo, Puerto Rico and Notice of Public Scoping Meetings and Comment Period”, published in the Federal Register May 23, 2016.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman

from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

□ 1930

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, the majority and the minority have agreed to these amendments being offered en bloc. They are amendments that address a variety of issues. Additionally, the sponsors of the amendments have agreed to consideration of these amendments en bloc. I urge the adoption of the amendments.

I yield back the balance of my time. Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I just oppose this. 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. CALVERT).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. RATCLIFFE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 84 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. 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 “Clean Energy Incentive Program Design Details” published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on June 30, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 42939 et seq.), or any rule of the same substance.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

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

Mr. Chairman, I am here today to offer a very simple amendment to restrict funding to the EPA for finalizing, implementing, administering, or enforcing its proposed rule called the Clean Energy Incentive Program Design Detail, or CEIP.

As many in this Chamber are aware, the United States Supreme Court issued an historic stay back in February on the EPA’s so-called Clean Power Plan, halting the EPA from proceeding on any plans to move forward this harmful and costly regulation, a regulation that would raise household electricity prices by up to 34 percent in some areas of our country.

Despite the Supreme Court ruling, we found that since the stay, the EPA has continued barreling forward, acting as if the Clean Power Plan will most certainly be upheld.

According to the EPA’s own documents, the final regulations of the Clean Power Plan already included the CEIP, meaning that the EPA’s decision to move forward on its implementation, would, in fact, be unlawful and clearly forbidden by the Supreme Court’s stay. Sadly, it is no surprise to many of us that the unelected bureaucrats at the EPA are once again choosing to ignore an order from the highest court in the land, but this amendment will stop the EPA from committing this blatant and unconstitutional violation.

I commend Chairman CALVERT for prohibiting funding to implement the Clean Power Plan in the underlying bill so we can ensure that the will of the Supreme Court and the provisions of the underlying bill are consistent in stopping the regulatory overreach of the EPA.

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, this amendment would prohibit the EPA from finalizing or implementing designs and details for the Clean Energy Incentive Program. The Clean Energy Incentive Program is voluntary. It is an option for States. States can choose whether or not to do it. It is not a mandate. The program provides incentives to develop renewable energy and energy efficiency projects.

The amendment is another example of some in the majority’s obstruction to anything that the EPA or this administration does to attempt to address climate change. This program is designed to diversify energy supplies used by power generation and provide cleaner power generation to improve air quality. This amendment is a job creator.

Let me highlight again, this program is designed to reward early investments in renewable energy generation and energy efficiency to reduce harmful emissions from electric-generated facilities. Many States have embraced this. Many States are voluntarily moving forward with this.

But this amendment seeks to remove the barriers that we are trying to bring down in low-income communities so that they are able to invest in renewable energy, they are able to help low-income customers reduce their energy bills; and that is what we should be working forward with States and with consumers who want to reduce their energy bills and reduce the effects of climate change.

I want to state again, State participation in this program is totally optional, so this amendment is another

attempt by some in the majority to block any action to address climate change and to continue this Nation's dependency on Big Oil. There is no reason to block a voluntary program from moving forward. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RATCLIFFE. Mr. Chairman, I once again encourage all Members to vote for my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Once again, Mr. Chairman, I can't stress enough, the Clean Energy Incentive Program is voluntary.

Why would we tell States that they couldn't choose to participate in something that will help their customers have lower utility bills, help with renewable energy, and help with the environment at the same time?

I urge my colleagues to strongly 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 Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE).

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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 85 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. 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 carry out the third sentence of section 107(f)(1) of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9607(f)(1)) (relating to use of recovered sums by the United States Government without further appropriation).

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, Natural Resource Trustees are Federal officials designated by the President to act on behalf of the public to assess potential damage to natural resources at certain sites.

These trustees are authorized to seek compensation for natural resource damages from responsible parties. Under the Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation and Liability Act, CERCLA, these funds collected by trustees are currently not subject to appropriation by Congress.

Unfortunately, in southeast Missouri, we have seen trustees run amuck. They have used money from settlements in places other than where the funds were intended to remedy, essentially resulting in land grabs by the Federal Government.

My amendment would provide congressional oversight in the Natural Resource Damage Assessment process by sending funds collected by the trustees under CERCLA back to the general funds of the Treasury.

This amendment is a necessary step in reining in overreach of the Federal Government and reasserting congressional authority, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would limit the Department of the Interior's ability to conduct damage assessments and inland oil spill preparedness by prohibiting the support of restoration work that is paid for by recovered settlement funds under the Superfund.

In fiscal year 2017, the Department of the Interior will receive nearly \$500 million from the Deepwater Horizon settlement. This amendment would prohibit the distribution of any of those funds to the impacted Gulf States.

The Department's inability to distribute jointly recovered funds to its co-trustees would have a devastating affect on strong Federal, State, Tribal cooperation that the Interior Department has developed over the years, and could lead to a reduction of future joint restoration settlements and a splintering of cooperative restoration efforts among co-trustees, and that would be a travesty.

The amendment could also create uncertainty about its impacts on authorities under CERCLA to retain recovered settlement funds and manage the \$800 million previously recovered in past settlements. This is a reckless amendment with far-reaching impacts.

If the Department of the Interior is unable to effectively administer its Natural Resource Damage Assessment program due to a change in its ability to use appropriated funds, it would likely have a significant effect on NOAA's own ability to effectively manage many of these cases, including the Deepwater Horizon. So I strongly oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is simple. It is about making sure elected Members of Congress appropriate funds that are collected under CERCLA instead of being delegated to unelected bureaucrats. It is not reckless. It is being responsible, and it is exerting our Article I authority of the power of the purse.

So I encourage this body to support the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I believe I have the right to close if the gentleman has no further speakers.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman is correct.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I would encourage this body to support this amendment. If they are in support of holding the power of the purse, support the Article I authority to make sure that Congress would actually appropriate the funds instead of an unelected bureaucrat.

This is just bringing back the power that has been delegated in the past and making sure that there is more congressional oversight when this money goes to the U.S. Treasury and that the appropriations process is done.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to state again that this would not allow the Department to distribute jointly recovered funds with co-trustees. It would have a devastating effect in the way the Federal, State, and Tribal governments work together and as they have worked together over the years. It could lead to a reduction of joint future restoration settlements and a splintering of cooperation restoration among co-trustees. And when people work together, we have better outcomes, we have better results, and that saves the taxpayers money.

This amendment would clearly limit the Department of the Interior's ability to conduct damage assessments and inland oil spill preparedness by prohibiting the support of restoration work that is paid for by recovered settlement funds under the Superfund. I recommend that the amendment be defeated.

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 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 Missouri will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 87 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. WESTERMAN. 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 the decision in Civil Action No. 14-1807 (JDB), United States District Court for the District of Columbia, issued March 29, 2016.

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. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of my amendment. My amendment would bar implementation of a Federal court decision issued on March 29, 2016, that stopped implementation of the 2014 U.S. Fish and Wildlife's decision to issue an Environmental Assessment extension for the issuance of depredation permits for double-crested cormorants.

Since 1998, Fish and Wildlife has allowed the issuance of depredation permits for cormorants that threaten commercially raised fish stocks.

In 2003, Fish and Wildlife issued the Public Resource Depredation Order through a final Environmental Impact Statement which allowed for the Federal Government, State officials, and tribal leaders to take cormorants found committing depredations of public supplies of fish.

Environmental Assessments in 2009 and 2014 renewed both of these depredation orders. On March 29, 2016, the U.S. Court for the District of Columbia issued a decision stopping implementation of the 2014 Environmental Assessment extension as a result of a special interest lawsuit.

In the meantime, Fish and Wildlife Service is beginning a new Environmental Assessment, but new depredation permits are not being issued to many farmers whose fish stocks are being depleted by cormorant populations. This is leading to considerable losses for farmers. Farmers are constantly living on the margin and just getting by.

My amendment prevents the use of funds by Fish and Wildlife for the enforcement of the March 29, 2016, court decision. It ensures that a successful depredation program continues so that our farmers continue to farm and feed America.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from California, Chairman CALVERT, for the opportunity to offer this amendment. I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. Let's stand up for small farmers in our communities who find themselves under constant pressure economically. They should not have to compete with bad rulings from activist judges.

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

□ 1945

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, in March 2015, the court found the Fish and Wildlife Service had violated

NEPA, in giving an open-ended approval for the lethal removal of the double-crested cormorant, and that they were committing or were about to commit predation on fish, saying that there was not current data or adequate analysis to support this depredation order. The court didn't stop depredation but required a mediation plan.

In May 2016, the court revoked these depredation orders stating that individual permits should be sufficient. The court noted in its decision that the service had ignored environmental benefits of the double-crested cormorants by controlling invasive species fish and economic disruption claims were imprecise, speculative, and not compelling.

This amendment seeks to ignore the findings of the court. In other words, this amendment would tell Fish and Wildlife you don't have to follow what the court said you needed to do, and it prevents the service from using appropriated funds to enforce a court's order on the taking of the double-crested cormorant.

This language does not affect the law's prohibition against the taking of migratory birds, and people who would take the cormorant would knowingly be violating the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and be subject to charges from wildlife officials or other law enforcement agencies.

So the gentleman might not like how the court ruled, but this is the ruling of the court. We are a society that follows the law, and Fish and Wildlife is compelled to comply with the court.

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

Mr. WESTMORELAND. Mr. Chairman, this is a unique situation where the Fish and Wildlife Service has already begun a new environmental assessment. In the meantime, there are fish farmers who are hurting because of this ruling as they are seeing their stock being eaten by these cormorants, with no recourse to take against them.

These cormorants not only affect fish farmers, they also affect smallmouth bass populations in the Lake States. These farmers should have the right to protect their crops while this new environmental assessment is being put in place, and I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment so that we can stand up for small farmers that are doing their best to feed our country.

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. WESTERMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider Amendment No. 88 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Representatives WESTMORELAND, COLLINS, and SMITH, I offer amendment No. 88.

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 pay legal fees pursuant to a settlement in any case, in which the Federal Government is a party, that arises under—

(1) the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7401 et seq.);

(2) the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 U.S.C. 1251 et seq.); or

(3) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

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, if this election cycle has shown us anything, it is that the American people are tired of our officials in Washington, D.C., not listening to the voice of the people. They are tired of a Federal bureaucracy that is accountable to no one and operates in the shadows without proper oversight.

The United States is facing a crisis of executive overreach, and nowhere else is this truer than at the Environmental Protection Agency. The EPA's escalation of sue and settle cases to change the law through Federal Court rulings threatens to shut down American businesses. By operating hand in hand with radical environmentalist groups that are willing participants in the scam, the EPA's use of sue and settle not only endangers the economy, but also our constitutional separation of powers.

According to a 2011 GAO report, between 1995 and 2010, three large environmental activist groups like the Sierra Club received almost \$6 million in attorney fees alone. Under our amendment, no funds can be used to pay legal fees under any settlement regarding any case arising under the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act, period. Litigants can still sue, but they will no longer be financially rewarded by the American taxpayer for their efforts.

I am hopeful that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will support this amendment to reduce the secretive transfer of U.S. tax dollars to private self-interest groups. It is inexcusable to allow this legal collusion.

By restricting Federal agencies from paying attorney fees, we will not only reduce Federal spending, but also reduce the incentive for these self-interest groups to continue suing the Federal Government and taking the American taxpayers' dollars.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment so that Congress can ensure taxpayers are protected from funding the legal efforts of special interest groups and reinforce our constitutional powers.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the Equal Access to Justice Act is the law of the land. It allows for the Federal payment of legal fees—within limits—to individuals, small businesses, and nonprofits where they are the prevailing parties in actions against Federal agencies unless the agency is able to show that the action was substantially justified or that special circumstances make the award unjust. This law helps deter government misconduct and encourages all parties—not just those with resources—to hire legal counsel to assert their rights.

Now, I know my colleagues, including my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, will agree with me that the ability to challenge Federal actions is the most important tool for ensuring government accountability.

The Clean Air Act, the Federal Water Pollution Control Act, and the Endangered Species Act are also the law of the land. These laws have contributed greatly to the protection and improvement of public health in this country.

A study by the nonpartisan Environmental Law Institute found that the Equal Access to Justice Act has been cost effective, and it only applies to the meritorious litigation and that existing legal safeguards and independent discretion of Federal judges continue to ensure its prudent application.

Here is a fact: the claim that large environmental groups are getting rich on attorney fees is simply not supported by available evidence. In 2011, the GAO did a study. It was requested by House Republicans on cases brought against the EPA. They found that most suits were brought by trade associations and private companies and that attorney fees were awarded only about 8 percent of the time. Among environmental plaintiffs, the majority of cases were brought by local groups rather than national groups. That is just a fact. It is completely unfair to target these important environmental safeguards for removal from the protections of the Equal Access to Justice Act.

But more importantly, this amendment would have a serious consequence on the public health. In order for our Nation's environmental safeguards to work properly and ensure the protection of public health, citizens—including those citizens with limited means—must have the ability to challenge Federal action. The Smith amendment is clearly designed to make it more difficult for citizens—every citizen—to ensure the accountability of the Federal Government.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

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

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may con-

sume to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in support of this amendment offered by my colleague from Georgia. The Constitution grants the power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper to Congress, not the executive branch. Yet many executive branch agencies are using sue and settle techniques to circumvent the rule-making process to enact overly broad and costly regulations, without any input or comment from the public.

One of the worst offenders is the EPA, which has increasingly relied on outside special interest groups to bring lawsuits demanding expanded regulations. And the EPA is all too willing to settle immediately.

My colleague's amendment would restrict the use of taxpayer dollars from paying the legal fees of these outside groups when suing the Federal Government under the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, or the Endangered Species Act.

This amendment does not prohibit affected parties from bringing these lawsuits, but restricting agencies' ability to pay attorney fees will reduce the incentive of using lawsuits as a way to expand the power of the executive branch.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, once again, I have the right to close, so I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Missouri has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, as the young lady across the aisle made note of the GAO report of 2011, also in that same report, as I noted, is that that report recognized that environmentalist groups such as the Sierra Club received almost \$6 million in settlement fees from just suing the government. Under no circumstances should the government be rewarding any group to sue the government on their behalf. They definitely don't do that to every individual citizen and to every small-business owner that is being targeted by the EPA where they are being targeted by other Federal agencies. This is about fairness, and this is making sure that self-interest groups are not profiting off of the Federal Government.

I encourage the body to support the amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I just want to state again that the GAO report clearly found that most suits were brought by trade associations and private companies and that attorney fees were only awarded about 8 percent of the time, and among environmental plaintiffs, the majority of those cases were brought by local groups rather than national groups.

So this amendment is clearly designed to make it much more difficult for citizens—my constituents—to ensure that there is accountability in the Federal Government so that they can have their day in court with being a plaintiff against the government when they feel it necessary.

I urge my colleagues to defeat 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 Missouri (Mr. SMITH).

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 Missouri will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 89 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. 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, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Oil and Gas and Sulphur Operations on the Outer Continental Shelf-Requirements for Exploratory Drilling on the Arctic Outer Continental Shelf" as published February 24, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 9916).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prevents funds from this act from being used to finalize, implement, or enforce the new Arctic regulations the Department of the Interior rushed to last week.

In addition to the billions of dollars already spent—\$7 billion—to develop these sales, these regulations would cost an additional \$2 billion for the oil and gas industry.

This regulation is nothing more than a tactic to lock safe Arctic energy development up in red tape because exploration would become full of unnecessary operational burdens.

The National Petroleum Council Arctic report found that Arctic resources

can be safely developed today using existing, field-proven technology. Locking up Arctic resources only hurts our Nation by preventing responsible energy development.

I ask my colleagues to support the State of Alaska, stand up for the Alaskan Natives of the North Slope who support this production in energy exploration, and vote “yes” on my amendment.

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

□ 2000

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BYRNE). The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. This amendment would block the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management from finalizing regulations that deal with exploratory drilling on the Arctic Outer Continental Shelf that has conducted mobile oil offshore drilling units. Oil and gas exploration on the Arctic Outer Continental Shelf is expensive and requires industry to make significant investments. Blocking this rule creates uncertainty for industry and other stakeholders. Delaying or inhibiting implementation of this rule will likely defer, rather than encourage, future Arctic exploration and development.

The amendment would also undermine efforts to protect Alaska Natives' health, livelihood, and cultural traditions. As we know, there are Alaska Natives that do have grave concerns about what is going on with oil drilling and exploration in Alaska.

The impact of a catastrophic oil spill would have extremely high cultural and societal costs to these Native Alaskans. The amendment would derail efforts to set specialized safety requirements and environmental precautions to account for the extreme environmental conditions, geography, and remoteness, like to fix infrastructure in existing operations in the Arctic Outer Continental Shelf.

The amendment stands in the way of efforts to reduce the risk of oil spill in an extreme sensitive environment where responding to any spill may be beyond current oil spill response capabilities. We need to protect our precious Arctic resources and ensure that they are managed responsibly.

Therefore, I must oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I can assure the young lady that the Natives of Alaska on the North Slope support this legislation. They want the development. They have talked about it. They have been really working close with the oil industry as partners. I think we ought to accept the fact that they are the most affected. If they want it, we ought to support it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I think this is something where people clearly in this Chamber know that the gentleman from Alaska and I are going to disagree on.

I will state for the RECORD that I have spoken with many Native Alaskans who do oppose this, so they are not all of one mind throughout Alaska on this issue. They are concerned about the effect an oil spill would have on their coastal and societal costs.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 90 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. 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 the Final Comprehensive Conservation Plan for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, Alaska for which notice of availability was published in the Federal Register on April 13, 2015 (80 Fed. 19678).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prevents funds from this act being used to implement a Department of the Interior management plan for the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, which designates the entirety as wilderness.

This would include the 1002 area that was set aside by Congress for potential development in the future, an area that holds 10 billion barrels of oil at the minimum and probably 37 trillion cubic feet of natural gas.

I am trying to do this because we already did this act. In the Alaska National Lands Act, we set that area aside. Now the Department that regulates it is trying to make it all wilderness with no drilling to take place.

I ask for a “yes” vote.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

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

I rise, respectfully, in opposition to this amendment offered by my friend and colleague from Alaska.

This amendment would block the implementation of the Comprehensive Conservation Plan for the Arctic Na-

tional Wildlife Refuge, a plan that will already have been in place for nearly 2 years by the time this language will take effect and a plan that received broad support upon its implementation.

At more than 19 million acres, the Arctic Refuge is one of the crown jewels of our Nation's public lands, and like Yellowstone and the Grand Canyon before it, this iconic landscape deserves to be protected for generations to come.

Included in the CCP is a recommendation for expanded wilderness designations which nearly 1 million people from all 50 States—including native, faith-based, business, and conservation groups—have submitted comments of support for.

The Arctic Refuge's Coastal Plain is the biological heart of the refuge, which the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service calls the “center for wildlife activity.”

The plan's current wilderness recommendation would ensure that these pristine habitats will remain intact for future generations. This is critical to supporting native wildlife and maintaining traditional and subsistence activities on the refuge.

Since President Eisenhower established the Arctic National Wildlife Range, Members of both parties have stood up to protect this truly unique national treasure. Republican Senator William Roth introduced the first bill to designate the refuge's Coastal Plain as wilderness in 1987.

A bill to protect this place as wilderness has been introduced every Congress since. And this Congress, 128 Members from both sides of the aisle have pledged their support.

I have the utmost respect for my friend and colleague Mr. YOUNG. I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, may I suggest to the gentleman that this was an act of Congress that set aside the 1002 area by the Senator from Washington State. That is crucially important because it is an area that has great potential 74 miles away from the existing pipeline. It also is an area that has the Village of Kaktovik that supports the drilling and development in 1002.

I am just saying that no agency has a right to overcome a law of the Congress. I am not talking about the 19 million acres. I am talking about the small acreage, a parcel no bigger than the Dulles Airport, to allow that to be continued to be considered by the Congress of the United States, who set it aside at the insistence of Scoop Jackson from Washington State with the help of Senator Ted Stevens and myself, for potential drilling. It has to have an act of Congress, but you can't drill in a wilderness area.

So I am saying no money shall be spent. No regulatory agency can turn

and make it an off-limits area to develop the oil if this Congress so decides.

I urge a “yes” on my amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN).

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman.

My friend from Alaska is correct. The ultimate decision and the final disposition of this incredible place is up to the Congress of the United States. However, the question before us now is how should this area be managed until Congress finally resolves this issue?

I am proud to have authored an amendment a few months back that showed that there is bipartisan support in the House for a final wilderness determination. I believe eventually that bipartisan support will be a majority of the Congress. But in the meantime, those of us that are working to protect this very important iconic place know that we are expressing the voice of the American people.

Nearly 1 million people commented in support of the wilderness recommendation. These are people from all 50 States. It includes Native Americans. It includes Native Alaskans. It includes people from the faith community, the business community, and the environmental community. This is a uniquely important place with wildlife that, in many cases, are not found anywhere else and with a connection for all of us of because the migratory bird species that spend part of their lives in the Coastal Plain of the Arctic Refuge travel to almost all 50 States in other parts of their life stage.

We all have a stake in this. We need to do the right thing. I believe the administration is doing the right thing by managing this area as wilderness while we continue to work on an act of Congress that will settle this longstanding question.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, all I can say is that most people don't know what they are talking about. We follow the laws of the Congress. We should. I respectfully suggest that I am not suggesting the whole—and I am not supporting it right now—the Arctic Wildlife Range, I am talking about 100,000 acres of land that we set aside—the Congress. The Senate agreed to it. The conference agreed to it. And here we are trying to let a regulatory agency tell us how to manage it. That is inappropriate.

I listened to another gentleman on this floor today talking about over-regulation of the EPA. That is what is wrong with this Nation today, is regulatory law allowing the executive branch to run this Nation without the people's voice being heard. That is what is happening here.

I respectfully urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have had the opportunity to be up in this area, and this protected area en-

compasses a wide range of Arctic and sub-Arctic ecosystems. The native flora and fauna is magnificent. The refuge is incredible with its biological diversity.

I understand that the gentleman from Alaska feels strongly about this issue in a way that I feel differently about and that he has been an advocate for his State for decades, but on this important issue, we just simply disagree.

Lastly, I would be remiss if I didn't point out one more obvious truth. The President will not sign a bill loaded up with anti-environmental riders just like this one. We only make our path for this bill harder by including it. I hope my colleagues would join me in opposing it.

I yield back the balance of my time. The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

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 Alaska will be postponed.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLEAVER) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. CLEAVER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the World War I Centennial Commission.

The United States entered World War I in 1917. More than 4 million Americans served in the Great War, including 350,000 African Americans and the first woman ever to enlist in the United States Armed Forces.

In order to properly commemorate and celebrate the brave service these Americans gave to us, the World War I Centennial Commission was established by this body in 2013. In addition to the memorial, the Commission is responsible for planning and executing educational and commemorative activities.

I ask the Chair and ranking member to work with me as this bill progresses to find the necessary resources for the Commission to do its work. While it is true that there are no World War I veterans still among us, their sacrifice must not be forgotten.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming my time, I pledge to work with the gentleman.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

I understand and share the gentleman's interest in the World War I Centennial Commission. The committee may be willing to consider funds for the Commission to carry out its mis-

sion, but we need to make sure that the process is open and transparent.

Report language accompanying this bill encourages the Commission to submit a budget request in the future so that we might review it in detail. The Commission will serve as the lead organizer for the Nation's commemorative event so that America can tell the story of the Great War that profoundly shaped our history.

I agree with the gentleman from Missouri that the work of the Commission is important and look forward to working with the gentleman on this issue.

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

□ 2015

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 91 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. 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 by the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service—

(1) to issue a final rule for the proposed regulations listed under docket number FWS-R7-NWRS-2014-0005; or

(2) to implement the final rule entitled “Alaska; Hunting and Trapping in National Preserves” and dated (80 Fed. Reg. 64325 (October 23, 2015)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits the funds in this act from being used to issue the final rule by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, which would seize authority away from the Alaskan Fish and Game of the State of Alaska to manage fish and wildlife for both nonsubsistence and subsistence uses on Federal wildlife refuges in Alaska. In addition, this amendment prohibits funds to be used on the existing National Park Service rule that interferes with State wildlife management authority on national preserve lands, which is guaranteed hunting under the Alaska National Lands Act in Alaska.

The two rules in question violate the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, the ANILCA, passed by Congress and signed into law in 1980, which protects the ability of the State

of Alaska to manage wildlife across the State on State, private, and Federal lands. This Chamber voted in favor of a similar amendment and this language in the sportsmen's package, H.R. 2604, back in February.

These regulations are nothing more than an illegal overreach of the Federal Government on the State of Alaska. It is agreed in the Constitution, and it is in the law that they manage all fish and game on all lands in the State of Alaska.

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, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CÁRDENAS).

Mr. CÁRDENAS. I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Mr. Chairman, I stand to strongly oppose this amendment.

This amendment would block Federal rules aimed at protecting wolves, wolverines, black bears, grizzly bears, and lynx from some of the most egregious hunting and killing methods. These methods include shooting defenseless, swimming caribou from motorboats; using airplanes to scout and shoot grizzly bears; luring grizzlies with rotting meat and pet food to get a point-blank kill; killing wolf, black bear, and coyote mothers and their dependent pups and cubs at their dens; and the trapping of grizzly and black bears with steel-jawed leg-hold traps and wire snares. These methods are inhumane and contrary to our values here in this great country.

We should support the scientists, rangers, and wildlife managers in the Fish and Wildlife Service and National Park Service in their efforts to maintain healthy ecosystems.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" and strike this poison pill rider from this bill. These are egregious things that we should not tolerate, and we should not codify them in law.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I am deeply disappointed in the comments that were just made because all he said was not true. The State does not den; the State does not snare; the State does not trap; the State does not kill wantonly. The State manages. To have the Federal Government manage the game when it is the law and when it is in the Constitution of the State of Alaska—an agreement made with this body—and to have an agency take that over and with the propaganda that has been espoused on this floor from the Humane Society is inappropriate of this body. It is a flat-out lie. That is what it is. It is not true.

The State manages, and they have not used these practices, but they have a right and should have a right to manage the fish and game on the property which was guaranteed to us.

I understand where this pressure is coming from. We in Alaska face this every day. No one understands that we have people in Alaska and that we have natives in Alaska who actually want the State to manage their fish and game or who would like to manage it by themselves, which I do support; but to have the Federal Government come in is wrong, and it is against our Constitution. I will stand by this amendment to stop moneys being spent by an agency that has overreached.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

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

I respect the concern of the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and his advocacy for his State, but I oppose this proposal which, in this case, does not present an opportunity for a balanced approach to wildlife management. Let me clarify why the National Wildlife Refuge is proposing these rules.

According to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, certain types of inhumane hunting, such as bear baiting and den hunting, has affected Federal refuge areas for wildlife. In fact, one refuge in the Kenai Peninsula had an emergency closing due to the extreme decrease in the number of brown bears, which was caused by these inhumane hunting practices.

Rather than shutting down areas in which these hunting methods are causing the overkilling of native Alaskan predators and restricting access to all hunters, it seems reasonable to me to provide for a balanced approach that provides for a means of traditional, permit-based hunting.

Nothing in the rule of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service would limit traditional hunting tactics, but, rather, it would continue and protect existing hunting practices. Unfortunately, this amendment does not address the wildlife diversity and mechanisms in place to maintain it. Therefore, it impacts the National Wildlife Refuge's ability to maintain its parks in a responsible manner and provide native animals with a refuge.

We as Members of Congress have a Federal responsibility to ensure that our National Wildlife Refuges are being used in the most responsible manner possible. The very agency Congress has vested with the responsibility to manage our wildlife thinks these killing tactics pose a threat to the necessary diversity of the wildlife, and I agree with them.

I urge my colleagues to support the ability of the Fish and Wildlife Service to effectively manage our National Wildlife Refuges for future generations of Americans. I urge a "no" vote on the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments from the gentleman.

I will say, though, that all of these instances that have been referred to have not happened under State management. I suggest, respectfully, that the Fish and Wildlife is no longer a manager of fish and wildlife. They have become people who prohibit activity on the refuges. That was not why these refuges were made. They were made by the people who hunt and fish, and now we are having other groups that say this is inhumane, which has nothing to do with it.

I am a little bit shocked that we are reading the thing from the Humane Society, PETA, and all of these other groups. Those are not the true facts. I ask the gentleman to, please, look at the true facts.

Management is crucial to the State of Alaska. As I mentioned before, we ought to really think about, maybe, management by the native corporations on their lands, too; but in having the Federal Government manage, it has done a miserable job of the management of game. Their idea of management is to just leave them walking around and to let nature take care of it. I happen to know a little bit about nature, and it doesn't take care of it. We are just talking about management, and the State has that right under its constitution; so I urge a "yes" vote on my amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment circumvents the established rulemaking process, which solicits public input and uses the best available science to reach a decision. Alaska's aggressive predatory control practices and disregard for science-based management in the approach of the Service would negatively impact the stability of the ecosystems and wildlife throughout the region.

Thirty-one biologists and scientists stated on March 28, 2016, in a letter to Interior Secretary Jewell and Service Director Ash:

The most current and best available science is clear that predator control measures that are intended to restore the herd, such as moose and caribou, are doomed to failure because the herds need to access nutrition. Their main limiting factor is Alaska's intensive management scheme, which is the wrong approach to conserving natural systems.

I urge my colleagues to 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 Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 92 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. 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 remove Arctic Sales 255, 258, and 262 from the 2017–2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Program for which notice of availability was published on March 18, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 14881).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. YOUNG of Alaska asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It prevents funding from this act to be used to remove 3 Arctic Sales that have already taken place from the 2017–2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Program.

The economic benefits that would be associated with offshore development in the Beaufort and Chukchi Seas are tremendous. In those two areas alone, we have the potential to produce about 23.6 billion barrels of oil and 104 trillion cubic feet of natural gas. Potentially creating 54,700 jobs nationwide will generate billions of dollars in revenue for the State and local governments. May I suggest, respectfully, that this money can be used in conservation efforts, in land and water conservation funds. You can't have that program without the development of oil; yet everybody I know on that side supports the program.

The second thing is, if I can say one thing, we sit with our heads in the sand when, across the border, China and the other nations are developing. We must, in fact, be part players of this program. We need to do it wisely and to do it safely and to do it for the benefit of the American people.

Now, if you don't believe in fossil fuels, I understand that, but there is no way that we are not going to be using fossil fuels for many years to come. If we are to do so, let's use that which is safe. We have already proven it can be done safely in the Arctic. It is not the frontier that people think it is. It is 150 feet deep. If we don't do this off our shores, it will be done by foreign countries.

I am asking the Department of the Interior not to withdraw those sales. It means money to the Treasury; it means we have less of a dependence on foreign oil; and it means we will be actively involved. When other countries are involved, we will be there with our equipment, and we will be able to have an oil spill recovery if they spill the oil, because they will not. I know how the parties play in this. We will. I urge the adoption of my amendment.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would mandate that the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management include specific areas in the Alaska region of the Outer Continental Shelf in its 2017–2022 lease schedule. This amendment would undermine the Bureau's fundamental mission to manage the development of offshore resources in an environmentally and economically responsible manner.

The 2017–2022 Outer Continental Shelf Oil and Gas Leasing Proposed Program was proposed in March of this year, and the public comment only closed a few weeks ago. The Bureau is required by law to consider the environmental impacts of the leasing decision. This includes a comprehensive Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement. It is inappropriate to circumvent this process.

Lease sales should be informed by sound science and by using the best data available. This amendment would violate multiple environmental statutes, including NEPA, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Coastal Zone Management Act. The amendment undermines the environmental protection that is required by law. Therefore, I must oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, these leases were put up for lease in 2017–2022. We are not asking for any additional new leases. We are asking for the leases that remain in the sales. Then we address the environmental issue as the sales take place before we have development. I am suggesting, respectfully, if we don't have those areas open, the 3 Arctic Sale areas, then the leases will not be issued in any other area.

Oil is not where you want it to be—it is where it is. I am saying we can address all of the issues the gentleman is concerned with after the sales take place and we receive the money. If it can't be done safely, it can be stopped at that time. This happened with Shell.

I am just saying not to let an agency or an administration get ahead of itself and say, "Oh, we are going to take the leases back." That is the prerogative of an agency, yes; but the leases were put up to begin with, so we ought to take and accept that. Let's go through the process, and the process will follow through. Then we will decide on the environmental impact, on the culture. Then we will have the way to do it right and correctly.

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, obviously, we disagree once again.

My concern is that this amendment would mandate the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management to include specific areas in the 2017–2022 lease sale schedule and that the Bureau needs to up-

hold the law. It is required to follow the law and to consider the environmental impacts of leasing decisions. This amendment would also violate, as I pointed out, quite a few statutes: NEPA, the Marine Mammal Protection Act, the Endangered Species Act, and the Coastal Zone Management Act.

Therefore, I must oppose the amendment.

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

□ 2030

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

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 Alaska will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 93 printed in House Report 114–683.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. 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 Department of the Interior to require changes to an existing placer mining plan of operations with regard to reclamation activities, including revegetation, or to modify the bond requirements for the mining operation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple. This is an area called the Forty Mile Mining District area in the State of Alaska that has been mined since 1895.

There was an attempt by the BLM to go in and stop this mining. These are not large mines. These are mom-and-pop operations, placer operations. They put down ridiculous regulations and reclamation now, and they want them to reclaim the land back to the original state before it was ever mined, not of the disturbance of the mining they were doing. It is amazing to me that they would even think about doing this.

I am talking about people who have been there for 20 years, most of them retired. They are really, if I have to say anything, the mom-and-pops of Alaska; they are the spirit of Alaska.

All of a sudden, they have a big agency coming in and saying: You have to

have a reclamation area, and this is the way that we want it done.

Yet, they don't recognize what has been done in the past and how it has worked. What they are proposing is wrong, and it costs a considerable amount of money to these small mom-and-pop miners.

One of our big plaques in the State of Alaska is the gold pan. Yet, we have this agency coming in for 140 acres. That is all they are talking about. For some reason, they got an idea that we want to put them out of business.

I am just saying, no, they should not impose these regulations. Follow the State mining law, and the reclamation that takes place now works. Let them continue to do that, and we can reclaim the land. They are agreeable to that. They just can't do what they are asking them to do because they can't afford to do it. It is that simple.

This is a simple amendment to try and protect mom-and-pop operations in the State of Alaska like you would do in your State for any other operation where the Federal Government is coming in and trying to take it away.

I urge a "yes" vote on this 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, most of the 186 active mining operations on the BLM—these are Federal managed lands in Alaska—are placer mining operations.

Between 4 and 800 miles of BLM Federal managed streams have historic or active placer mining impacts, and there is a legacy of historic claims with reduced ecosystem function.

Now, BLM continues various outreach activities, including public meetings and interactions with individual miners, and is working with industry to incorporate best practice management and to use new science-based reclamation techniques to accelerate stream recovery.

I hear what the gentleman is saying about State lands and State recovery. And what the State of Alaska chooses to do with recovery in its own State boundaries is one thing, but these are Federal lands. In the course of reclamation activities, it may be necessary to increase an annual cost to miners to recover these streams and restore the ecosystem function.

The amendment prohibits assessing the cost of reclaiming these areas to placer miners who are profiting from Federal mineral extraction on federally managed lands, BLM lands. So the taxpayers all across this country should not be shouldering the burden of these restoring costs. The responsible party should. So that is why I strongly oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest one thing to the

gentlewoman; we are only talking about 49 families. This is small. I am not talking about all the other placer mining. This is, in fact, the Forty Mile Miners. I mean, they have been there forever.

Like I say, you can go there and it is like looking into a museum of 1859. And they are patented claims. It is their land. A lot of it is State land.

They are claiming it because it is placer mining. The BLM is claiming they have the authority to impose a reclamation system that does not work.

Did they consult? No.

I am just saying, keep in mind that we are not talking about corporations. We are not talking about large industry. We are talking about, very frankly, if you go up there—and I wish you would—you will find out they are a pretty good group of older Alaskans, some hippies. We still have a few of those left. And they are not making any money.

This is an occupation, but if they have to do what the BLM is suggesting they do—by the way, there are fish in that stream now, and it was mined in 1895. What they are asking, it will break them. They can't do it, and you will say good.

Well, that is taking people—this is a huge area, the total area. That, I am not arguing. I am just talking about this little Forty Mile group. So give them a break. Let them go out and make enough money to buy Saturday night party time.

I urge the passage of my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alaska has convinced me of one thing: I need to go back to Alaska, and I need to spend some time with you there.

I still oppose this amendment. The American taxpayer should not be accepting the burden of restoration costs to make sure that these waterways are reclaimed to how they should be.

I continue 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 Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CALVERT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 820, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 108, 109, 110, 112, 115, 117, 121, 124, 125, and 126 printed in House Report 114-683, offered by Mr. CALVERT of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 108 OFFERED BY MR. BLUMENAUER OF OREGON

Page 16, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 38, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 109 OFFERED BY MR. CLYBURN OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 16, lines 4 and 24, after each dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 38, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MR. COHEN OF TENNESSEE

Page 16, lines 4 and 23, after each dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 38, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 112 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

Page 72, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

Page 73, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 115 OFFERED BY MR. KILDEE OF MICHIGAN

Page 81, line 18, insert "or if a Federal or State emergency declaration has been issued due to a threat to public health from heightened exposure to lead in a municipal drinking water supply before the date of enactment of this Act: *Provided further*, That in a State in which such an emergency declaration has been issued, the State may use more than 20 percent of the funds made available under this title to the State for Drinking Water State Revolving Fund capitalization grants to provide additional subsidy to eligible recipients" before the semicolon at the end.

AMENDMENT NO. 117 OFFERED BY MS. MENG OF NEW YORK

Page 120, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: "(reduced by \$300,000) (increased by \$300,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 121 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL OF NEW YORK

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 Department of the Interior, the Environmental Protection Agency, or any other Federal agency to lease or purchase new light duty vehicles for any executive fleet, or for an agency's fleet inventory, except in accordance with Presidential Memorandum—Federal Fleet Performance, dated May 24, 2011.

AMENDMENT NO. 124 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of bill, before the short title, add the following new section:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act for the "DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR—NATIONAL PARK SERVICE—NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION" may be used in contravention of section 320101 of title 54, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 125 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to eliminate the Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnership.

AMENDMENT NO. 126 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to limit outreach programs administered by the Smithsonian Institution.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PIN-GREE) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, the majority and the minority have agreed to these amendments en bloc. They are noncontroversial amendments that affect a variety of issues. Additionally, the sponsors of the amendments have agreed to consideration of these amendments en bloc.

I urge adoption of the amendments. I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman from Maine, the ranking member, and the chairman of the subcommittee for their kindness and their support of the Jackson Lee amendments.

Let me indicate that in the sum total of my amendments, amendments Nos. 124, 125, and 126, my amendments promote support for national historic areas in our Nation, promote partnership strategies in preserving our urban life refuges, and promote outreach programs by the Smithsonian Institution on the fantastic historical and artistic knowledge of our Smithsonian houses, which facilitate an appreciation for America all over the world.

In particular, my amendment No. 124 is an amendment that expresses support for the national historic areas and for the continuation of a national policy of preserving for public use historic sites, buildings, and other objects of national significance.

My amendment No. 125 is an amendment that would prohibit the use of funds to eliminate the urban wildlife refuge partnership. Additionally, there is an amendment that would prohibit the use of funds to limit outreach administered by the Smithsonian.

The idea behind these three amendments is to, again, recognize the great history of this Nation, even as young as this country is. In particular, in my congressional district, we have Freedmen's Town that had Camp Logan. It was a place of freed African American slaves, which grew into an amazing community. In addition, the Allen Brothers, who founded Houston, are buried in that same neighborhood.

In addition to that, we have something called the Juneteenth Trail. That is the trail the slaves traveled from Galveston up to Houston. The trail has an enormous amount of history, and that is part of the history of celebrating Juneteenth. To preserve that history is very important.

In the second amendment, I want to make sure that we maintain a program that helps and introduces urban youth to the wonders of wildlife and historic preservation.

Finally, I think it is important that we recognize the historic importance of the Smithsonian and continue to emphasize its outreach capacity to ensure that it reaches Americans of all levels to speak about the story of this great Nation.

My amendments, again, ask these simple questions: Is our history worthy of knowing, studying, and preserving?

It is.

Is it important to work with our State and local governments to help them preserve their history?

My amendments answer that question by supporting policies that will work with State and local governments that will reach out to urban youth so they can understand the wildlife preservation through the urban wildlife refuge programs, and then, of course, the Smithsonian that provides an eye to the history of this Nation.

I ask my colleagues to support Jackson Lee amendment Nos. 124, 125, and 126 in the en bloc amendment.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for making in order Jackson Lee Amendments Number 124, along with my other Amendments Number 125 and Number 126 to H.R. 5538—"Department of the Interior and the Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2017."

I also commend Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their leadership in shepherding this measure to the Rules Committee.

Mr. Chair, in sum, my Amendment promotes support for National Historic Areas in our nation.

Indeed, among other agencies, this measure funds the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park System, and the Smithsonian Institution, which operates our national museums including the National Zoo.

Most Americans do not know that this measure also funds a very special agency, the National Trust for Historic Preservation, and its adjunct, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation.

Mr. Chair, the Jackson Lee Amendments are simple because they send a very important message from the Congress of the United States: that we value tradition, that we think about the impact of history and tradition on future generations to come and that if we recognize and know our history, we are able to work together as an American family in the spirit of respect, unity and growth.

Specifically, Jackson Lee Amendment Number 124 encourages us to preserve history, whereby the National Historic Preservation Fund and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation are charged to redouble their efforts to assist state and local governments and community groups in identifying and working to preserve nationally significant sites, structures, and artifacts, for example those relating to communities founded by newly emancipated slaves, such as Freedmen's Town in home District of Houston, Texas.

Indeed, just west of downtown Houston lies the Fourth Ward.

It is the city's oldest African American community, but before it was the Fourth Ward, this community was known by its original name, Freedmen's Town, given by freed slaves who settled it shortly after receiving the news of their emancipation on Juneteenth.

Freedmen's Town prospered during the turn of the century.

Economic, community, and social development were at a peak until local government became threatened by the prosperity of this area and its residents.

In the 1920's, Freedmen's Town was the "Harlem of the Southwest."

The area was filled with many restaurants, jazz spots, and night clubs.

As the years passed and with the coming of integration, many of Freedmen's Town residents began to move towards Texas Southern University, in the Third Ward, and other areas of the city.

Freedmen's Town has a rich and colorful past and is still home to many significant historical landmarks and features.

It was famous for its hand laid brick streets, constructed by Houston's Rev. Jeremiah Smith and his congregation over half a century ago.

Houston's first cemetery, Founder's Cemetery at Valentine and West Dallas, contains the graves of military men who fought in the Civil War, as well as the historical remains of John and Augustus Allen, the founders of Houston.

Behind Founder's Cemetery lies Congregation Beth Israel, the oldest Jewish cemetery in Houston, which is beautifully maintained to this day.

Among other historical churches in the area, Antioch Missionary Baptist Church built in 1866 continues to be a major focal point of Freedmen's Town, though it has been relocated from its original site on "Baptist Hill" where the Music Hall and Coliseum now stand.

Rev. John Jack Yates, the first Black pastor of Antioch, was a dynamic and influential leader known for his deep commitment to the education of Black youngsters.

He often used his personal finances to send Freedmen's Town children to school.

Today, Jack Yates High School in the Third Ward stands in his honor.

Although Freedmen's Town is a nationally registered historical site, and the largest intact freed slave settlement left in the entire nation, its official designation protects only 40 of the 80 blocks or more of the remaining Freedmen's Town area.

To preserve what remains of Freedmen's Town will require the combined efforts of community groups working with local, state, and federal government to reach a consensus of projects worthy of preservation.

One such project for Freedmen's Town is the "Bricks Street Project," which is intended to preserve the original brick pavers of Freedmen's Town along Andrews Street and Wilson Street.

These streets were found to contain brick pavers patterns which may be unique to the Freedmen's Town area, and are consistent with brick patterns seen on architectural features located in the Historic District.

Mr. Chair, hearts break when irreplaceable structures are destroyed or damaged beyond repair, instead of preserved and protected as they deserve.

A plaque pointing out "on this site a great building once stood" simply cannot tell the story in whole or in full.

Equally tragic is the loss of traditions: a way of living or crafting wood or farming, of celebrating holidays or worshipping or feasting on "Juneteenth" cuisine.

The preservation of artifacts as well as traditions is important to telling the story of the people who settled a community.

Thus, I urge support for Jackson Lee Amendment Number 124.

Mr. Chair, I would also like to thank Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for making in order Jackson Lee Amendment Number 125 to H.R. 5538—"Department of the Interior and the Environment

and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2017.”

I also comment Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their leadership in shepherding this measure to the Rules Committee.

Mr. Chair, in sum, my Amendment promotes partnership strategies in preserving our urban wildlife refuges.

Jackson Lee Amendment Number 125 prohibits the utilization of funds to eliminate Urban Wildlife and Refugee Partnerships.

According to some estimates, 80 percent of the U.S. population currently resides in urban communities, and the challenge before us is ensuring our natural resources are conserved and valued by the American people and that our youth are beneficiaries of Urban Wildlife and Refugee partnerships.

Thus, Jackson Lee Amendment Number 125 works to facilitate the nurturing and education of Americans, especially our youth on the imperative of exposure to urban wildlife and refugee facilities across our nation.

Picture this: nature meets skyline near Houston’s Buffalo Bayou, one of many sites where Texas works with Houston Wilderness to create shared conservation messages and strategies.

Indeed, I commend the work of the Houston Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnership, in Texas.

Additionally, the Texas Mid-Coast Refuge Complex will work with Houston Wilderness, an alliance of business, environmental and government interests, to create a coordinated conservation presence in the metro area.

Moreover, young people deserve exposure to the educational opportunities and excitement these urban wildlife and refugee parks have to offer, where their minds are developed and enriched; indeed, where they get to interact with and see wildlife they have read about in their school books.

Urban wildlife and refugee parks spark creativity in a healthy dose for the imagination of our young people so that they have an appreciation of nature and all the beautiful inhabitants it offers us.

From Houston, to Rhode Island to Baltimore, to Chicago and everywhere in between, young people have the opportunity to spearhead replanting projects along various rivers; learn about birding and be partners and stakeholders in their communities’ parks and zoos while also sharpening their minds.

For all these reasons, I urge support for Jackson Lee Amendment Number 125.

Mr. Chair, I would also like to thank Chairman SESSIONS and Ranking Member SLAUGHTER for making in order Jackson Lee Amendment Number 126 to H.R. 5538—“Department of the Interior and the Environment and Related Agencies Appropriations Act of 2017.”

I also commend Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their leadership in shepherding this measure to the Rules Committee.

Mr. Chair, in sum, my Amendment promotes outreach programs by the Smithsonian Institution on the fantastic historical and artistic knowledge our Smithsonian houses and facilities an appreciation for America and the world over.

Specifically, Jackson Lee Amendment Number 126 prohibits funds to be utilized to limit outreach programs administered by the Smithsonian Institution.

As I mentioned earlier, the Smithsonian Institution operates as our national museum and

attracts not only Americans and American youth but also dignitaries from across the globe, from Africa to Asia to Europe and everywhere in-between.

Indeed, our historical Smithsonian Institution has attracted intellectuals, kings, dignitaries and youth from across the country and others who have come from afar to witness in person the diversity of the art housed in our Smithsonian Institution, the world’s largest museum and research complex which includes 19 museums and galleries and the National Zoological Park.

No doubt, these Museums have enriched our lives: the African American History and Culture Museum, African Art Museum, the Air and Space Museum, the Air and Space Museum Udvar-Hazy Center, American Art Museum, the American History Museum, the American Indian Museum, Anacostia Community Museum, the Arthur M. Sackler Gallery, Freer Gallery of Art, Hirshhorn Museum and Sculpture Garden, the National Zoo, the Natural History Museum, the Portrait Gallery, Postal Museum and the Renwick Gallery.

By promoting and protecting the buildings, landscape, special places and qualities that enrich and captivate the exceptional American imagination, attracting visitors from across the globe, we preserve our history for future generations to come and educate the general public about American history.

For all these reasons, I urge support for Jackson Lee Amendment Number 126.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member and the chairman of the committee and subcommittee for their work on this very important issue.

This en bloc amendment includes two amendments that I offered that would provide specific relief to my hometown. Many of you have heard me on the floor of this House talk about the incredible challenge that my hometown of Flint, Michigan, faces.

Through no fault of its own, during a time when a State-appointed emergency manager was literally running every aspect of city government, a terrible decision, a thoughtless and really not science-based decision was made to use river water to replace water from the Great Lakes as the drinking water source. That decision caused a series of events that led to lead leaching into the water and, quite literally, poisoning a city of 100,000 people. The impact of this event will be long felt in my hometown.

We all have an obligation. Even though the principal responsibility lies with the State, we all have an obligation to contribute to the efforts that this city will painfully go through in order to recover. The amendments within this en bloc amendment that I offered will help.

The committee has already done great work to provide some flexibility to States in administering the clean drinking water revolving loan fund, the state revolving loan fund, which in this

case would provide the State of Michigan with tools to assist the City of Flint in making the kinds of changes to its water system to prevent this from ever happening again and correct the problem in the first place.

There is another amendment that would actually allow the city some help in transitioning to a permanent water source derived from Lake Huron and away from dependence on either the Detroit water system or this river water, which was the source of the problem.

I will just say this: It will take a lot more to fix this problem and a lot of commitment from the State and the Federal Government, but it means a lot to the people back home.

I just want to express my gratitude to the ranking member and to Chairman CALVERT for their work on this. It will help my hometown of Flint, but it will also potentially be of value to other communities facing water emergencies.

I urge my colleagues to support this en bloc amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support the en bloc amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Ms. MENG. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman CALVERT for supporting this amendment as well as my friend, Ranking Member MCCOLLUM. Thank you to you both.

Mr. Chair, this amendment reduces the Smithsonian Institution account on page 120, line 23, of the bill by \$300,000, and then increases it by the same amount. The purpose of the amendment is to ensure that the Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center receives a \$300,000 increase over last year’s enacted funding amount, consistent with the President’s request in his fiscal year 2017 budget.

The Congressional Budget Office scored this amendment as budget neutral, and more than enough money exists in the \$515,000 increase to the Smithsonian’s ‘Administration’ account, which funds the Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center, to accomplish the goal of my amendment.

Frankly speaking, I do not care where the Committee, or the Board of Regents, wish to reallocate funds from, I only wish to seek assurance that the Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center will receive the \$300,000 increase it so justly deserves. Thank you again, Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM, for agreeing to this funding level moving forward.

According to the Smithsonian’s budget justification to Congress, these additional funds will be used to provide for the salaries and benefits of one associate program director, one curator for Asian Pacific studies, and one education coordinator.

With the addition of three additional staff, the Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center will be able to continue to serve as the leading voice on the Asian Pacific American experience, as well as host events in cities across the country.

Mr. Chair, I believe the Smithsonian Asian Pacific American Center deserves our support, and I thank everyone in this Chamber this evening for agreeing with me.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

□ 2045

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 94 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. ZELDIN. 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 declare a national monument under section 320301 of title 54, United States Code, in the exclusive economic zone of the United States established by Proclamation Numbered 5030, dated March 10, 1983.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to bar funding for the creation of any national marine monuments in the EEZ through Presidential proclamation. I do this on behalf of commercial fishermen on Long Island and throughout the Nation who, like so many other hardworking Americans, are increasingly under assault from the executive overreach of this administration.

This amendment uses the power of the purse to ensure the President does not abuse the Antiquities Act to lock out commercial fishermen from portions of the EEZ that contain essential fisheries. Any efforts to create a marine-protected area must be done through the transparent process laid out by Magnuson-Stevens, not through executive fiat that threatens to put thousands of hardworking men and women out of business.

The Antiquities Act has been an effective tool in the past to preserve historic sites like the Statue of Liberty, but the overly broad interpretation of this law held by the current administration is threatening to shut down thousands of square miles of ocean from fishing through a Presidential proclamation.

In the northwest Atlantic, ocean fishermen from my district and throughout this region work in some of the most productive fishing areas in the world. This area is currently under consideration for a marine monument designation with little public input and zero transparency. The concerns regarding the marine monument designations reach nationwide, where the administration's closed and secretive process have left fishermen and regional fishery managers extremely concerned.

Recent marine monument designations proclaimed by the Obama administration have been the largest in U.S. history, locking out all fishing in perpetuity, a severe departure from the original intent of the Antiquities Act to preserve historical sites and archaeological treasures.

Mr. Chairman, protecting the seafood economy, coastal communities, and the hardworking men and women who provide for their families through commercial fishing is a top priority for my constituents on the east end of Long Island.

I would like to thank Chairman CALVERT and Chairman BISHOP for their support of this amendment to rein in executive overreach on behalf of America's fishermen. I urge all my colleagues to support this critical amendment.

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

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 yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS).

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, since Theodore Roosevelt's designation of our first national monument, Devil's Tower in Wyoming, 16 Presidents from both parties have used the Antiquities Act to protect more than 160 of America's best known and loved landscapes. Only three Presidents have not.

Many national monuments created through the Antiquities Act have since become some of our greatest national parks, like Zion, Bryce Canyon, Death Valley, Joshua Tree, and Glacier Bay to name a few. All of these parks were first national monuments that Congress decided warranted national park status.

The Antiquities Act has also been used on a bipartisan basis to preserve Federal marine areas as marine national monuments, with both President George W. Bush and President Obama using the Antiquities Act to protect some of the most unique and vulnerable areas of the Pacific Ocean.

To be clear, the Antiquities Act may only be used on existing Federal lands and waters, areas which belong to all Americans and are typically designated only after an extensive locally driven stakeholder outreach process. Instead of honoring this long bipartisan history of the Antiquities Act that has saved so much for our country, this amendment would foreclose any opportunity for local communities to seek to protect their regions' most valued marine resources located in Federal waters.

We have a generational responsibility to ensure that historic and cultural resources and important conservation areas found on our Nation's public lands and waters are available to future generations. I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and to help protect our Nation's most

treasured public resources through the Antiquities Act.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER), also a member of the subcommittee.

Mr. KILMER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Antiquities Act has protected some of our most extraordinary landscapes. In my neck of the woods, it was central to the creation of Olympic National Park. It is a big deal for our oceans, too. President George W. Bush and President Obama both used the act to create marine national monuments and to help vulnerable ecosystems in our waters.

Like our forests, the ocean is an essential resource that matters to livelihoods and to the health of our planet, and we need to be sure they are around for future generations, including my daughters. But this amendment would deny any President, regardless of party, the ability to use the Antiquities Act to create marine national monuments.

The Zeldin amendment would put more than 4.5 million square miles out of reach of protection and would curb our Nation's ability to show the world that we care about our waters. We have seen the benefits of protecting sensitive areas that are at risk. It helps drive tourism while protecting fish populations that are essential to fisheries and coastal communities.

The Nation's leading aquariums support protection of unique and vulnerable ocean areas, as do hundreds of thousands of people, hundreds of scientists, educators, businessowners, boaters, surfers, beachgoers, and members of faith-based organizations, together with conservation organizations representing millions of people.

The Antiquities Act was created 110 years ago. Rather than engaging in an attack on this law, I urge my colleagues to join me and the American people in celebrating our shared history and its 110th anniversary. Vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, if the President was to designate the Plum Island Lighthouse tonight under the Antiquities Act, I would certainly welcome that, as in all the past precedent of important use and historical use of the Antiquities Act for good reason.

I introduced this amendment on behalf of all those commercial fishermen, those hardworking commercial fishermen all along the northwest Atlantic concerned that, if this marine monument is enacted by this President, they will be put out of business.

I look forward to working with all of my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, especially from this region, who are concerned both with the important desire for conservation, the important work of protecting and utilizing the Antiquities Act productively, but also ensuring that we are not putting our commercial fishermen out of business.

Mr. Chairman, again, I thank Chairman CALVERT and Chairman BISHOP. I would ask all of my colleagues to please support this important amendment, which is very important for my region, not just Long Island, but the entire northwest Atlantic.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I certainly appreciate my colleague from New York suggesting that he is very much in favor of the balance between conservation and supporting our commercial fishermen. Being from the State of Maine, we certainly look at both of those things. I will look forward to working with him, but I do think this amendment is an attack on our national monument Antiquities Act policies, and it should be recognized as that.

I do understand his concern about the inclusion of groups and the importance of a public input process. In New England, we take that very seriously. I agree with him that there is a vital need in the monument designation process for local voices to be heard, but the way to ensure that that occurs is not by an amendment that would stop monument designations in their tracks, and it is certainly not by stopping monument designation powers in the entire exclusive economic zone, the EEZ area.

Today we should be talking about the importance of public input in the monument process, about the importance of an open and transparent process that uses common sense. Instead, we are debating an amendment that sends the wrong message about this important conservation tool for our oceans.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this attempt to stop local coordination, collaboration, and information sharing. I do hope that the gentleman from New York and I and the other people who represent coastal communities can find a way to balance conservation and our fishing industries and work together on that.

For now, I oppose the Zeldin amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN).

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

Ms. PINGREE. 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 York will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 95 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:

At the end of the bill (before the short title), insert the following:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO IMPLEMENT OR ENFORCE SPECIFIC SECTIONS

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce section 114, 119, or 445.

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 strikes three riders that undercut sound implementation of the Endangered Species Act as it pertains to the gray wolf, the greater sage-grouse, and the lesser prairie chicken.

Despite what many of my colleagues assert, the gray wolves are not recovered. Attempts by the Fish and Wildlife Service to remove Endangered Species Act protections for wolves have failed time and again, and they have failed because the Endangered Species Act requires listing and delisting decisions be based on sound science.

The scientific experts have shown, and courts have confirmed, that the best available science does not justify the removal of all ESA protections for gray wolves at this time. This is true whether you are talking about proposals to delist wolves in the western Great Lakes, Wyoming, or nationwide.

In fact, the only instances in which wolves have been delisted is through unprecedented and unfortunate congressional action in 2011 to remove protections from wolves in the northern Rocky Mountains. These wolves are now continually persecuted by hunters and ranchers despite the positive impacts they have had on the ecosystem and the minimal toll they take on livestock.

Gray wolves are incredible animals. Their reintroduction to the Western United States has revitalized Yellowstone, and wolf-related tourism around Yellowstone generates more than \$35 million annually for local economies. And, yet, gray wolves occupy only 5 percent of their historic range.

With respect to the lesser prairie chicken, the Fish and Wildlife Service has gone to great lengths to accommodate development interests and, at the same time, protect the bird. Populations of the bird are declining rapidly, and 80 percent of the short grass prairie it calls home has been plowed, paved, or otherwise destroyed.

The Obama administration is undertaking an unprecedented effort to conserve the bird and its habitat, and, thereby, avoid the need for Endangered Species Act protections.

Federal agencies have worked closely with the States throughout the process of developing science-based strategies to conserve sage-grouse and their habitat. Claims that the States have been frozen out of the process just don't reflect realities. In fact, the 10 resource management plans released by the In-

terior Department are all based on plans developed by the States, not one-size-fits-all plans, but individual plans to suit each State. Because of these plans, the Fish and Wildlife Service determined that listing the greater sage-grouse under the Endangered Species Act was not warranted.

The ESA has been the catalyst for the conservation of many species and landscapes across the country. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

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, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the chairman of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, I don't know quite how many clichés to use here, but where a scalpel could have been helpful, this is a meat ax that not only has missed the fingers, it has cut off the entire hand.

In 2012, the Fish and Wildlife Service did declare the gray wolf was recovered, and the Endangered Species Act demands that that goes back to State for enforcement. A court vacated that not on the basis of the science, but on a technicality. So the Fish and Wildlife Service, what it wishes to do is done in the bill. This amendment would force them to do what they don't want to do. Fish and Wildlife Service doesn't get it right that often. For heaven's sake, let them do what they want to do this time.

In 2014, the prairie chicken was listed, but they did not look at the State requirements, so it was vacated by a district court. So, once again, the underlying bill tells them what they wish to do. In fact, the Department of Justice has said they don't have any intent of appealing that decision. This allows them to do what they do. The amendment would require the Department of Justice to do what they don't want to do.

The sage-grouse last year was not listed even though it was then put in plans that would act as if it were listed, but the issue is when it was first started, Secretary Salazar told the States to actually come up with plans. Every State that has a sage-grouse population has a plan. The basic bill allows those State plans to go into effect. This amendment would prohibit the State plans from going into effect. So, in essence, this amendment tells the Fish and Wildlife Service to do what it doesn't want to do, the Justice Department to do what it doesn't want to do, and the States can't do what they do want to do.

In essence, we are doing the thing backwards, and we are harming people in the process. This is an amendment that simply sounds good on paper, but it misses the mark, and it hurts people.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 2½ minutes.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), my colleague and co-sponsor of this amendment.

□ 2100

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, of course, I have tremendous respect for the chairman of the committee, but it wasn't quite an accurate statement.

Courts have found that what Fish and Wildlife said is: If you want to have delisting and manage the wolf, you must adopt an acceptable management plan. Courts have found that neither Wyoming nor Minnesota have adopted adequate management plans. In fact, we have seen basically management to the point of extirpation. Even in States that have theoretically adopted plans, like Idaho, they are attempting to reduce the population to unsustainable levels.

There is a fabulous "Dear Colleague" from Mr. RIBBLE showing the biggest, fiercest, ugliest looking wolf I have ever seen attacking a small school child. Of course, there have been no wolf attacks in the lower 48 in the recorded history of the United States, but that is what we are protecting against here tonight.

They talk about predation on cattle. If we had better management of cattle, better husbandry—it is, basically, disease and weather are the biggest cause of loss of cattle. Then the number two cause is other predators. That would be coyotes. And guess what? Wolves kill coyotes. And wolves' preferred prey is not cattle.

So what is this insane obsession with killing wolves? I don't get it. I mean, were you frightened by a wolf as a small child. I don't get it. This is an incredible, iconic top species which actually helps regulate the ecosystem. Look at Yellowstone since we had wolves reintroduced there and how much more healthy it is.

I just don't get this irrational behavior. I would urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment and don't substitute political science and stupidity for science.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RIBBLE).

Mr. RIBBLE. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I would try to bring some clarity about the amendment, and I stand in opposition to this amendment.

We have heard a lot of hyperbole here this evening, but I want to try to set the record straight.

We cannot have it both ways. We can either have an Endangered Species Act and we can have the Fish and Wildlife Service and their scientists manage it, or we can get rid of it and just have the court do it.

So it appears that our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, when things don't go the way they like by the Fish

and Wildlife Service, they are fully supportive of the court system. When things don't go right in the court system, it appears, Mr. Chairman, that they are fully supportive of the Fish and Wildlife Service.

What I would prefer is that we protect the Endangered Species Act and the agency that was directed to manage it and to manage these rare populations or endangered species like the gray wolf.

In the 1990s—and I am from Wisconsin—there were only a handful of mating pairs of gray wolves in northern Wisconsin. Throughout the Great Lakes region today, there are 3,700 wolves in this area. It is an economically and ecologically unsustainable number.

The Fish and Wildlife Service rightly decided that the population had recovered and that their program to protect this species had been so completely successful that it was time to delist and turn the power back to the States to manage, which in fact they were doing, until a court decided that the Fish and Wildlife Service and the experts there protecting the Endangered Species Act just didn't get it right.

Well, we cannot have it both ways, Mr. Chair, and it is time that this Congress tells the courts what the laws are and how we want these things managed. What we are doing here in this bill and in the underlying language is protecting both the Endangered Species Act and the Fish and Wildlife Service scientists who are giving the proper jurisdiction to manage endangered species, including the gray wolf.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I am very happy to support this amendment, and I want to thank the gentleman from Virginia for yielding time and for his commitment to this issue and the preservation of the Endangered Species Act.

There are many of us in Congress concerned about the continual assault that is being waged against the ESA. On an appropriations bill, and particularly the one before us today, we see attempts to reduce the scope of the Endangered Species Act and to continue to weaken its protections.

We must continue to work with the Fish and Wildlife Service to make sure they are hearing from all stakeholders and taking their concerns seriously. But that does not mean we get rid of the ESA.

We have so many strong examples of how the Endangered Species Act works and worked over the past 40 years. One of my favorites that my colleagues often hear me speak of is the success of the bald eagle and the fact that it now thrives in Maine, where it was once endangered. Where they were only once 30 nesting pairs in Maine, now there are over 630 nesting pairs of bald eagles in Maine.

There are so many other success stories, from the peregrine falcon to

the brown pelican to the sea otter. All of these success stories were based on sound science and local input through the Fish and Wildlife Service.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Wyoming (Mrs. LUMMIS).

Mrs. LUMMIS. You are darn right there are success stories with the ESA. That is because the agency that was designed to implement the laws decided the species were recovered. They delisted them, and they are doing fine. That is why there are so many eagles in this country.

That is not what happened with the gray wolf. The scientists at the agency decided that they had recovered. They delisted them, by rule. The courts got involved in D.C.—not in the State where the wolves are, but in D.C.—and said, "No, we disagree with all the sound science," the sound science of the agency, and they took it over. That is why we are here.

Congress makes the laws. The executive branch implements the laws. The courts interpret the laws. The agency implemented the law. Using sound science, they found that those wolves should be delisted. And they delisted them by rule. And then D.C. environmental groups went to a D.C. court and said: We don't like the decision. And now, all of a sudden, they are back.

Mr. Chairman, this is the way to respond, by law.

Mr. CALVERT. 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. BEYER).

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

Mr. BEYER. 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. 96 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 96 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:

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—

- (1) Executive Order 13653; or
- (2) Executive Order 13693.

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. Chair, I firmly believe that addressing the causes and consequences of climate change is perhaps the most pressing issue of our time.

Each week, I share the latest scientific facts with my constituents about climate change—its impact on coral reefs, on disease migration, community displacement, species extinction, sea level rise, cloud movement, and so much more.

Unfortunately, Mr. Chairman, there is no shortage of material to draw upon. Our best scientists are warning us that, unless carbon emissions were dramatically cut, we face severe consequences ecologically and economically, not to mention global instability.

We need to be doing more in this body to address the causes and consequences of climate change. Instead, we have an appropriations bill laden with riders aimed at undermining climate action.

We have section 122, which prevents the Bureau of Land Management from cutting emissions of methane, a potent greenhouse gas; section 417, prohibiting regulation of carbon dioxide methane as part of Clean Air Act title V permits; section 418, prohibiting establishment of a greenhouse reporting program for manure management; section 436, stripping the executive of its ability to incorporate the social cost of carbon into rulemakings and guidance; and, section 439, prohibiting regulation of oil and gas sector methane emissions under section 111 of the Clean Air Act.

Another provision of the bill requires the EPA to make the false assumption that burning biomass is carbon neutral. In reality, in 2012, EPA's scientific advisory board directly challenged the claim that all forest biomass is carbon neutral, explaining that while some type may indeed be carbon neutral, it is not appropriate to assume that all types of forest biomass are carbon neutral.

Numerous studies have underscored that using some types, particularly slow-growing trees, can actually increase atmospheric carbon for many decades. To know what types of biomass are truly low carbon, scientists need to assess them, and EPA deserves to have its scientific judgment uncorrupted by Congress.

With this amendment, I seek to render inert the anticlimatic action riders of this bill. Executive Order 13653, titled "Preparing the United States for the Impacts of Climate Change," requires Federal agencies to integrate considerations of the challenges posed by climate change effects into their programs, policies, rules, and operations to ensure that they continue to be effective, even as the climate changes.

Executive Order 13693, titled "Planning for Federal Sustainability in the Next Decade," requires Federal agen-

cies to carry out a range of actions to improve Federal sustainability. These include tracking and reducing greenhouse gas emissions, climate resiliency measures, energy conservation and renewable energy targets, green building goals, and other positive steps. Federal agency actions have major impacts on our contributions to global warming.

For that reason, I offer an amendment to ensure that no funds are spent on activities that are not in compliance with the President's 2013 executive order on climate change adaptation and the 2015 executive order on sustainability.

It is the right thing to do to run an effective and efficient government. It is the right to do to return the highest value to the American taxpayer.

I urge a "yes" vote on this 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 is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, the gentleman wants to ensure that funds are being expended on climate and sustainability executive orders issued by the President.

Simply put, the President did not consult Congress on these executive orders. We would not be doing our job if we allowed this President or any President to unilaterally make policy decisions without allowing Congress to weigh in with appropriate policy debates.

In the meantime, we must use our congressional power of the purse to rein in executive branch overreach, which is exactly what we are going to do.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I urge everyone 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 Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

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

Mr. BEYER. 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. 97 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 97 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:

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 authorize, permit, or conduct geological or geophysical activities (as those terms are used in the final programmatic environmental impact statement of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management entitled "Atlantic OCS Proposed Geological and Geophysical Activities, Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic Planning Areas" and completed February 2014) in support of oil, gas, or methane hydrate exploration and development in any area located in the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, or Straits of Florida Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area.

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, my bipartisan amendment would essentially prohibit geological or geophysical activities in support of oil and gas exploration and development in the Atlantic in fiscal year 2017. Most importantly, this includes seismic airgun blasting.

In March of this year, the Department of the Interior removed the Atlantic Ocean from offshore oil and gas drilling until 2022. However, the administration is still considering permits to conduct seismic airgun blasting for subsea oil and gas deposits. Not only is this unnecessary, because drilling is not permitted, but this exploratory process would cause undue harm to marine resources.

Seismic airgun pulses are loud, repetitive, explosive sounds. The produced sound can travel over enormous distances, due to its low pressure and high amplitude. Because sound travels so efficiently underwater, the noise from a blast can be heard up to 2,500 miles from the source, roughly the distance from Washington, D.C., to Las Vegas.

What these loud, repetitive, explosive sounds ultimately do is harm a range of aquatic species and the communities that rely upon them.

Numerous studies have shown that noise from seismic airgun testing negatively impacts fish. Examples include 40 to 80 percent reduced catches in the Atlantic of cod, haddock, rockfish, herring, sand eel, and blue whiting. Sea turtles and invertebrates have also been found to demonstrate alarm and avoidance responses when exposed to seismic blasts.

The critically endangered North Atlantic right whale species, of which less than 500 remain, use sound to find food, locate mates, and keep track of their young. The area proposed for blasting includes the only known right whale calving grounds in the world. Seismic airgun blasting could displace right whales from their habitats and tip the species toward extinction.

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

□ 2115

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, the administration, as already mentioned, already removed the Atlantic leases from consideration in the 5-year lease plan from 2017 to 2022. This language is completely unnecessary, and I urge all the Members to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the bipartisan amendment to prohibit seismic testing in the Atlantic, which I have cosponsored, along with colleagues from New Jersey, Maryland, Virginia, and South Carolina.

After taking into account the overwhelming opposition to offshore drilling in the Atlantic, including my home State of North Carolina, the Obama administration wisely removed the prospect of drilling from the 5-year Oil and Gas Leasing Program for the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf.

Now that there are no foreseeable plans to drill among the dynamic ecosystems and pristine beaches of the Atlantic Coast, we should move immediately to prevent seismic testing and other geological and geophysical activities. Not only are these activities unnecessary in light of the administration's decision, they also pose a significant environmental threat.

Seismic testing is hugely disruptive to marine ecosystems. Its negative impacts include displacing fish over a large geographic area, reducing catch rates for commercial fishermen, and impacting the reproduction, foraging, communication, and other vital behaviors of marine mammals, including the North Atlantic right whale, one of the most endangered species on the planet.

Further, the data generated from the seismic testing is proprietary and, therefore, unavailable to the public or to policymakers who might rely on it to inform public policy, planning, or debate regarding the economic and environmental impact of offshore energy exploration.

Instead of allowing oil and gas companies to conduct an unnecessary and ecologically damaging activity, just miles from our Nation's coastline, we should be investing our time and money in advancing energy efficiency, renewable fuels, alternative energy technologies, including offshore wind development to reduce dependence on fossil fuels.

I thank my colleague from Virginia for taking the leadership on this amendment. I urge its adoption.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. How much time is left, Mr. Chairman?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I would like to talk just for 1 minute about the community impacts. Along the Atlantic Coast nearly 1.4 million jobs and over \$95 billion in gross domestic product rely on healthy ocean ecosystems. In my State of Virginia that is 91,000 jobs and nearly \$5 billion in GDP.

The Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic Fishery Management Councils have formally updated their policy position to express opposition and serious reservation to seismic airgun blasting.

Our chair kindly says this isn't necessary because the Obama administration has taken the drilling off the table until 2022, but it has not taken seismic airgun off the table, and that research will go on.

I urge my colleagues to support our amendment to put a moratorium on airgun blasting. Oil and gas development should not come at the expense of coastal communities and the marine species on which they rely.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chairman, seismic testing has been done all over the globe for decades, not a single verifiable instance of a marine mammal being hurt or killed due to seismic activity.

In fact, I am on the Natural Resources Committee. We got Abigail Hopper's own testimony in the committee saying that there hadn't been a verifiable instance.

Go to BOEM's Web site. Their Chief Biologist has a written statement there. Not a single verifiable instance of a marine mammal being hurt or killed due to seismic.

If we want to find out what resources are available in this country for future energy independence, let's allow the seismic to happen off the coast of South Carolina, off the coast of Georgia, off the coast of North Carolina, to see if there are resources that may be harvestable to help with American energy independence going forward.

Stopping seismic is just ludicrous because there is not a single verifiable instance. Go do the research yourself on the BOEM Web site. Look at the Chief Biologist, listen to Abigail Hopper, the Director's own testimony in Natural Resources, and you will hear it for yourself.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I am in opposition to this amendment. I urge everyone to vote "no."

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. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia 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. 76 by Mr. PALMER of Alabama.

Amendment No. 78 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 79 by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 80 by Mr. PERRY of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 84 by Mr. RATCLIFFE of Texas.

Amendment No. 85 by Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

Amendment No. 88 by Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

Amendment No. 90 by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Amendment No. 92 by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Amendment No. 94 by Mr. ZELDIN of New York.

Amendment No. 95 by Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

Amendment No. 96 by Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

Amendment No. 97 by Mr. BEYER of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 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 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 195, noes 223, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 453]

AYES—195

Abraham	Bridenstine	Davis, Rodney
Aderholt	Brooks (AL)	Denham
Allen	Buck	DeSantis
Amash	Burgess	DesJarlais
Amodei	Byrne	Duffy
Babin	Carter (GA)	Duncan (SC)
Barletta	Carter (TX)	Duncan (TN)
Barr	Chabot	Ellmers (NC)
Barton	Chaffetz	Emmer (MN)
Benishek	Clawson (FL)	Farenthold
Bilirakis	Coffman	Fincher
Bishop (MI)	Collins (GA)	Fleischmann
Bishop (UT)	Collins (NY)	Fleming
Black	Comstock	Flores
Blackburn	Conaway	Forbes
Blum	Cook	Fortenberry
Bost	Cramer	Foxx
Boustany	Crawford	Franks (AZ)
Brady (TX)	Culberson	Garrett
Brat	Davidson	Gibbs

Gibson	Lucas	Rothfus	Nolan	Roybal-Allard	Torres	Burgess	Huizenga (MI)	Price, Tom
Gohmert	Luetkemeyer	Rouzer	Norcross	Ruiz	Tsongas	Byrne	Hultgren	Ratcliffe
Goodlatte	Lummis	Royce	O'Rourke	Rush	Turner	Calvert	Hunter	Reed
Gosar	Marchant	Russell	Pallone	Ryan (OH)	Upton	Carter (GA)	Hurd (TX)	Renacci
Gowdy	Massie	Sallon	Pascarell	Sánchez, Linda	Valadao	Carter (TX)	Hurt (VA)	Ribble
Graves (GA)	McCarthy	Sanford	Paulsen	T.	Van Hollen	Chabot	Issa	Rice (SC)
Graves (MO)	McCaul	Scalise	Payne	Sanchez, Loretta	Vargas	Chaffetz	Jenkins (KS)	Rigell
Griffith	McClintock	Schweikert	Pelosi	Sarbanes	Veasey	Clawson (FL)	Jenkins (WV)	Roby
Grothman	McHenry	Scott, Austin	Perlmutter	Schakowsky	Vela	Coffman	Johnson (OH)	Roe (TN)
Guinta	McKinley	Sensenbrenner	Peters	Schiff	Velázquez	Cole	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (AL)
Guthrie	McMorris	Sessions	Peterson	Schrader	Visclosky	Collins (GA)	Jolly	Rogers (KY)
Hardy	Rodgers	Shimkus	Pingree	Scott (VA)	Walden	Collins (NY)	Jones	Rohrabacher
Harper	McSally	Shuster	Pocan	Scott, David	Walters, Mimi	Comstock	Jordan	Rokita
Harris	Meadows	Smith (MO)	Poliquin	Serrano	Walz	Conaway	Joyce	Rooney (FL)
Hartzler	Mica	Smith (NE)	Polis	Sherman	Wasserman	Cook	Kelly (MS)	Roskam
Hensarling	Miller (FL)	Smith (TX)	Posey	Simpson	Schultz	Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Ross
Hice, Jody B.	Moolenaar	Stefanik	Poey (NC)	Sinema	Walters, Maxine	Crawford	King (IA)	Rothfus
Holding	Mooney (WV)	Stewart	Quigley	Sires	Watson Coleman	Crenshaw	Kirkpatrick	Rouzer
Hudson	Mullin	Stivers	Rangel	Slaughter	Welch	Cuellar	Kline	Royce
Huelskamp	Mulvaney	Stutzman	Reed	Smith (NJ)	Whitfield	Culberson	Knight	Russell
Huizenga (MI)	Murphy (PA)	Thompson (PA)	Reichert	Smith (WA)	Wilson (FL)	Davidson	Labrador	Salmon
Hultgren	Neugebauer	Thornberry	Rice (NY)	Speier	Woodall	Davis, Rodney	LaHood	Sanford
Hunter	Newhouse	Tiberi	Richmond	Takano	Yarmuth	Denham	LaMalfa	Scalise
Hurd (TX)	Noem	Tipton	Rigell	Thompson (CA)	Young (IN)	DeSantis	Lamborn	Schweikert
Hurt (VA)	Nugent	Tonko	Rogers (KY)	Thompson (MS)	Zeldin	DesJarlais	Lance	Scott, Austin
Jenkins (KS)	Nunes	Trott	Ros-Lehtinen	Titus		Diaz-Balart	Latta	Scott, Justin
Jenkins (WV)	Olson	Wagner				Duffy	Long	Sensenbrenner
Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Walberg	Costa	Himes	Poe (TX)	Duncan (SC)	Loudermilk	Sessions
Johnson, Sam	Palmer	Walker	Gallego	Issa	Ruppersberger	Duncan (TN)	Love	Shimkus
Jones	Perry	Walorski	Garamendi	Marino	Sewell (AL)	Ellmers (NC)	Lucas	Shuster
Jordan	Pittenger	Weber (TX)	Granger	Messer	Swalwell (CA)	Emmer (MN)	McCarthy	Luetkemeyer
Katko	Pitts	Webster (FL)	Hastings	Pearce	Takai	Farenthold	Lummis	Smith (MO)
Kelly (MS)	Pompeo	Wenstrup				Fincher	Marchant	Smith (NE)
Kelly (PA)	Price, Tom	Westerman				Fleischmann	Massie	Smith (TX)
King (IA)	Ratcliffe	Westmoreland				Fleming	McCarthy	Stewart
Kline	Renacci	Williams				Flores	McCaul	Stivers
Knight	Ribble	Wilson (SC)				Forbes	McClintock	Stutzman
Labrador	Rice (SC)	Wittman				Fox	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
LaHood	Roby	Womack				Franks (AZ)	McKinley	Thornberry
LaMalfa	Roe (TN)	Yoder				Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Tiberi
Lamborn	Rogers (AL)	Yoho				Gibbs	Rodgers	Tipton
Lance	Rohrabacher	Young (AK)				Gohmert	McSally	Trott
Latta	Rokita	Young (IA)				Meadows	Messer	Turner
Long	Rooney (FL)	Zinke				Goodlatte	Valadao	Upton
Loudermilk	Roskam					Gosar	Mica	Walberg
Love	Ross					Gowdy	Miller (FL)	Walden
						Granger	Miller (MI)	Walker
						Graves (GA)	Moolenaar	Walorski
						Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)	Walters, Mimi
						Graves (MO)	Mulvaney	Weber (TX)
						Griffith	Murphy (PA)	Webster (FL)
						Grothman	Neugebauer	Wenstrup
						Guinta	Newhouse	Westerman
						Guthrie	Noem	Westmoreland
						Hardy	Nugent	Williams
						Harper	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
						Harris	Olson	Wittman
						Hartzler	Palazzo	Womack
						Heck (NV)	Palmer	Woodall
						Hensarling	Perry	Yoder
						Herrera Beutler	Peterson	Yoho
						Hice, Jody B.	Pittenger	Young (AK)
						Hill	Pitts	Young (IA)
						Holding	Poliquin	Young (IN)
						Hudson	Pompeo	Zinke
						Huelskamp	Posey	

NOT VOTING—15

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2141

Messrs. HINOJOSA, KINZINGER of Illinois, and GRAYSON changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Messrs. FINCHER and McHENRY 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. TONKO. Mr. Chair, during rollcall Vote No. 453 on H.R. 5538, I mistakenly recorded my vote as “yes” when I should have voted “no.”

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted: “No” on rollcall No. 453.

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting 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 219, noes 203, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 454]

AYES—219

Adams	DeFazio	Jolly	Abraham	Barr	Boustany	Adams	Clay	Ellison
Aguilar	DeGette	Joyce	Aderholt	Barton	Brady (TX)	Aguilar	Cleaver	Engel
Ashford	Delaney	Kaptur	Allen	Benishak	Brat	Bass	Clyburn	Eshoo
Bass	DeLauro	Keating	Amash	Bilirakis	Bridenstine	Beatty	Cohen	Esty
Beatty	DelBene	Kelly (IL)	Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (AL)	Becerra	Connolly	Farr
Becerra	Dent	Kennedy	Ashford	Black	Brooks (IN)	Bera	Conyers	Fitzpatrick
Bera	DeSaulnier	Kildee	Babin	Blum	Buck	Beyer	Cooper	Fortenberry
Beyer	Deutch	Kilmer	Barletta	Bost	Bucshon	Bishop (GA)	Costa	Foster
Bishop (GA)	Diaz-Balart	Kind				Bishop (MI)	Costello (PA)	Frankel (FL)
Blumenauer	Dingell	King (NY)				Blumenauer	Courtney	Fudge
Bonamici	Doggett	Kinzinger (IL)				Bonamici	Crowley	Gabbard
Boyle, Brendan F.	Dold	Kirkpatrick				Boyle, Brendan F.	Cummings	Galleo
Brady (PA)	Donovan	Kuster				Brady (PA)	Curbelo (FL)	Garamendi
Brooks (IN)	Doyle, Michael F.	Langevin				Brown (FL)	Davis (CA)	Gibson
Brown (FL)	Duckworth	Larsen (WA)				Brownley (CA)	Davis, Danny	Graham
Brownley (CA)	Edwards	Larson (CT)				Buchanan	DeFazio	Grayson
Buchanan	Ellison	Lawrence				Bustos	DeGette	Green, Al
Bucshon	Engel	Lee				Butterfield	Delaney	Green, Gene
Bustos	Eshoo	Lewis				Capps	DeLauro	Grijalva
Butterfield	Esty	Lieu, Ted				Capuano	DelBene	Gutiérrez
Calvert	Farr	Lipinski				Cárdenas	Dent	Hahn
Caverts	Fitzpatrick	LoBiondo				Carney	DeSaulnier	Hanna
Capuano	Foster	Loebsack				Carson (IN)	Deutch	Heck (WA)
Cárdenas	Frankel (FL)	Lofgren				Cartwright	Dingell	Higgins
Carney	Frelinghuysen	Lowenthal				Castor (FL)	Doggett	Hinojosa
Carson (IN)	Fudge	Lowe				Castro (TX)	Dold	Honda
Cartwright	Gabbard	Lujan Grisham (NM)				Chu, Judy	Donovan	Hoyer
Castor (FL)	Graham	Lujan, Ben Ray (NM)				Ciilline	Doyle, Michael F.	Huffman
Castro (TX)	Graves (LA)	Lynch				Cleaver	Duckworth	Israel
Chu, Judy	Grayson	MacArthur				Cohen	Edwards	Jackson Lee
Ciilline	Green, Al	Maloney				Cole		Jeffries
Clark (MA)	Green, Gene	Maloney, Sean				Connolly		
Clarke (NY)	Grijalva	Matsui				Conyers		
Clay	Gutiérrez	McColum				Cooper		
Cleaver	Hahn	McDermott				Costello (PA)		
Clyburn	Hanna	McGovern				Courtney		
Cohen	Heck (NV)	McNerney				Crenshaw		
Cole	Heck (WA)	Meehan				Crowley		
Connolly	Herrera Beutler	Meeks				Cuellar		
Conyers	Higgins	Meng				Cummings		
Cooper	Hill	Miller (MI)				Curbelo (FL)		
Costello (PA)	Hinojosa	Moore				Davis (CA)		
Courtney	Honda	Moulton				Davis, Danny		
Crenshaw	Hoyer	Murphy (FL)				DeFazio		
Crowley	Huffman	Nadler				DeGette		
Cuellar	Israel	Napolitano				Delaney		
Cummings	Jackson Lee	Neal				DeLauro		
Curbelo (FL)	Jeffries					Dent		
Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)					DeSaulnier		
Davis, Danny	Johnson, E. B.					Deutch		

Johnson (GA) McGovern
 Johnson, E. B. McNerney
 Kaptur Meehan
 Katko Meeks
 Keating Meng
 Kelly (IL) Moore
 Kennedy Moulton
 Kildee Murphy (FL)
 Kilmer Nadler
 Kind Napolitano
 King (NY) Neal
 Kinzinger (IL) Nolan
 Kuster Norcross
 Langevin O'Rourke
 Larsen (WA) Pallone
 Larson (CT) Pascrell
 Lawrence Paulsen
 Lee Payne
 Levin Pelosi
 Lewis Perlmutter
 Lieu, Ted Peters
 Lipinski Pingree
 LoBiondo Pocan
 Loebsock Polis
 Lofgren Price (NC)
 Lowenthal Quigley
 Lowey Rangel
 Lujan Grisham Reichert
 (NM) Rice (NY)
 Luján, Ben Ray Richmond
 (NM) Ros-Lehtinen
 Lynch Roybal-Allard
 MacArthur Ruiz
 Maloney, Carolyn Rush
 Ryan (OH)
 Maloney, Sean Sánchez, Linda
 Matsui T.
 McCollum Sanchez, Loretta
 McDermott Sarbanes

NOT VOTING—11

Blackburn Mullin Sewell (AL)
 Hastings Pearce Swallowell (CA)
 Himes Poe (TX) Takai
 Marino Ruppertsberger

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2144

So the amendment was agreed to.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.
 PERRY) 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 will be a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 161, noes 262,
 not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 455]

AYES—161

Abraham Bost Clawson (FL)
 Aderholt Boustany Coffman
 Allen Brat Collins (GA)
 Amash Bridenstine Collins (NY)
 Babin Brooks (AL) Conaway
 Barletta Brooks (IN) Cook
 Barr Buchanan Cramer
 Benishek Buck Crawford
 Bilirakis Burgess Culberson
 Bishop (UT) Byrne Davidson
 Black Carter (GA) DeSantis
 Blackburn Carter (TX) DesJarlais
 Blum Chabot Duffy

Duncan (SC) Johnson, Sam
 Duncan (TN) Jones
 Ellmers (NC) Jordan
 Farenthold Kelly (MS)
 Fincher Kelly (PA)
 Fleischmann Labrador
 Fleming LaHood
 Flores LaMalfa
 Forbes Lamborn
 Foy Fox
 Franks (AZ) Long
 Garrett Loudermilk
 Gibbs Luetkemeyer
 Gibson Lummis
 Gohmert Marchant
 Goodlatte Massie
 Gosar McHenry
 Gowdy McKinley
 Granger McMorris
 Graves (GA) Rodgers
 Graves (MO) Meadows
 Griffith Messer
 Grothman Miller (FL)
 Guinta Miller (MI)
 Guthrie Mooleenaar
 Harper Mooney (WV)
 Harris Mullin
 Hartzler Mulvaney
 Hensarling Murphy (PA)
 Hice, Jody B. Neugebauer
 Holding Newhouse
 Hudson Noem
 Huelskamp Olson
 Huizenga (MI) Palmer
 Hultgren Perry
 Hurd (TX) Pittenger
 Hurt (VA) Pompeo
 Issa Posey
 Jenkins (KS) Ratcliffe
 Jenkins (WV) Reed
 Johnson (OH) Renacci

NOES—262

Adams DeFazio Jeffries
 Aguilar DeGette Johnson (GA)
 Amodei Delaney Johnson, E. B.
 Ashford DeLauro Jolly
 Barton DelBene Joyce
 Bass Denham Kaptur
 Beatty Dent Katko
 Becerra DeSaulnier Keating
 Bera Deutch Kelly (IL)
 Beyer Diaz-Balart Kennedy
 Bishop (GA) Dingell Kildee
 Bishop (MI) Doggett Kilmer
 Blumenauer Dold Kind
 Bonamici Donovan King (IA)
 Boyle, Brendan Doyle, Michael King (NY)
 F. F. Kirkpatrick
 Brady (PA) Duckworth Kline
 Brown (FL) Edwards Knight
 Brownley (CA) Ellison Kuster
 Bucshon Emmer (MN) Lance
 Bustos Engel Langevin
 Butterfield Eshoo Larsen (WA)
 Calvert Esty Larson (CT)
 Capps Farr Lawrence
 Capuano Fitzpatrick Lee
 Cárdenas Fortenberry Levin
 Carney Foster Lewis
 Carson (IN) Frankel (FL) Lieu, Ted
 Cartwright Cartwright Frelinghuysen Lipinski
 Castor (FL) Fudge LoBiondo
 Castro (TX) Gabbard Loebsock
 Chaffetz Gallego Lofgren
 Chu, Judy Garamendi Love
 Cicilline Graham Lowenthal
 Clark (MA) Clark (LA) Lowey
 Clarke (NY) Grayson Lucas
 Clay Green, Al Lujan Grisham
 Cleaver Green, Gene (NM)
 Clyburn Grijalva Luján, Ben Ray
 Cohen Gutierrez (NM)
 Cole Hahn Lynch
 Comstock Hanna MacArthur
 Connolly Hardy Maloney,
 Conyers Heck (NV) Carolyn
 Cooper Heck (WA) Maloney, Sean
 Costa Herrera Beutler Matsui
 Costello (PA) Higgins McCarthy
 Courtney Hill McCaul
 Crownshaw Himes McClintock
 Crowley Hinojosa McCollum
 Cuellar Honda McDermott
 Cummings Hoyer McGovern
 Curbelo (FL) Huffman McNerney
 Hunter Hunter Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny Israel
 Davis, Rodney Jackson Lee

Ribble Meng
 Rice (SC) Mica Rigell
 Roby Moore Rogers (KY)
 Roe (TN) Moulton Rohrbacher
 Rogers (AL) Murphy (FL) Ros-Lehtinen
 Rokita Nadler Roskam
 Rooney (FL) Napolitano Roybal-Allard
 Ross Neal Royce
 Rothfus Nolan Ruiz
 Rouzer Norcross Trotter
 Salmon Nugent Russell
 Sanford Nunes Ryan (OH)
 Scalise O'Rourke Sánchez, Linda
 Schweikert Palazzo T.
 Scott, Austin Sarbanes Sanchez, Loretta
 Sessions Pascrell Sarbanes
 Shimkus Paulsen Schakowsky
 Shuster Payne Schiff
 Smith (MO) Pelosi Schrader
 Smith (NE) Perlmutter Scott (VA)
 Smith (TX) Peters Scott, David
 Stutzman Peterson Sensenbrenner
 Thornberry Pingree Serrano
 Tipton Pitts Sherman
 Wagner Pocan Simpson
 Walberg Walgren Sinema
 Walden Walker Poliquin
 Walker Walorski Sires
 Weber (TX) Westerman Slaughter
 Westerman Williams Smith (NJ)
 Wilson (SC) Wittman Smith (WA)
 Wittman Womack Speier
 Woodall Yoder Rangel
 Yoder Yoho Stewart
 Young (IA) Young (IN) Stivers
 Young (IN) Zeldin Swallowell (CA)
 Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Brady (TX) Pearce Takai
 Hastings Poe (TX) Tiberi
 Kinzinger (IL) Ruppertsberger
 Marino Sewell (AL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2147

So the amendment was rejected.
 The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr.
 PERRY) 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 188, noes 239,
 not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 456]

AYES—188

Abraham Brat Crawford
 Aderholt Bridenstine Culberson
 Allen Brooks (AL) Davidson
 Amash Brooks (IN) Denham
 Babin Buck DeSantis
 Barletta Burgess DesJarlais
 Barr Byrnes Duffy
 Barton Carter (GA) Duncan (SC)
 Benishek Carter (TX) Duncan (TN)
 Bilirakis Chabot Ellmers (NC)
 Bishop (MI) Chaffetz Emmer (MN)
 Bishop (UT) Clawson (FL) Farenthold
 Black Collins (GA) Fincher
 Blackburn Collins (NY) Fleischmann
 Blum Conaway Fleming
 Bost Conyers Flores
 Boustany Cook Forbes
 Brady (TX) Cramer Foxx

Franks (AZ) Loudermilk
Garrett Love
Gibbs Luetkemeyer
Gohmert Lummis
Goodlatte Marchant
Gosar Massie
Gowdy McCarthy
Granger McCaul
Graves (GA) McClintock
Graves (LA) McHenry
Graves (MO) McKinley
Griffith McMorris
Grothman Rodgers
Guinta Meadows
Guthrie Messer
Harper Miller (FL)
Harris Miller (MI)
Hartzler Moonenar
Hensarling Mooney (WV)
Hice, Jody B. Mullin
Hill Mulvaney
Holding Murphy (PA)
Hudson Neugebauer
Huelskamp Newhouse
Huizenga (MI) Noem
Hultgren Olson
Hunter Palazzo
Hurd (TX) Palmer
Hurt (VA) Perry
Issa Peterson
Jenkins (KS) Pittenger
Jenkins (WV) Pitts
Johnson (OH) Pompeo
Johnson, Sam Posey
Jones Price, Tom
Jordan Ratcliffe
Kelly (MS) Ribble
Kelly (PA) Rice (SC)
King (IA) Rigell
Knight Roby
Labrador Roe (TN)
LaMalfa Rogers (AL)
Lamborn Rogers (KY)
Latta Rohrabacher
Long Rokita

NOES—239

Adams Davis, Rodney
Aguilar DeFazio
Amodei DeGette
Ashford Delaney
Bass DeLauro
Beatty DelBene
Becerra Dent
Bera DeSaulnier
Beyer Deutch
Bishop (GA) Diaz-Balart
Blumenauer Dingell
Bonamici Doggett
Boyle, Brendan Dold
F. Donovan
Brady (PA) Doyle, Michael
Brown (FL) F.
Brownley (CA) Duckworth
Buchanan Edwards
Bucshon Ellison
Bustos Engel
Butterfield Eshoo
Calvert Esty
Capps Farr
Capuano Fitzpatrick
Cárdenas Fortenberry
Carney Foster
Carson (IN) Frankel (FL)
Cartwright Frelinghuysen
Castor (FL) Fudge
Castro (TX) Gabbard
Chu, Judy Gallego
Cicilline Garamendi
Clark (MA) Gibson
Clarke (NY) Graham
Clay Grayson
Cleaver Green, Al
Clyburn Green, Gene
Coffman Grijalva
Cohen Gutiérrez
Cole Hahn
Comstock Hanna
Connolly Hardy
Cooper Heck (NV)
Costa Heck (WA)
Costello (PA) Herrera Beutler
Courtney Higgins
Crowley Himes
Cuellar Hinojosa
Cummings Honda
Curbelo (FL) Hoyer
Davis (CA) Huffman
Davis, Danny Israel

Rooney (FL) Meeks
Ross Meng
Rothfus Mica
Rouzer Moore
Royce Moulton
Russell Murphy (FL)
Salmon Nadler
Sanford Napolitano
Scalise Neal
Schweikert Nolan
Scott, Austin Norcross
Sensenbrenner Nugent
Sessions Nunes
Shimkus O'Rourke
Shuster Pallone
Smith (MO) Pascrell
Smith (NE) Schiff
Smith (TX) Schrader
Stewart Scott (VA)
Stutzman Scott, David
Thompson (PA) Serrano
Thornberry Sewell (AL)
Tiberi Sherman
Tipton Simpson
Trotter Poliquin
Upton Polis
Wagner Price (NC)
Walberg Quigley
Walker Rangel
Walorski Reed
Walters, Mimi Reichert
Weber (TX) Wenstrup
Westerman Westmoreland
Whitfield Whitfield
Williams Williams (SC)
Wittman Wittman
Womack Womack
Woodall Woodall
Yoder Yoder
Yoho Yoho
Young (AK) Young (AK)
Young (IN) Young (IN)

NOT VOTING—6

Crenshaw Marino
Hastings Pearce

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR
The Acting CHAIR (during the vote).
There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 2150

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. RATCLIFFE
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Texas (Mr. RATCLIFFE)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes 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 231, noes 197,
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 457]
AYES—231

Abraham Buck
Aderholt Bucshon
Allen Burgess
Amash Byrne
Amodei Calvert
Babin Carter (GA)
Barietta Carter (TX)
Barr Chabot
Barton Chaffetz
Bishop (MI) Clawson (FL)
Bishop (UT) Coffman
Black Cole
Black Collins (GA)
Blackburn Collins (NY)
Blum Comstock
Blum Conaway
Bost Cook
Boustany Cramer
Brady (TX) Crawford
Brat Crewshaw
Bridenstine Culberson
Brooks (AL) Davidson
Brooks (IN) Davis, Rodney
Buchanan Denham

Gosar Stivers
Gowdy Swalwell (CA)
Granger Takano
Graves (GA) Thompson (CA)
McCaul Roskam
Graves (MO) Thompson (MS)
Griffith Titus
Grothman Ruiz
Guinta Torres
Guthrie Tsongas
Hardy Turner
Harper Valadao
Harris Van Hollen
Hartzler Vargas
Heck (NV) Veasey
Hensarling Vela
Herrera Beutler Velázquez
Hice, Jody B. Visclosky
Hill Walden
Holding Walz
Hudson Wasserman
Huelskamp Schultz
Huizenga (MI) Waters, Maxine
Hultgren Watson Coleman
Hunter Webster (FL)
Hurd (TX) Welch
Hurt (VA) Wilson (FL)
Issa Yarmuth
Jenkins (KS) Young (IA)
Jenkins (WV) Zeldin
Johnson (OH) Zinke
Johnson, Sam

Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Kline
Knight
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer

NOES—197

Adams Curbelo (FL)
Aguilar Davis (GA)
Ashford Davis, Danny
Bass DeFazio
Beatty DeGette
Becerra Delaney
Bera DeLauro
Beyer DelBene
Bishop (GA) Dent
Blumenauer DeSaulnier
Bonamici Deutch
Boyle, Brendan Dingell
F. Doggett
Brady (PA) Dold
Brown (FL) Doyle, Michael
Brownley (CA) F.
Bustos Duckworth
Butterfield Edwards
Capps Ellison
Capuano Engel
Cárdenas Eshoo
Carney Esty
Carson (IN) Farr
Cartwright Fitzpatrick
Castor (FL) Foster
Castro (TX) Frankel (FL)
Chu, Judy Fudge
Cicilline Gabbard
Clark (MA) Gallego
Clarke (NY) Garamendi
Clay Graham
Cleaver Grayson
Clyburn Green, Al
Cohen Green, Gene
Connolly Grijalva
Conyers Gutiérrez
Cooper Hahn
Costa Hanna
Costello (PA) Heck (WA)
Courtney Higgins
Crowley Himes
Cuellar Hinojosa
Cummings Honda

Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jolly
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
Lujan, Ben Ray
Lujan, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney
Maloney, Sean
Maloney
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott

McGovern	Price (NC)	Slaughter	Labrador	Nunes	Smith (NE)	Rice (NY)	Scott, David	Torres
McNerney	Quigley	Smith (WA)	LaHood	Perry	Stewart	Richmond	Serrano	Tsongas
Meehan	Rangel	Speier	LaMalfa	Pittenger	Stivers	Roby	Sessions	Turner
Meeks	Rice (NY)	Swalwell (CA)	Lamborn	Pitts	Stutzman	Rogers (AL)	Sewell (AL)	Van Hollen
Meng	Richmond	Takano	Lance	Poliquin	Thompson (PA)	Rogers (KY)	Sherman	Vargas
Moore	Ros-Lehtinen	Thompson (CA)	Latta	Pompeo	Tiberi	Rooney (FL)	Simpson	Veasey
Moulton	Roybal-Allard	Thompson (MS)	Long	Posey	Tipton	Ros-Lehtinen	Sinema	Vela
Murphy (FL)	Ruiz	Titus	Loudermilk	Price, Tom	Troott	Roybal-Allard	Sires	Velázquez
Nadler	Ruppersberger	Tonko	Love	Reed	Upton	Ruiz	Slaughter	Visclosky
Napolitano	Rush	Torres	Lucas	Renacci	Valadao	Ruppersberger	Smith (NJ)	Walden
Neal	Ryan (OH)	Tsongas	Luetkemeyer	Ribble	Wagner	Rush	Smith (TX)	Walz
Nolan	Sánchez, Linda	Van Hollen	Lummis	Rice (SC)	Walberg	Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)	Wasserman
Norcross	T.	Vargas	Massie	Rigell	Walker	Sánchez, Linda	Speier	Schultz
O'Rourke	Sanchez, Loretta	Veasey	McCarthy	Roe (TN)	Walorski	T.	Stefanik	Waters, Maxine
Pallone	Sarbanes	Vela	McClintock	Rohrabacher	Walters, Mimi	Sanchez, Loretta	Swalwell (CA)	Watson Coleman
Pascarell	Schakowsky	Velázquez	McHenry	Rokita	Wenstrup	Sarbanes	Takano	Weber (TX)
Payne	Schiff	Visclosky	McKinley	Roskam	Westerman	Scalise	Thompson (CA)	Webster (FL)
Pelosi	Schrader	Walz	McMorris	Ross	Westmoreland	Schakowsky	Thompson (MS)	Welch
Perlmutter	Scott (VA)	Wasserman	Rodgers	Rothfus	Whitfield	Schiff	Thornberry	Williams
Peters	Scott, David	Schultz	McSally	Rouzer	Wilson (SC)	Schrader	Titus	Wilson (FL)
Peterson	Serrano	Waters, Maxine	Meadows	Royce	Wittman	Scott (VA)	Tonko	Yarmuth
Pingree	Sewell (AL)	Watson Coleman	Messer	Russell	Womack			
Pocan	Sherman	Welch	Mica	Woodall				
Poliquin	Sinema	Wilson (FL)	Miller (MI)	Yoder				
Polis	Sires	Yarmuth	Moolenaar	Yoho				
			Mooney (WV)	Young (AK)				
			Mullin	Young (IA)				
			Mulvaney	Young (IN)				
			Newhouse	Zeldin				
			Noem	Zinke				

NOT VOTING—5

Hastings	Pearce	Takai
Marino	Poe (TX)	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2153

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 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 ayes 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 257, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 458]

AYES—170

Allen	Cramer	Grothman
Amash	Crawford	Guinta
Amodei	Davidson	Guthrie
Barletta	Davis, Rodney	Hardy
Barr	Denham	Harris
Benishek	DeSantis	Hartzler
Bilirakis	DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler
Bishop (MI)	Duffy	Hice, Jody B.
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (SC)	Holding
Black	Duncan (TN)	Hudson
Blackburn	Ellmers (NC)	Huelskamp
Blum	Emmer (MN)	Huizenga (MI)
Bost	Fincher	Hultgren
Brat	Fleischmann	Hunter
Bridenstine	Fleming	Hurt (VA)
Brooks (IN)	Forbes	Issa
Buck	Foxx	Jenkins (KS)
Bucshon	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins (WV)
Carter (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (OH)
Chabot	Garrett	Jolly
Chaffetz	Gibbs	Jones
Clawson (FL)	Goodlatte	Jordan
Coffman	Gosar	Joyce
Cole	Gowdy	Kelly (PA)
Collins (GA)	Graves (GA)	King (IA)
Collins (NY)	Graves (MO)	Kline
Cook	Griffith	Knight

NOES—257

Abraham	Dent
Adams	DeSaulnier
Aderholt	Deutch
Aguilar	Diaz-Balart
Ashford	Dingell
Babin	Doggett
Barton	Dold
Bass	Donovan
Beatty	Doyle, Michael F.
Becerra	Duckworth
Bera	Edwards
Beyer	Ellison
Bishop (GA)	Engel
Blumenauer	Bonamici
Boustany	Eshoo
Boyle, Brendan F.	Esty
Brady (PA)	Farenthold
Brady (TX)	Farr
Brooks (AL)	Fitzpatrick
Brown (FL)	Flores
Brownley (CA)	Portenberry
Buchanan	Foster
Burgess	Frankel (FL)
Bustos	Fudge
Butterfield	Gabbard
Byrne	Gallego
Calvert	Garamendi
Capps	Gibson
Capuano	Gohmert
Cárdenas	Graham
Carney	Granger
Carson (IN)	Graves (LA)
Carter (TX)	Grayson
Cartwright	Green, Al
Castor (FL)	Green, Gene
Castro (TX)	Grijalva
Chu, Judy	Gutiérrez
Cicilline	Hahn
Clark (MA)	Hanna
Clarke (NY)	Harper
Clay	Heck (NV)
Cleaver	Heck (WA)
Cohen	Hensarling
Clyburn	Higgins
Cohen	Hill
Comstock	Himes
Conaway	Hinojosa
Connolly	Honda
Conyers	Hoyer
Cooper	Huffman
Costa	Hurd (TX)
Costello (PA)	Israel
Courtney	Jackson Lee
Crenshaw	Jeffries
Crowley	Johnson (GA)
Cuellar	Johnson, E. B.
Culberson	Johnson, Sam
Cummings	Kaptur
Curbelo (FL)	Katko
Davis (CA)	Keating
Davis, Danny	Kelly (IL)
DeFazio	Kelly (MS)
DeGette	Kennedy
Delaney	Kildee
DeLauro	Kilmer
DelBene	Kind
	King (NY)

NOT VOTING—6

Hastings	Murphy (PA)	Poe (TX)
Marino	Pearce	Takai

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2157

So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 88 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 ayes 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 226, noes 202, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 459]

AYES—226

Abraham	Chaffetz	Forbes
Aderholt	Clawson (FL)	Fortenberry
Allen	Coffman	Foxx
Amash	Cole	Franks (AZ)
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Frelinghuysen
Babin	Collins (NY)	Garrett
Barletta	Comstock	Gibbs
Barr	Conaway	Gohmert
Barton	Cook	Goodlatte
Benishek	Cramer	Gosar
Bilirakis	Crawford	Gowdy
Bishop (MI)	Crenshaw	Granger
Bishop (UT)	Culberson	Graves (GA)
Black	Davidson	Graves (LA)
Blackburn	Davis, Rodney	Graves (MO)
Blum	Denham	Griffith
Bost	Dent	Grothman
Boustany	DeSantis	Guinta
Brady (TX)	DesJarlais	Guthrie
Brat	Diaz-Balart	Hanna
Bridenstine	Donovan	Hardy
Brooks (AL)	Duffy	Harper
Brooks (IN)	Duncan (SC)	Harris
Buck	Duncan (TN)	Hartzler
Bucshon	Ellmers (NC)	Heck (NV)
Burgess	Emmer (MN)	Hensarling
Byrne	Farenthold	Herrera Beutler
Calvert	Fincher	Hice, Jody B.
Carter (GA)	Fleischmann	Hill
Carter (TX)	Fleming	Holding
Chabot	Flores	Hudson

Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano

NOT VOTING—5

Hastings
Marino

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2203

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) on
which further proceedings were post-
poned and on which the ayes 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 will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 242, noes 185,
not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 461]

AYES—242

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
Coffman
Cole

Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
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
Zeldin

Jones
Jordan
Joyce
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger (IL)
Palmer
Paulsen
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)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions

Murphy (PA)
Neugebauer
Newhouse
Noem
Nugent
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
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)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce
Russell
Salmon
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions

NOES—185

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
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clawson (FL)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Costa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Dold

Doyle, Michael
F.
Duckworth
Edwards
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Esty
Farr
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Graham
Grayson
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hahn
Heck (WA)
Higgins
Hill
Himes
Hinojosa
Honda
Hoyer
Huffman
Israel
Jackson Lee
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Kuster
Langevin
Delaney
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lee
Levin
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski

Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Stutzman
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Vela
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

Schakowsky
Schiff
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)

NOT VOTING—6

Hastings
Marino

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2207

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes 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 will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 225, noes 202,
not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 462]

AYES—225

LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham
(NM)
Luján, Ben Ray
(NM)
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McDermott
McGovern
McNerney
Meeke
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Rangel
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez, Linda
T.
Sanchez, Loretta
Sanford
Sarbanes

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
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford

Crenshaw
Culberson
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
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
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
Hurd (TX)
Hurt (VA)
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jolly
Jones
Jordan
Joyce
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
Marchant
Massie

McCarthy	Reed	Stutzman	Thompson (CA)	Van Hollen	Wasserman	Pallone	Sanford	Titus
McCaul	Renacci	Thompson (PA)	Thompson (MS)	Vargas	Schultz	Pascrell	Sarbanes	Tonko
McClintock	Ribble	Thornberry	Titus	Veasey	Watson Coleman	Payne	Schakowsky	Torres
McHenry	Rice (SC)	Tiberi	Tonko	Vela	Welch	Pelosi	Schiff	Tsongas
McKinley	Rigell	Tipton	Torres	Velázquez	Wilson (FL)	Perlmutter	Schrader	Van Hollen
McMorris	Roby	Trott	Tsongas	Visclosky	Yarmuth	Peters	Scott (VA)	Vargas
Rodgers	Roe (TN)	Turner	Upton	Walz		Pingree	Scott, David	Veasey
McSally	Rogers (AL)	Valadao				Pocan	Serrano	Vela
Meadows	Rogers (KY)	Wagner				Polis	Sewell (AL)	Velázquez
Messer	Rohrabacher	Walberg	Hastings	Pearce	Takai	Price (NC)	Sherman	Visclosky
Mica	Rokita	Walden	Marino	Poe (TX)	Waters, Maxine	Quigley	Sinema	Walz
Miller (FL)	Rooney (FL)	Walker				Rangel	Sires	Wasserman
Miller (MI)	Roskam	Walorski				Rice (NY)	Slaughter	Schultz
Moolenaar	Ross	Walters, Mimi				Richmond	Smith (NJ)	Smith (WA)
Mooney (WV)	Rothfus	Webster (FL)				Roybal-Allard	Smith (NJ)	Waters, Maxine
Mullin	Rouzer	Weber (TX)				Ruiz	Speier	Watson Coleman
Mulvaney	Royce	Webster (FL)				Ruppersberger	Swalwell (CA)	Welch
Murphy (PA)	Russell	Wenstrup				Ryan (OH)	Takano	Whitfield
Neugebauer	Salmon	Westerman				Sánchez, Linda	Thompson (CA)	Wilson (FL)
Newhouse	Sanford	Westmoreland				T.	Thompson (MS)	Yarmuth
Noem	Scalise	Whitfield						
Nugent	Schweikert	Williams						
Nunes	Scott, Austin	Wilson (SC)						
Olson	Sensenbrenner	Wittman						
Palazzo	Sessions	Womack						
Palmer	Shimkus	Woodall						
Perry	Shuster	Yoder						
Pittenger	Simpson	Yoho						
Pitts	Smith (MO)	Young (AK)						
Poliquin	Smith (NE)	Young (IA)						
Pompeo	Smith (TX)	Young (IN)						
Posey	Stefanik	Zeldin						
Price, Tom	Stewart	Zinke						
Ratcliffe	Stivers							

NOT VOTING—6

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2210

So the amendment was agreed to.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 95 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 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 will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 193, noes 235,
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 463]

AYES—193

Adams	DeGette	Keating
Aguilar	Delaney	Kelly (IL)
Ashford	Ashford	Kennedy
Bass	Bera	Kildee
Beatty	DelBene	Kilmer
Becerra	DeSaulnier	Kirkpatrick
Bera	Deutch	Kuster
Beyer	Dingell	Lance
Bishop (GA)	Doggett	Langevin
Blumenauer	Bishop (GA)	Larsen (WA)
Bonamici	Blumenauer	Larson (CT)
Boyle, Brendan	Bonamici	Lawrence
F.	Bonamici, Brendan	Lee
Brady (PA)	F.	Levin
Brown (FL)	Brady (PA)	Lewis
Brownley (CA)	Brown (FL)	Lieu, Ted
Bustos	Brownley (CA)	Lipinski
Butterfield	Buchanan	LoBiondo
Capps	Bustos	LoBiondo
Capuano	Butterfield	Loeb
Cárdenas	Capps	Lofgren
Carney	Capuano	Lowey
Carson (IN)	Cárdenas	Lujan Grisham
Cartwright	Carney	(NM)
Castor (FL)	Carson (IN)	Luján, Ben Ray
Castro (TX)	Castor (FL)	(NM)
Chu, Judy	Castro (TX)	Lynch
Ciilline	Chu, Judy	Maloney,
Clark (MA)	Ciilline	Carolyn
Clarke (NY)	Ciilline	Maloney, Sean
Clawson (FL)	Clark (MA)	Matsui
Clay	Clarke (NY)	McCollum
Cleaver	Clay	McDermott
Clyburn	Cleaver	McGovern
Cohen	Clyburn	McNerney
Connolly	Cohen	Meehan
Conyers	Connolly	Moores
Cooper	Conyers	Hinojosa
Costa	Cooper	Meng
Costello (PA)	Costa	Moore
Courtney	Costello (PA)	Moulton
Crowley	Courtney	Murphy (FL)
Cuellar	Crowley	Nadler
Cummings	Cuellar	Napolitano
Curbelo (FL)	Cummings	Neal
Davis (CA)	Curbelo (FL)	Nolan
Davis, Danny	Dodd	Norcross
DeFazio	Dodd	O'Rourke
DeGette	Dodd	
Delaney	Dodd	
DeLauro	Dodd	
DelBene	Dodd	
Dent	Dodd	
DeSaulnier	Dodd	
Deutch	Dodd	
Dingell	Dodd	
Doggett	Dodd	
Dold	Dodd	
Donovan	Dodd	
Doyle, Michael	Dodd	
F.	Dodd	
Duckworth	Dodd	
Edwards	Dodd	

Yoho Young (IA) Zeldin
Young (AK) Young (IN) Zinke

NOT VOTING—5

Hastings Pearce Takai
Marino Poe (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2213

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois
changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 96 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 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 will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 194, noes 234,
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 464]

AYES—194

Adams DeSaulnier Kilmer
Aguilar Deutch Kind
Ashford Dingell Kirkpatrick
Bass Doggett Kuster
Beatty Dold Langevin
Becerra Donovan Larsen (WA)
Bera Doyle, Michael Larson (CT)
Beyer F. Lawrence
Blumenauer Duckworth Lee
Bonamici Edwards Levin
Boyle, Brendan Ellison Lewis
F. Engel Lieu, Ted
Brady (PA) Eshoo Lipinski
Brown (FL) Esty Loeb sack
Brownley (CA) Farr Lofgren
Bustos Fitzpatrick Cuellar
Butterfield Foster Lowey
Capps Frankel (FL) Lujan Grisham
Capuano Fudge (NM)
Cárdenas Gabbard Luján, Ben Ray
Carney Gallego (NM)
Carson (IN) Garamendi Lynch
Cartwright Gibson Malone y,
Castor (FL) Graham Carolyn
Castro (TX) Grayson Maloney, Sean
Chu, Judy Green, Al Matsui
Cicilline Green, Gene McCollum
Clark (MA) Grijalva McDermott
Clarke (NY) Gutiérrez McGovern
Clay Hahn McNerney
Cleaver Hanna Meehan
Clyburn Heck (WA) Meeks
Cohen Higgins Meng
Connolly Himes Moore
Conyers Hinojosa Moulton
Cooper Honda Murphy (FL)
Costa Hoyer Nadler
Costello (PA) Huffman Napolitano
Courtney Israel Neal
Crowley Jackson Lee Nolan
Cummings Jeffries Norcross
Curbelo (FL) Johnson (GA) O'Rourke
Davis (CA) Johnson, E. B. Pallone
Davis, Danny Jolly Pascrell
DeFazio Kaptur Payne
DeGette Keating Pelosi
Delaney Kelly (IL) Perlmutter
DeLauro Kennedy Peters
DelBene Kildee Pingree

Pocan Schakowsky Titus
Polis Schiff Tonko
Price (NC) Schrader Torres
Quigley Scott (VA) Tsongas
Rangel Scott, David Van Hollen
Reichert Serrano Vargas
Rice (NY) Sewell (AL) Veasey
Richmond Sherman Vela
Ros-Lehtinen Sinema Velázquez
Roybal-Allard Sires Visclosky
Ruiz Slaughter Walz
Ruppersberger Smith (WA) Wasserman
Rush Speier Schultz
Ryan (OH) Stefanik Waters, Maxine
Sanchez, Linda Swallow (CA) Watson Coleman
T. Takano Welch
Sanchez, Loretta Thompson (CA) Wilson (FL)
Sarbanes Thompson (MS) Yarmuth

NOES—234

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

Hastings Pearce Takai
Marino Poe (TX)

NOT VOTING—5

Hastings Pearce Takai
Marino Poe (TX)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2218

Messrs. COHEN and RUSH changed
their vote from “no” to “aye.”
So the amendment was rejected.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 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 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 will be a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 192, noes 236,
not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 465]

AYES—192

Adams Doggett Lawrence
Aguilar Dold Lee
Ashford Doyle, Michael Levin
Bass F. Lewis
Beatty Duckworth Lieu, Ted
Becerra Edwards LoBiondo
Bera Ellison Loeb sack
Beyer Engel Lofgren
Bilirakis Eshoo Lowenthal
Blumenauer Esty Lowey
Bonamici Farr Lujan Grisham
Boyle, Brendan Foster (NM)
F. Frankel (FL) Luján, Ben Ray
Brady (PA) Frelinghuysen (NM)
Brown (FL) Fudge Lynch
Brownley (CA) Gabbard Maloney,
Buchanan Gallego Carolyn
Bustos Garamendi Maloney, Sean
Butterfield Graham Matsui
Capps Grayson McCollum
Capuano Green, Al McDermott
Cárdenas Green, Gene McGovern
Tiberi Grijalva McNerney
Carney Gutiérrez Meeks
Carson (IN) Hahn Meng
Cartwright Hahn Moore
Castor (FL) Heck (WA)
Castro (TX) Higgins Moulton
Chu, Judy Himes Murphy (FL)
Cicilline Hinojosa Nadler
Clark (MA) Honda Napolitano
Clarke (NY) Hoyer Neal
Clawson (FL) Huffman Nolan
Clay Israel Norcross
Cleaver Jackson Lee O'Rourke
Clyburn Weber (TX) Pascrell
Cohen Johnson (GA) Payne
Connolly Johnson, E. B. Pelosi
Conyers Jolly Perlmutter
Courtney Jones Peters
Crowley Kaptur Pingree
Cummings Keating
Curbelo (FL) Kelly (IL) Pocan
Davis (CA) Kennedy Poliquin
Davis, Danny Kildee Polis
DeFazio Kilmer Price (NC)
DeGette Kind Quigley
Delaney Kirkpatrick Rangel
DeLauro Keating Kuster
DelBene Lance Richert
DeSaulnier Langevin Rice (NY)
Deutch Larsen (WA) Richmond
Dingell Larson (CT) Roybal-Allard

Ruiz	Sewell (AL)	Van Hollen
Ruppersberger	Sherman	Vargas
Rush	Sires	Veasey
Ryan (OH)	Slaughter	Vela
Sánchez, Linda T.	Smith (NJ)	Velázquez
Sanchez, Loretta	Smith (WA)	Visclosky
Sanford	Speler	Wasserman
Sarbanes	Swalwell (CA)	Schultz
Schakowsky	Takano	Waters, Maxine
Schiff	Thompson (CA)	Watson Coleman
Schrader	Thompson (MS)	Welch
Scott (VA)	Titus	Wilson (FL)
Scott, David	Tonko	Yarmuth
Serrano	Torres	
	Tsongas	

NOES—236

Abraham	Graves (LA)	Palazzo
Aderholt	Graves (MO)	Palmer
Allen	Griffith	Paulsen
Amash	Grothman	Perry
Amodi	Guinta	Peterson
Babin	Guthrie	Pittenger
Barletta	Hanna	Pitts
Barr	Hardy	Pompeo
Barton	Harper	Posey
Benishek	Harris	Price, Tom
Bishop (GA)	Hartzler	Ratcliffe
Bishop (UT)	Heck (NV)	Reed
Black	Hensarling	Renacci
Blackburn	Herrera Beutler	Ribble
Blum	Hice, Jody B.	Rice (SC)
Bost	Hill	Rigell
Boustany	Holding	Roby
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Roe (TN)
Brat	Huelskamp	Rogers (AL)
Bridenstine	Huizenga (MI)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Hultgren	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Hunter	Rokita
Buck	Hurd (TX)	Rooney (FL)
Bucshon	Hurt (VA)	Roskam
Burgess	Issa	Ross
Byrne	Jenkins (KS)	Rothfus
Calvert	Jenkins (WV)	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Royce
Carter (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Russell
Chabot	Jordan	Salmon
Chaffetz	Joyce	Scalise
Coffman	Katko	Schweikert
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Sensenbrenner
Collins (NY)	King (IA)	Sessions
Comstock	King (NY)	Shimkus
Conaway	Kinzinger (IL)	Shuster
Cook	Kline	Simpson
Cooper	Knight	Sinema
Costa	Labrador	Smith (MO)
Costello (PA)	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Cramer	LaMalfa	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Lamborn	Stefanik
Crenshaw	Latta	Stewart
Cuellar	Lipinski	Stivers
Culberson	Long	Stutzman
Davidson	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Love	Thornberry
Denham	Lucas	Tiberi
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Tipton
DeSantis	Lummis	Trott
DesJarlais	MacArthur	Turner
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Upton
Donovan	Massie	Valadao
Duffy	McCarthy	Wagner
Duncan (SC)	McCaul	Walberg
Duncan (TN)	McClintock	Walden
Ellmers (NC)	McHenry	Walker
Emmer (MN)	McKinley	Walorski
Farenthold	McMorris	Walters, Mimi
Fincher	Rodgers	Walz
Fitzpatrick	McSally	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	Meadows	Webster (FL)
Fleming	Meehan	Wenstrup
Flores	Messer	Westerman
Forbes	Mica	Westmoreland
Fortenberry	Miller (FL)	Whitfield
Foxx	Miller (MI)	Williams
Franks (AZ)	Moolenaar	Wilson (SC)
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Wittman
Gibbs	Mullin	Womack
Gibson	Mulvaney	Woodall
Gohmert	Murphy (PA)	Yoder
Goodlatte	Neugebauer	Yoho
Gosar	Newhouse	Young (AK)
Gowdy	Noem	Young (IA)
Granger	Nugent	Young (IN)
Graves (GA)	Nunes	Zeldin
	Olson	Zinke

NOT VOTING—5

Hastings	Pearce	Takai
Marino	Poe (TX)	

□ 2222

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WOODALL). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 98 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:

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 section 120, 425, 426, or 427.

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 dirty water riders in this bill. These four poison pill riders do not need to be in the bill. Each in its own right is a good example of a bad rider, and together they represent an assault on clean water, an attempt to forcibly supplant Agency expertise with ideology.

The first dirty water rider, section 120, undermines the Interior Department's Stream Protection Rule which updates regulations which would allow coal mining companies to pollute and often extinguish altogether our mountain streams. We need this rule, and it is sufficiently flexible to accommodate regional variability. It is stringent enough to protect the people of Appalachia from the negative health and environmental impacts of mountaintop removal mining.

The second dirty water rider, section 425, prohibits the EPA from updating the definition of fill material under the Clean Water Act. It was never congressional intent to allow mining refuse and similar material—some of it hazardous—to qualify as fill material and thereby bypass a more thorough environmental review and meet Federal pollution standards.

Downstream water users have every right to be concerned that the section 404 process fails to protect them from the discharge of hazardous substances. To freeze those definitions in time, as section 425 does, ties the hands of implementing agencies despite evolving scientific understanding and current regulatory insights. Current and future administrations must have the discretion to implement key terms and clarify them when needed.

The third dirty water rider, section 426, requires that certain dredge and fill activities be completely exempted from the permitting process. This is in

direct contravention to the text of the Clean Water Act and essentially bars the executive from being able to implement the environmental safeguards contemplated in the act.

The fourth rider, section 427, blocks the EPA and the Army Corps of Engineers' Clean Water Rule, which restores critical pollution standards to our Nation's small streams and wetlands. At stake is the protection of almost 60 percent of U.S. streams. Headwaters and nonperennial streams supply drinking water to more than 117 million Americans.

American businesses need certainty. They need to know when the Federal Government has authority and when it doesn't. Without updated guidance, businesses will often not know when they need an Army Corps permit. This uncertainty will continue in the light of the recent Supreme Court decision and underscores the need for the Clean Water Rule to clarify the limits of Federal authority.

These riders are a far cry from sensible adjustments to the Clean Water Act. On the contrary, they are just the latest in a seemingly endless effort to undo clean water protections and regulatory clarity. All four of these riders are not only unnecessary, they pose a significant threat to water quality, public health, and fish and wildlife populations.

Just as important is poison pill riders like these that prevent us from doing our jobs and pass appropriations bills that have any chance of passing the Senate, any chance of being signed by our President. I urge my colleagues to oppose these riders and support this amendment.

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. Chair, first, I want to point out that we have had separate and stand-alone debates on each of the provisions that the gentleman is trying to address, so obviously we have already had this debate.

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. JENKINS).

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. Over the last few days, we have heard from our colleagues across the aisle that it is the market that is responsible for the downturn in coal, not this administration's regulations. But if you issue regulation upon regulation that completely overhauls the entire industry sector, is that really just the market at work?

Instead of acknowledging that it is the onerous regulations that play a big part in the problems impacting the coal industry, this administration has blamed coal's troubles on the market; and, incredibly, this has been what our friends on the opposite side of the aisle seem to agree with.

□ 2230

They are minimizing the devastating impacts of regulations like Office of Surface Mining's proposed stream protection rule.

So let me tell you about the real-world consequences: lost jobs, lost revenues, lost taxes, lost resources. The stream protection rule would reduce total recoverable coal by 65 percent. That means a decrease of \$3 billion in coal taxes. Our towns and counties rely on the revenue to pay for schools, police, emergency services, and so much more.

A big drop in coal production means a big drop in good-paying jobs. Over 100,000 jobs are at risk because of this rule. Coal puts food on the table, pays the bills, and supports our families.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia. Without the good jobs coal provides, families are having to make tough decisions, decisions that will impact these individuals' lives: How will they get their bills paid? How will they make their car payment or their house payment?

It is time we stand up for these hard-working miners, their families, and American energy. Therefore, I urge opposition to this amendment.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I heartily agree with my friend from West Virginia that it is time we stand up for coal miners and their families. It is time we stand up for their health. I don't know West Virginia's health statistics, but I do know those from southwest Virginia. They, unfortunately, have the highest negative health consequences of any counties in Virginia.

The New York Times did a story a few years ago about the 20 counties in America where the death rate was going up. Seven were in the coalfields of southwest Virginia. The incidence of sickness, birth defects, cancer, and all kinds of illnesses are much higher when you look at the streams that have been buried by coal refuse.

Let's look at this. In this so-called war on coal, no administration has put as much money into research on trying to bring coal back—coal gasification and carbon capture sequestration—trying to make coal a vital part of our economy again, without the health consequences and without environmental consequences. This is what we are trying to do.

We cherish these people also. Let's take care of them in a strong way rather than subjecting them to environmental conditions and lifestyles that destroy their lives.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, as I mentioned earlier, we already had a number of debates about each of the provisions that the gentleman is trying to

strike; therefore, this amendment is totally unnecessary. Nevertheless, the committee included each of these provisions for sound reasons, and each have their own merit. Broadly speaking, these policy provisions are included in the bill to put the brakes on flawed policies that this administration is trying to implement.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I would just agree with the distinguished chairman of this committee that, yes, we have had debates. It is important that we continue the debates, and ultimately, wisdom will emerge. It is this back-and-forth, hopefully, that gets us to the very best policies and the very best laws.

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. 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. 99 OFFERED BY MRS. CAPPS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 99 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mrs. CAPPS. 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 process any application under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) for a permit to drill or a permit to modify, that would authorize use of hydraulic fracturing or acid well stimulation treatment in the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, despite technological improvements, we know that extracting, transporting, and burning oil and gas is a dirty and dangerous business. There is simply no disputing that.

Our reliance on these outdated fuel sources is placing people and our environment at risk. This is especially true for offshore drilling and the activities used to extract as much oil and gas as possible from these wells, methods such as hydraulic fracturing, called fracking, and acid well stimulation.

Offshore fracking has been occurring for over 20 years off California's coast, and yet we know very little about the impacts on our oceans. That is why, last year, I introduced H.R. 1951, the Offshore Fracking Transparency and Review Act, which would require an environmental impact statement to be produced for fracking and acid well stimulation. We simply must know more about these activities before they should continue.

While my legislation has not been afforded a hearing, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, BOEM, and the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement, BSEE, completed a programmatic assessment providing the first attempt to examine offshore well stimulation treatments, which resulted in a legal settlement with stakeholders in my congressional district earlier this year.

This assessment confirmed that the potential for negative impacts on the environment and wildlife from offshore fracking and acid well stimulation, as well as the many unknowns as to the extent of the impacts, are well confirmed. Despite this, they decided that a more thorough analysis of potential impacts would not be undertaken.

Regrettably, this has resulted in a missed opportunity to fully examine the risks posed by these treatments through a full environmental impact statement, as my legislation would require. Additionally, there is a severe lack of transparency as to what types of chemicals are being used for tracking and well stimulation activities and how they would be polluting our waters.

So I join my constituents in expressing significant concerns over the impacts that these activities may have on our local environment, marine life, and public health.

Given the many questions surrounding the impacts of offshore fracking activities, my amendment would prohibit the use of funds to process any application for a permit to drill or permit to modify that includes hydraulic fracturing and acid well stimulation in the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf. This would provide a pause in activities to allow us to study both the need to extend the life of these wells as well as the safety and long-term impacts of these activities.

My amendment provides a measured approach to a very uncertain practice that could have long-term and severe consequences to our oceans and public health. I urge my colleagues to support it.

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. First, I want to say I have enjoyed serving with the gentlewoman from California for a number of years. We have shared many a plane

ride back and forth here to Washington, D.C., but we disagree on this issue.

In May, the Department of the Interior issued a finding of no significant impact with respect to these operations. This followed a review of 23 oil and gas platforms currently operating off the shore of California. The review drew upon the best available science and reaffirms these operations are operating as safely as they should.

The amendment is nothing more than another attempt to restrict offshore development for oil and gas. I oppose the amendment and encourage my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Chairman, also to my colleague with whom I have enjoyed serving and with whom we share a particular affinity for a certain portion of a coastline along my district which I know he and I both appreciate, I want to close by reiterating that oil and gas extraction, transportation, and combustion is inherently risky and dirty. And this we do know. There is no denying it.

But what we don't know equally concerns me. We have very little knowledge of the long-term impacts of offshore fracking and well stimulations on our oceans and our marine life as well as our public health, yet these activities continue to occur off our coast.

□ 2240

Mr. Chairman, my amendment simply provides a pause in the use of fracking and acid well stimulation on the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf so that we have the chance to evaluate the need for and potential impacts of these practices.

Let's make sure we fully understand the potential damage we are doing to our sensitive coastal and ocean environments, the species that live in them, and our public health.

I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to say that BSEE has done an enormous amount of study and assessment. They continue to do so as they look at the operations of oil and gas industry in California, certainly off the coast of California.

Many people don't realize how large a producer the State of California is in the oil and gas industry. It has a long history in the State of California, one of the largest oil companies in the country, Chevron, still one of the few that operates out of the State of California, and we are certainly very proud of that.

It has not been a perfect history, but the science has improved. The production practices have improved, and it is certainly an important part of our economy, and we want to make sure that they continue to operate safely. We are going to make sure that these agencies do the necessary regulatory work that they need to do.

So I am opposed 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 (Mrs. CAPPS).

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

Mrs. CAPPS. 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. 100 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 100 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:

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 to terminate—

- (1) the Law Enforcement and Investigations unit of the Forest Service; or
- (2) the Office of Law Enforcement and Security of the Bureau of Land Management.

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, this amendment will ensure that none of the funds made available by this legislation are used to abolish the Bureau of Land Management or the U.S. Forest Service law enforcement units.

BLM and the Forest Service law enforcement units are highly specialized, highly trained professionals responsible for enforcing a range of Federal laws across our public lands. These responsibilities include enforcing grazing regulations, monitoring mine safety, protecting archaeological resources, and enforcing fire restrictions.

A vote for this amendment will simply send the message that Congress supports these important responsibilities and does not condone any effort to undermine or eliminate this important Federal authority and the officers in those law enforcement units.

Today, more than ever, Federal law enforcement officers charged with protecting our public lands deserve our respect and support. Tragically marked by the illegal occupation of the Malheur National Wildlife Refuge by armed militants earlier this year—an occupation, I remind you, that House Republicans refused to officially condemn—there is a growing hostility toward Federal land management and is increasingly exposing Federal law enforcement officers to violence, threats of violence, intimidation, and disrespect.

Whether it is individuals like Cliven Bundy who believe they are above the law and refuse to pay below-market, federally subsidized grazing fees, violent secessionists plotting to bomb a Federal facility, or treasure hunters determined to deface and loot precious cultural resources, law enforcement officers at Federal land management agencies enforce critical laws like the Endangered Species Act, the Lacey Act, the Native Americans Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, and they deserve our support.

But despite these important functions, House Republicans aim to strip Federal land management agencies of their law enforcement authority, going so far as to introduce legislation, H.R. 4571, to completely dissolve BLM and Forest Service law enforcement authority.

To do so would be disrespectful and outright dangerous. Instead of pouring gasoline on the fire and contributing to the climate that leads to violent armed occupations, we should stand up for the integrity of the Federal law enforcement officers, and not cast them away with scorn, neglect or disrespect.

With this amendment, we have an opportunity to send a clear message that Congress supports Federal law enforcement officers and the rule of law across our public lands.

Please support this amendment to ensure that none of the funds made available by the bill can be used to abolish BLM or Forest Service law enforcement units. I urge my colleagues to support federal law enforcement officers by voting in favor of this simple, commonsense and, indeed, reassuring amendment.

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, the bill provides funds for law enforcement functions of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. Even if these agencies wanted to, they could not eliminate their law enforcement offices and responsibility. Neither could they provide more or less funding for them without the approval of the Appropriations Committee, and this committee has no desire to end the law enforcement function of either the Forest Service or the Bureau of Land Management.

This amendment has no purpose and, therefore, it is not needed. It is nothing more than a nuisance amendment, in my opinion. I would urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, H.R. 4571, does exactly that, strips the authority. And Congress can and has the authority to strip from law enforcement units and Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management their authority and their ability to enforce the laws that they have been responsible under their jurisdiction to enforce.

So this amendment, as I said earlier, is a reassurance that the intentions are both good intentions, to retain these services, but that, by approving this amendment, we effectively negate and hold harmless and impotent the present legislation that is out there to, indeed, get rid of these units.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, there is no need for this amendment, and I would oppose this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time. Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, 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. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MR. HIGGINS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 101 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. HIGGINS. 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:

COMPLIANCE WITH GREAT LAKES COMPACT

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by a State in contravention of the interstate compact regarding water resources in the Great Lakes—St. Lawrence River Basin consented to and approved by Congress in Public Law 110-342.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, at the outset, I would like to thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work on this appropriations bill. While not perfect, the bill funds the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative at \$300 million so that critically important work to clean up the Great Lakes can continue.

My amendment would prohibit funds in this act from being used by States in violation of the Great Lakes Compact, an agreement among the eight Great Lakes States outlining how this precious and nonrenewable resource is to be managed.

The compact prohibits water from being pumped to areas beyond the drainage basin, and sets strict criteria for any diversion request.

To that end, a municipal government outside the basin recently had its ap-

plication approved to divert up to 8.2 million gallons per day from Lake Michigan, most of which will be returned after being treated.

This diversion request was only approved after conditions were met lowering the volume of water to be withdrawn as well as reducing the service territory it would be provided to.

□ 2250

Going forward, it will be important to ensure that the approval of this request does not set a precedent that will threaten to deplete this resource by encouraging further diversion requests that do not uphold the strict water management standards outlined in the compact. As freshwater supplies in other parts of the country and the world dwindle, the desire to divert water by tanker or the construction of pipelines could become a greater threat to the Great Lakes.

The Great Lakes are a nonrenewable source. Less than 1 percent of the water is renewed annually through rainfall and snow melt. The onslaught of climate change will likely cause water levels to decline in the future. Irresponsibly diverting water from the basin could threaten the fragile ecosystem, putting fish and wildlife at risk by degrading water quality and damaging habitats.

This amendment is supported by the Alliance for the Great Lakes, the National Wildlife Foundation, and Citizens Campaign for the Environment.

[From Citizens Campaign for the Environment]

MEMORANDUM OF SUPPORT: COMPLIANCE WITH THE GREAT LAKES COMPACT AMENDMENT TO H.R. 5538—HIGGINS

Background

While seemingly inexhaustible, the Great Lakes are truly a gift of the glaciers, as rainfall and snowmelt only naturally replenish about one percent of the water annually. Once water removal from the Great Lakes for any reason extends beyond one percent annually, lake levels will decrease. The existing strains on this fragile ecosystem, such as pollution, invasive species, and climate change, will only be exacerbated if the sheer quantity of water is jeopardized by Great Lakes water export.

The Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Basin Water Resources Compact has been law in New York and the United States since 2008. The Compact is a valuable interstate agreement that builds on century-old interstate and international protections for the Great Lakes. The Compact specifies how each Great Lakes state will act to protect Great Lakes water quantity. The Compact prohibits water diversions out of the basin, with limited exceptions.

Justification

A municipal government that is considered a community in a straddling county of the Great Lakes Basin recently had its diversion application approved after strict conditions regarding the volume of water and service territory were met, among others. Going forward, it will be important to ensure that the approval of this request does not set a precedent that will threaten to deplete this resource by encouraging further diversion requests that do not uphold the strict water management standards outlined in the Compact.

Congress can help ensure compliance with the Great Lakes Compact by prohibiting federal funds from being used by states to break the strict guidelines laid out in the Compact. Predicted to be more valuable than oil, our abundant fresh water resources are the envy of many who suffer from already strained, polluted, or disappearing water resources. Congress must protect the integrity of the Compact if we are to protect Great Lakes water quantity for future generations.

ALLIANCE FOR THE GREAT LAKES,

JULY 12, 2016.

Hon. BRIAN HIGGINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN HIGGINS: On behalf of the Alliance for the Great Lakes, I thank you for offering an amendment to H.R. 5536, the Interior and Environment Appropriations bill, regarding compliance with the Great Lakes Compact. The Alliance for the Great Lakes is pleased to support this amendment.

The Alliance for the Great Lakes appreciates that you recognize the importance of the Great Lakes to our region, our communities, and our way of life. The Great Lakes provide economic engines for our communities and recreational opportunities for families. They hold almost 20 percent of the world's surface fresh water and supply drinking water to more than 30 million people. In order to protect this amazing resource, the Great Lakes Compact was adopted in 2008. It provides significant protections to Great Lakes water because it prohibits diversions of Great Lakes water, with limited exceptions, and requires each state to enact water management programs for in-basin water use. Your amendment is a good reminder of how important the Great Lakes Compact is to protecting this precious natural resource.

Recently the Compact Council approved with conditions the first diversion request under the exception standards of the Great Lakes Compact. This diversion will serve the City of Waukesha, Wisconsin. Given this development, the Alliance for the Great Lakes supports your amendment that seeks to uphold the spirit and intent of the Great Lakes Compact. The Alliance for the Great Lakes and our partners will work to ensure that this diversion approval with conditions is enforced and sets a high bar for any future diversion requests.

Thank you for your continued leadership on Great Lakes issues.

Sincerely,

MOLLY M. FLANAGAN.

JULY 12, 2016.

Hon. BRIAN HIGGINS,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE HIGGINS: On behalf of the National Wildlife Federation (NWF) and our 248,000 members and supporters in New York, we thank you for offering an amendment to H.R. 5536, The Interior and Environment Appropriations bill, regarding the Great Lakes Compact (Compact) and wish to express our support for this effort.

As you well know, our Great Lakes are a wonder of the world. They hold almost 20 percent of the world's surface fresh water, supply drinking water to more than 30 million people, and are the foundation of our economy and way of life. The Great Lakes are vast, but fragile, and are susceptible to water withdrawals and diversions. As a result, the Compact was negotiated and adopted in 2008 to help protect and sustain our Great Lakes. The Compact provides significant protections to Great Lakes water because it prohibits diversions of Great Lakes water, with limited exceptions, and promotes the wise use of in-basin water resources.

Given the recent approval with conditions of the first diversion request under the Compact by the City of Waukesha, Wisconsin, NWF supports your amendment that seeks to uphold the spirit and intent of the Compact. It is important to ensure that this diversion approval with conditions is enforced and sets the right precedent. Therefore, we share your efforts to reinforce the strength of the Compact and protect the largest surface freshwater system in our country.

We thank you for your continued leadership and look forward to working with you on this issue.

Sincerely,

MARC SMITH,

*Policy Director, National Wildlife
Federation's Great Lakes Regional Center.*

Mr. HIGGINS. Mr. Chairman, by prohibiting the use of funds by States in violation of the compact, Congress can send a clear message that it takes seriously its responsibility to protect the largest surface freshwater system in our Nation.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I have no problem with the amendment and am willing to accept the amendment.

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

The Acting Chair. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR.
LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 102 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:

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 Secretarial Order 3289, issued by the Secretary of the Interior on September 14, 2009, and addressing the impacts of climate change on America's water, land, and other natural and cultural resources.

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. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would ensure that the Department of the Interior continues to address the impacts of climate change on our public lands, on our waters, and cultural resources by maintaining a 2009 Secretarial order on climate change.

Across the country, our public lands and wildlife are often on the front lines of climate change.

Every week, we learn more from scientists about the impacts of rising levels of greenhouse gases in our atmosphere. Ocean acidification, droughts,

increased frequency of wildfires, heat waves, extreme weather events, diminished air quality, habitat loss, species migrations, and more changes than even these to our environment are occurring because of climate change.

The Department of the Interior is in a unique position when it comes to climate change because it is responsible for where fossil fuels are extracted, how fossil fuels are extracted, and the amount of fossil fuels extracted from our public lands and our waters.

Of course, fossil fuels, when burned, contribute a significant amount of climate-changing pollution to the atmosphere. In addition, the Department of the Interior is also responsible for managing much of our public lands and waters that are impacted by that damaged climate.

Therefore, the Department of the Interior should play a significant role in both promoting the transition to a low-carbon economy and mitigating the effects of climate change on our public lands and waters.

That is why I am so glad the Department is finalizing a rulemaking for renewable energy development on public lands, paving the way for massive clean energy development.

The Department of the Interior also recognizes that climate change is drastically changing the landscape and the wildlife it is working to preserve, and so the Department has taken a series of commonsense steps to protect our national resources from the impacts of climate change.

These steps include coordinating responses across multiple bureaus of the Department; communicating the science of climate change impact; establishing regional hubs to study existing climate change impacts and management strategies; engaging the public through education; developing a network of local, State, and national partners to devise strategies for responding to climate impacts; and understanding and limiting the Department's own pollution footprint.

The complexity of a changing climate require multidisciplinary teams covering large swaths of the landscape who strive to understand what is going on, respond appropriately, and adapt long-term management strategies so that the public lands, waters, and resources continue to be accessible to the public and resilient to the impacts of climate change. My amendment supports these commonsense measures to help our public lands and resources become more resilient to the impacts of climate change so that future generations will continue to benefit from our rich natural and cultural resources. My amendment also ensures that these Department of the Interior actions continue into the next administration.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to support the Department of the Interior's efforts by voting "yes" on my amendment.

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, my friend wants to ensure that funds are being expended on efforts to address climate change. I understand that. Simply put, though, we are not here to write blank checks. Some programs may have merit; many certainly do not.

We would not be doing our jobs if we allow the Secretary of the Interior to just unilaterally make policy decisions without allowing Congress to weigh in with appropriate policy debates, and certainly, we are not going to allow a future Secretary to be bound by a prior Secretary's fiat without congressional input.

In the meantime, we must use congressional power of the purse to rein in the executive branch overreach. I would think that whoever is in power, we cannot allow an executive to continue to use executive orders in violation of the separation of powers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, I remind my colleagues that these Secretarial actions that I am asking to continue have been going on since September of 2009 with approval and with oversight and reports back to this Congress. These are rational, logical steps that the Secretary has put into place.

I ask my colleague, what would you oppose? We should not communicate responses across multiple bureaus? We don't need to understand the science of climate change impacts? We don't need regional hubs to study this, which are ongoing?

All we are saying is let's continue this course of action. We need to develop resiliency. We know these impacts. The science is overwhelming. This is an ongoing activity. To deny this now means to stop what is already ongoing, and that would be a shame at this time.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to continue the actions of the Department of the Interior to really coordinate and understand climate change impacts.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, just call me old-fashioned. I just think that the folks that are elected to office should have some authority around this town.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment and urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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.

AMENDMENT NO. 103 OFFERED BY MR. POCAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 103 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. POCAN. 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 Executive Order 13693.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I believe climate change represents one of the greatest threats to our economic livelihood, our national security, and the health of the planet.

To help combat this growing threat, on February, 19, 2015, the President issued a historic executive order which requires that the Federal Government commit to key sustainability goals. This executive order builds off of ongoing low-cost efforts throughout the administration to reduce emissions, save energy, and achieve key sustainability goals.

□ 2300

The efforts bolstered by this executive order have already helped Federal agencies save \$1.8 billion in cumulative energy costs. Surely we can all agree that the Federal Government, as the country's largest consumer of energy, should be a leader in cutting energy costs and saving taxpayer dollars, which is exactly what this executive order enables us to do.

Specifically, the executive order directs Federal agencies to ensure 25 percent of their total energy consumption is from clean energy sources by 2025 and reduces energy use at Federal buildings by 2½ percent per year between 2015 and 2025. These are worthy realistic goals to strive for because the consequences of not acting are dire.

Unmitigated global warming will reduce our global gross domestic product by almost a quarter in the next 80 years. As a professor at Stanford University said, we are basically throwing away money by not addressing climate change.

And to be clear, Mr. Chairman, this isn't something that only environmental groups are concerned about. Citigroup issued a report that found that minimizing temperature rises could reduce the global gross domestic product loss by \$50 trillion.

While climate change will have catastrophic long-term consequences, the effects of our warming planet are already being felt in our own backyards. Given the nature of this threat and the modest, yet worthy, goal this executive order sets to help combat the economic security and health risk climate change poses to us, I hope we can push through these commonsense measures. 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, my friend wants to ensure that funds are being expended on an executive order issued by the President. Simply put, the President did not consult Congress on these executive orders. Again, call me old-fashioned, but around here you should be able to pass a law in the House of Representatives, the United States Senate, have it signed, and not do things unilaterally.

Obviously, we were not consulted. From the perspective of the majority, we have a problem with this executive order. We would not be doing our jobs if we allowed the President to unilaterally make policy decisions without Congress having the ability to weigh in with these appropriate policy debates.

In the meantime, we must use our congressional power of the purse to rein in the executive branch overreach.

I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman may have a little confusion and not be as concerned about funds that are expended, but really funds that are saved—the \$1.8 billion in cumulative energy costs and the billions of dollars we will save by addressing climate change. I know in 2015, in the gentleman's home State of California, they had the worst water shortage in 1,200 years, which has been intensified 15 to 20 percent by global warming. In my home State of Wisconsin, farmers are facing more pests and widespread disease from higher humidity and warmer winter temperatures.

I would argue that this isn't about spending funds. This is about saving taxpayer funds, which is what I thought people on the other side of the aisle also would want to do. I hope that the gentleman might change his mind and support this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, obviously, being from California, we have our own versions of what is going on with the drought, and certainly the science that I look at is different than the gentleman's look at the science that he is at; but that is what policy debates are all about. We should debate that here in the Congress, we should debate that in the Senate, and it shouldn't be decisions that are unilaterally made by any President of the

United States. That is why we have a democracy here, not a king.

I oppose this amendment, and I encourage all of the Members here to oppose this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN).

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

Mr. POCAN. 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 Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 104 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 104 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. POLIS. 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. 441. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 102(a)(1) of Public Law 94-579 (43 U.S.C. 1701(a)(1)).

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 offer this amendment, along with my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the ranking member of the Natural Resources Committee.

The amendment is very simple. It offers a choice for those in Congress to make. It is a choice for Members to vote on whether we want to keep our public lands public or not.

Very simply, my amendment says that none of the funds available through this bill can be used in violation of the law with regard to keeping our public lands public. This amendment would not undo anything or undermine any current congressional or administrative land exchanges that are done legally.

The amendment would, however, prohibit the use of funds in this bill to pursue any extra-legal ways to turn Federal land over to private owners through various things like a commission, or others that have been espoused.

The district I have the honor of representing in Colorado is over 60 percent public lands. Public lands are not only beautiful and majestic, but they are the fundamental drivers of our mountain area economies in counties like Grand and Eagle and Summit Counties.

Public lands are good for our body, mind, and soul. A U.S. Army veteran of

the Kosovo and Iraq war who lives in Colorado recently said: "I fought to protect all that makes our Nation great, and that includes the public lands that belong to every American."

Not only are our public lands good for our souls, but they are also one of our largest economic drivers in our State and throughout the Rocky Mountain region and, indeed, across the country. Over \$646 billion is generated economically through our public lands, and visiting our public lands supports over 6 million jobs. From small businesses to ski resorts, from gas stations to diners, our economy thrives largely in part because of the public lands in areas like the one I have the honor of representing.

A recent poll across six Western States revealed that 96 percent of Americans support protecting public lands for future generations. Clearly, it is a top priority for our families. People want to see our public lands stay public and they want to see the maintenance for access of outdoor areas on our public lands as a critical focus of the Federal Government.

States simply don't have the resources to take on the responsibilities for maintaining and keeping our Federal lands safe. Selling these lands outright to private owners would undoubtedly lead to loss of access, loss of jobs, devastate our economy, and hurt the quality of life in districts like mine.

If you talk to the people on the ground who use these lands, whether it is sportsmen and recreational shooters, hikers, bikers, campers, hunters, or motorized activists, they don't want our land, the land they use, taken away from them. Obviously, those concerned with environmental well-being, water quality, and public health also strongly support our public lands.

With this amendment, I offer a clear choice to my colleagues. Support the protection of public lands and let's cast a vote to do that. I ask my colleagues to support the 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 agree with the gentleman that current law regarding public lands must be followed. There is nothing in this bill that contradicts that. We are not going to be getting rid of public lands in this bill. As such, there is no purpose or relevance for this, so I would oppose this. I think this is trying to get people all excited that we are going to be getting rid of public lands in this bill, which is not true.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I, again, thank the gentleman that there is not any sale of public lands in this bill. I would point out that there are Members in this body—in fact, the chair of

the authorizing committee in this general area—who speak regularly about privatizing our public lands, so there is a real threat. This is not simply something that comes out of nowhere. I think the peace of mind that we would get by including this kind of language in an appropriations bill would make it very clear that Congress supports the opinion of the American people, supports the economy in districts like mine, and wants to keep our public lands public.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 2310

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, there is no need for 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. POLIS).

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

Mr. POLIS. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 105 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 105 printed in House Report 114-683.

Ms. SPEIER. 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 finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Dog Management" published by the National Park Service in the Federal Register on February 24, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 9139 et seq.; Regulation Identifier No. 1024-AE16).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer this bipartisan amendment to the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act to ensure my constituents and those who visit the Golden Gate National Recreation Area will be able to enjoy the park as it is intended to be enjoyed.

The Golden Gate National Recreation Area is in the bay area and was envisioned to have multiple complementary uses. This is enshrined in its mission statement "to preserve and enhance the natural, historic, and scenic resources of the lands north and south of the Golden Gate for the education,

recreation, and inspiration of people today and in the future." However, the National Park Service is moving forward on a severely restrictive rule on an activity that many bay area residents presently enjoy in the GGNRA, and that is dog walking.

Dog walking off leash has been allowed in certain areas of the GGNRA for 40 years, but under a new proposed rule this amendment addresses, it would dramatically restrict access. While the NPS wants to treat all parks the same, the GGNRA has enjoyed off-leash walking for decades with little or no problems. As one of our Nation's few urban parks, it requires dog rules that fit the unique place in our community.

I have heard from literally thousands of San Francisco and San Mateo County residents who oppose the rule. Dog owners certainly must act responsibly. As a dog owner myself, I understand that I must make sure my dog is well trained and safe for all visitors to the GGNRA. I don't think all of the GGNRA should be open to off-leash dogs, only designated off-leash areas that won't impact our native wildlife and flora and fauna.

I love my dog, Buddy, a beautiful yellow Lab. I love walking him, and he certainly enjoys the fresh air and being off leash and free to roam. So this amendment is for Buddy and for all the "Buddies" in the bay area that enjoy the GGNRA. Buddy has been there for me, and, tonight, I am here for him and for all of his four-legged buddies.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SPEIER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. If you come by my office, the gentlewoman can meet our dog, Callie, whom we refer to as the "barker of the House." As a fellow dog lover, I have no problem with the gentlewoman's amendment and would happily support it.

Ms. SPEIER. Mr. Chairman, in reclaiming my time, I will accept that on behalf of the 200,000 dogs in San Francisco and the many more in San Mateo County, and I thank the gentleman for his support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SPEIER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 106 OFFERED BY MS. TSONGAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 106 printed in House Report 114-683.

Ms. TSONGAS. 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 in this Act may be used in contravention of section 302(a) of Public Law 94-579 (43 U.S.C. 1732(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentlewoman

from Massachusetts (Ms. TSONGAS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, many of our Nation's public lands, those lands which belong to all Americans, are managed under a multiple use mandate. This means that they are managed to support a wide variety of uses, including hunting, fishing, hiking, and other recreation activities, alongside responsible energy development, the preservation of historic and cultural resources, the conservation of some of our Nation's most iconic landscapes, and wildlife habitat protection.

The resource management plans that were recently finalized by the Bureau of Land Management to protect the greater sage-grouse and the broader sagebrush sea landscape strike the appropriate balance between the many uses of our public lands. The plans, which were developed in close consultation with the States and which reflect an unprecedented collaboration among stakeholders, allow for the responsible resource development, recreation, and preservation of the habitat which the greater sage-grouse requires to survive and thrive.

Without these plans, it is highly likely that the greater sage-grouse would need to be listed under the Endangered Species Act. However, language in the underlying bill blocks funds from being used to implement the resource management plans, upsetting the carefully crafted balance that is required under the multiple use mandate. This harmful provision could also put the many other species that depend on this landscape at risk, including elk, mule deer, and pronghorn antelope; and it would deprive hunters and other outdoor enthusiasts of opportunities to use their public lands and enjoy the benefits of renewable wildlife resources.

This is why hunters and sportsmen across the West support the sage-grouse conservation plans and strongly oppose any effort to block the plans from moving forward, including groups such as the Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, the Backcountry Hunters and Anglers, the Archery Trade Association, and the Dallas Safari Club, just to name a few. My amendment would allow the BLM management plans to go into effect if failing to implement the plan would impact the multiple use mandate and, thereby, deprive outdoor enthusiasts of their ability to use these Federal lands.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which protects opportunities for sportsmen and sportswomen and other outdoor enthusiasts, who depend on our public lands.

Mr. Chairman, 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, of course the Federal lands are managed according to current law, and current law requires that they be managed for sustained yield and multiple use. There is nothing in this bill that contradicts that—nothing. There is no purpose for this amendment, so I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. TSONGAS. Mr. Chairman, the Federal Land Policy and Management Act requires the Bureau of Land Management to manage the public lands it administers according to two principles, as we both agree: multiple use of the landscape and sustained yield of renewable resources.

Multiple use and sustained yield mean balance. Opportunities to hunt, fish, and watch wildlife are just as important and have just as much legitimacy under the laws as activities like grazing, mining, logging, and drilling. Unfortunately, the balance has swung too far toward the second set of activities, resulting in significant damage to wildlife habitat and diminished uses and yields for people who wish to enjoy the outdoors.

Updating and implementing resource management plans is critical to maintaining balance and complying with the law. In this case, it not only guarantees that those who wish to enjoy the great outdoors can do so, but, in complying with the multiple use mandate, it does all that is necessary to prevent the greater sage-grouse from being listed under the Endangered Species Act.

This very balanced plan recognizes the needs and interests of all parties who seek to use these lands so as not only to protect the great sage-grouse, but to make sure our sports enthusiasts also have access to it. The failure to implement this plan could put all of those uses in danger.

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

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

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

Ms. TSONGAS. 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 Massachusetts will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 111 OFFERED BY MR. CHAFFETZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 111 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. 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 29, line 12, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$1,500,000)".

Page 30, line 3, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$1,500,000)".

Page 73, line 3, after the dollar amount insert "(decreased by \$1,750,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

□ 2320

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, in a bipartisan effort with ANN KIRKPATRICK, we are offering this amendment. It is an amendment on behalf of Native American schoolchildren dangerously rutted in flood-prone dirt roads that cause Native American kids to miss school, on an average, 10 days a year. I have one of the pictures here of a whole series. You can take the whole seasons here and you can see what these bus routes are like.

When it rains, when it snows—and it does in parts of Utah and Arizona—you look at the Navajo Nation and you are going to find that kids are missing 10 days a year on average because of roads like this.

Now, the funding for the BIA to take care of these roads has not changed since 1988. We are asking for a modest shift of less than \$2 million to deal with this situation.

I have a county in my district, a county that is larger than the State of New Jersey, and yet, the population there is less than 15,000 people. That is a tremendous tax burden for them to try to maintain such massive roads. It is hard to imagine sometimes on the East Coast how massive some of these areas are, but they need a little maintenance money for these roads and for these schoolchildren.

So I have joined with ANN KIRKPATRICK in offering this amendment. I would encourage Members to vote for it. It is less than \$2 million. It will make a huge difference on the Navajo Nation, in particular, where we desperately need to make sure that kids can get to school in a consistent manner. We have dealt with the funding for nearly 30 years at the same level. It is time to make that adjustment. I would encourage Members to vote in favor of this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I share the gentleman's legitimate concern for the condition of BIA roads, but reluctantly must oppose this amendment because it takes even more money from an already starved EPA.

EPA's main operating account is already cut by \$92 million in the bill. Amendments have cut an additional \$116 million. Again, while I share the concern that the gentleman has, the fact is that the bill already provides \$30 million for BIA road maintenance. This is \$3.2 million more than the budget request.

So although road maintenance is critically important, I cannot support the offset. I oppose the amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's amendment. I have experience firsthand with Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, as a matter of fact, and with Ms. MCCOLLUM. We were at the Navajo reservation about a year ago, and my back is still hurting from the road that we were on. It was quite an experience.

So they need help. I think this is a very modest amount of money. I appreciate the support that our colleagues give to Indian Country. They certainly deserve it.

I would encourage adoption of this amendment.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the distinguished ranking member.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ), we agree that these roads need to be fixed. In fact, Chairman SIMPSON and I, just sitting on the bus, we did 500 steps. I had one brand of tracking equipment, and he had another. I won't mention the names here.

We are not opposed to fixing these roads, but we just wanted to take an opportunity on this amendment to point out how much has already been cut from the Environmental Protection Agency. They have had \$164 million cut. There have been other cuts that have come through. At the same time, Members come to the floor and complain that they haven't done the delisting, and they haven't been out there, and they haven't checked this out, and they haven't done this, and they haven't done that. Well, we need to give them the tools in the toolbox.

We know that this amendment is going to pass. We hope that the schoolchildren arrive to school safely. As a teacher, I want them there every day to be educated, but we really need to figure out a way to fund some of these other projects besides already taking out an already pared-down Environmental Protection Agency.

Mr. CHAFFETZ. Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that I think you would find the mutual bipartisan approach to achieve the goal. I don't think anybody is in opposition to this.

The reality is, in nearly 30 years, the funding level hasn't changed. It is very modest. It is less than \$2 million.

I hope people find it in their heart to let this pass. It makes a world of difference to people. We can debate about where to pull those funds. I have offered this amendment in a bipartisan way from this fund. It is the way it is structured, and I do hope it passes.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ISRAEL. Mr. Chairman, again, I fully respect the gentleman's concern.

Although he says this is a modest offset, that may be true, but we have one modest offset on top of another modest offset on top of another modest offset. Before you know it, the EPA is just starving and cannot do its mission.

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 Utah (Mr. CHAFFETZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 113 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 113 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. GRAYSON. 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 \$468,000)(increased by \$468,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is nearly identical to an amendment that passed by voice vote last year. I hope we will agree on its passage again this year.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from Florida wants to cut it short, I will accept the amendment right now.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 114 OFFERED BY MR. NORCROSS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 114 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 74, line 25, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$15,282,000) (increased by \$15,282,000)".

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 amendment would designate an additional \$50 million within the Superfund accounts specifically for the enforcement division.

This amendment does not take money from other programs. Rather, it

designates a portion of already allocated monies for enforcement. It is revenue neutral and would equal the amount the EPA said it needs to hold accountable those companies which have polluted the lakes, streams, and even the homes of my constituents and our constituents.

As I mentioned yesterday, there are still well over 1,000 active Superfund sites across this great Nation. In my district alone and home to the author of the Superfund bill, there are over 13 sites that are still contaminated today.

I want to tell you about just three of those sites, in particular, named for the company responsible for dumping lead and arsenic into the ground, streams, and the lakes. It is called the Sherwin-Williams Sites. These sites include Sherwin-Williams/Hilliard's Creek Site located in both Gibbsboro and Voorhees, the Route 561 Dump Site in Gibbsboro, and the United States Avenue Burn Site, which is in Gibbsboro.

Early in the 1930s, Sherwin-Williams purchased a former paint and varnish manufacturing plant in Gibbsboro and expanded their operation throughout that facility. For 20 years, the company allowed these chemicals from their synthetic varnish to be disposed of in that area. The contamination happened not only at the manufacturing plant, but in two separate disposal sites, dump sites that they created. Just one of the Sherwin-Williams disposal methods included pumping sludge into holes in the ground around the property.

These chemicals from the varnish seeped into the groundwater, contaminating not only that property, but properties and streams around the entire area.

□ 2330

The facility was closed in 1977, and Sherwin-Williams tried to pass the bag by selling the property to a developer in 1981. The soil in the groundwater beneath these sites is contaminated with chemicals, including lead and arsenic, which have devastating effects on both human health and children's development. After the devastating events in Flint, Michigan, I know we understand so many of the horrific effects of lead exposure, but I think it bears repeating what my constituents and Americans across the country are facing.

Lead exposure can have serious long-term health consequences in adults and children. Even at low levels lead in children can cause IQ deficiencies, learning disabilities, impaired hearing, many of those things that we have heard about over the past few months. It also leads to problems in pregnant women and also harms fetuses. According to EPA, long-term exposure to high levels of arsenic can lead to skin lesions and a variety of cancers, including skin, bladder, and lung cancer.

We must hold companies like Sherwin-Williams accountable for the havoc that they have caused in both

Gibbsboro and Voorhees. For almost 40 years, this ground has laid there. For the author of the Superfund bill, Jim Florio, this was one of the driving forces for writing this, and yet 40 years later it stays there, still not being addressed by the company that caused it. I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment.

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 (Mr. CHAFFETZ). The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, Jim Florio was a good friend of mine, a great guy.

As I mentioned during the debate on the gentleman's previous Superfund amendment, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's support for robust funding for the Superfund program, particularly the cleanup program. I agree, we need to make progress to address the backlog of 1,300 sites, as the gentleman mentioned, on the national priorities list, and the bill proposes to do so with the \$40.1 million increase for cleanup work.

However, the gentleman's amendment proposes to increase EPA's enforcement budget by \$15.2 million, offset by other reductions within the Superfund account. Presumably, those reductions would come at the expense of the cleanup program. So I reluctantly oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote "no." Certainly, I sympathize with what the gentleman is trying to do, but we just don't agree to the offset. I urge opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. NORCROSS. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate that. Jim Florio's vision, unfortunately, caused by this site, just being one of many in New Jersey and in this site, but the fact of the matter is we have to hold accountable those companies that are still active, that are still making profits today while the cause that they had in these two particular sites still go unaddressed. Forty years, the company is still making money, still not being held accountable. This is one way we can start holding them accountable.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Again, 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 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. 116 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 116 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. POLIS. 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 91, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Page 95, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 96, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

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 offer this amendment along with my colleagues Mr. PETER KING of New York and Mr. RAUL RUIZ of California. The amendment is small, but its impact is large and very important to our three districts and many others across the country that have rural towns with volunteer fire departments.

All this amendment does is increase funding for the Volunteer Fire Assistance grant program from \$13 million to \$15 million. VFA funds are awarded to volunteer fire departments that protect small communities of less than 10,000 people and help them prepare to respond to wildfires.

Sadly, I have a perfect example of this need in my district right now. The small town of Nederland in Boulder County, Colorado, is battling the Cold Springs forest fire, with the fire crews largely made up of volunteers, initially. As just one example, Charlie Schmidtman, who is a captain with the Nederland Fire Protection District, and Bretlyn Schmidtman, who is an ER nurse, a paramedic, and volunteer firefighter already lost their home to the Cold Springs fire, even as they continue to work to save neighbors' homes. It is this sort of heroic work that we need to support through the funding that they need so they have the tools that they need to fight fires swiftly and effectively.

For some reason, we still don't treat fires the way we treat other natural disasters. Wildfires are underfunded when it comes to mitigation, prevention, and suppression. Fires often occur in rural communities with smaller populations.

The Volunteer Fire Assistance program is critical to moving the needle on wildfire management, preventing large wildfires from getting out of hand while they are still small. Though this grant program is small, its impact is incredible. The Volunteer Fire Assistance program provides matching funds to volunteer fire departments protecting communities with 10,000 or fewer residents.

Volunteer fire departments provide nearly 80 percent of the initial attack on wildfires across the United States, but, unfortunately, these volunteer fire departments frequently lack significant financial resources. \$2 million may not sound like a lot in this town, but it makes an enormous difference for our volunteer fire departments across the country.

In recent years, the threat of wildland fires has increased steadily across the country. The 10-year average cost to the Federal Government of suppressing wildland fires continues to go up; but instead of funding communities that might be able to suppress the fires in the initial phase, we have been underfunding that very program that can save taxpayer money by preventing large forest fires.

I ask for your support for this amendment, which has been endorsed by the National Association of State Foresters and International Association of Fire Chiefs, in adding \$2 million to this program.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CALVERT. This is a good amendment. We are willing to accept the amendment.

Mr. POLIS. I thank the gentleman for accepting this important amendment on behalf of the many small towns and volunteer fire departments across the United States.

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 amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 119 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 119 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:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by the Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the modification to boating restrictions contained in the news release issued by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service entitled "Minor Modification to Boating Restrictions at Havasu Wildlife Refuge" and dated May 20, 2015.

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 today to offer a commonsense, bipartisan amendment. The Gosar-Sinema-Cook-Kirkpatrick-Amodei-Buck-Cramer-Duncan-Franks-Jones-McClinton-Schweikert-Zinke-Salmon-Heck amendment will assist with keeping Lake Havasu open for all users.

On May 20, 2015, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service issued new motorized boating restrictions that arbitrarily expanded a no-wake zone on Lake Havasu, a renowned fishing and boating destination on the Colorado River popular with visitors from Arizona, California, Nevada, and around the world. These arbitrary wake restrictions effectively prohibited tubing, waterskiing, and wakeboarding in an area utilized by recreational enthusiasts for decades. This action was taken behind closed doors with no advance notice and without opportunity for public comment.

These new mandates were announced and implemented just 2 days before Memorial Day weekend, an economically vital weekend, as tourists spend more than \$200 million annually in the area and support 4,000 full-time jobs. Further, 75 percent of tourists are interested in waterskiing and recreational boating activities while visiting Havasu.

The Service has attempted to justify the May 2015 “temporary restrictions” by stating that they are necessary to address safety concerns. The Arizona Game and Fish Department recently submitted formal comments refuting this claim, stating there were only four incidents in the last 3 years in the area—three groundings and one swamping.

The Department went on to state: “The temporary restriction imposed in May 2015 . . . includes a safe, traditional, very popular waterskiing and wakeboarding flat-area . . . [The Service] does not adequately justify this additional restriction and that the impacts to the recreational area would be significant . . . The reported events do not support the existence of a safety concern.”

□ 2340

On April 12, 2016, the Service announced a draft recreational boating compatibility determination and the agency’s intent to pursue even more boating restrictions on Lake Havasu. Due to significant opposition, which included more 1,000 concerned citizens showing up at a public meeting, the Service suspended the agency’s pursuit of the April 12 proposed restrictions.

While this action was welcomed, the Service still has not reopened the area closed on May 20, 2015, that started this very controversy. These temporary restrictions have now been in effect more than a year.

In addition to being arbitrary, unwise, and unsafe, the action by the Fish and Wildlife Service was also unlawful. The agency violated the law by not going through the regular NEPA process and soliciting public comment from stakeholders.

Such irresponsible action by Federal bureaucrats should alarm not only the visitors to Lake Havasu, but Americans who value the rule of law and a government accountable to the people it serves.

This bipartisan amendment is endorsed by more than 20 local and national organizations, including Americans for Limited Government, the Arizona Game and Fish Department, Concerned Citizens for America Arizona Chapter, the Lake Havasu Area Chamber of Commerce, the Yuma County Chamber of Commerce, New Mexico Federal Lands Council, and many, many more.

My amendment is about government accountability. It simply prohibits a press release from closing an area on Lake Havasu that has been utilized by recreational enthusiasts for decades. The Service should solicit public comments and go through the normal scoping process before making major changes that impact users on Lake Havasu.

I ask my colleagues to support this amendment. I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their time and for their goodwill on this bill.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, just so I can make a comment and share a concern.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

There was no objection.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I am from a water State. I am from Minnesota. And I know that sometimes boating becomes an issue where it hasn’t been an issue before because of popularity and the number of people coming to an area.

So sometimes our State DNR or sometimes, in our State, it is actually municipalities that oversee some of the waterways, or we have a park board that oversees it. Sometimes we have to go back and we have to reexamine what is going on because of the way that something has just caught on with people coming. And the more people that are in an area in water, whether it is swimming, boating, sailing, fishing, sometimes it becomes that, all of a sudden, this resource where there was plenty of room and opportunity for everybody to do what they wanted to do, now we finding people are on top of each other. And then you add the fact that this is a body of water—and I have pictures up here—where you also have wildlife habitat.

So I hear clearly what you are saying, that it doesn’t appear that the people in the area who have recreated in this wildlife refuge felt they were given much advanced notice or much input on in this.

Here is the concern that I have about us taking a vote here on this. I think you raise legitimate concerns. I think we need to make sure that it is addressed. But I don’t want to start having every refuge start being managed by Members of Congress.

I think you show that you have a lot of people in support of what you are doing. It is bipartisan in nature. The way that it appears that the Fish and Wildlife Service handled it wasn’t in an

open process where people either understood what they were doing or could comment on what they are doing. But when we come to the floor here and legislate this, I think it sets kind of a bad precedent.

So the question I have to the gentleman: Do you really feel you need to pass an amendment to legislate this? I am willing to work with you on this. Is there a way that we can get the achieved goal and objective that you are seeking and making sure visitors’ safety and recreational use is preserved but preserved in a way that is safe and enjoyable for everyone? A part of this is that there is multiple use with more people coming in a confined area.

I understand your frustration. That is why you are here on the floor. But I am wondering if there is a better way you can accomplish the goal.

I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. GOSAR. I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

The issue is very interesting, because we actually issued a FOIA request for emails. This was done egregiously by two people complaining.

If you look at the map, what ends up happening by closing this area where families and young kids learn how to water-ski, it forces them into the main channel of the Lake Havasu area, where boats go 50 to 70 to 75 miles an hour. People are going to get hurt.

So my point is if the Fish and Wildlife Service doesn’t want us to continue to do this, then do their job right. Follow the law. That is the key here.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, and this is why I think it becomes a little cumbersome. When you have people swimming and fishing and water-skiing all in the same area, there is more and more pressure on it. So I just rose in opposition to have a discussion to understand this issue better.

With that, I withdraw my opposition to this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the dialogue back and forth. Once again, let’s follow the rule of law. If the agency doesn’t want to have incidents like this and have their hands slapped publicly, then do their job and do it right and do it well. This is about safety, but it is in the reverse fashion.

With that, I appreciate the work of the gentlewoman and the chairman.

Mr. Chairman, 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. 120 OFFERED BY MR. WEBER OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 120 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. 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:

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of section 321(a) of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7621(a)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer a very simple and commonsense amendment to H.R. 5538, the Department of the Interior and EPA appropriations bill.

This amendment passed by a voice vote last year, and I hope all Members can support it again today—or should I say tonight.

America's job creators have faced an onslaught of regulations from the EPA, Mr. Chairman, even as Congress has consistently reduced the Agency's budget year after year. The EPA has proposed lower national ozone standards, regulations on new and existing power plants, regulations on waters of the United States, just to name a few.

All of these regulations are based on questionable scientific data and will lead to higher energy prices for hard-working families and small businesses and, without a doubt, will negatively impact American jobs.

The Agency has cited its authority under the Clean Air Act as the basis for many of its regulatory actions. However, when it comes to evaluating how its regulations impact American jobs, the Agency has failed to follow the law.

Section 321(a) of the Clean Air Act clearly states: "The Administrator shall conduct continuing evaluations of potential loss of shifts of employment . . . including, where appropriate, investigating threatened plant closures or reductions in employment allegedly resulting from such administration or enforcement."

Mr. Chairman, the EPA is even now involved in ongoing litigation for its failure to comply with this provision, and Congress has repeatedly heard testimony reinforcing EPA's failure to comply with section 321(a).

In response to questions for the record during her Senate confirmation hearing, Administrator McCarthy said that the "EPA has not interpreted section 321(a) to require EPA to conduct employment investigations in taking regulatory actions."

□ 1150

Mr. Chairman, Congress put this provision into the Clean Air Act for a reason: to provide a necessary check on the regulatory powers of unelected bureaucrats at the EPA. In response to the EPA's refusal to follow the law, Congress must act to ensure that the true impact of regulations on jobs are disclosed to inform the public and Members of Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this 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, I was trying to figure out exactly what this amendment does. So, under the Clean Air Act, the EPA is required to evaluate potential loss or shifts of employment as a result of air pollution regulation. No one is disputing that requirement.

So this would tell the EPA that they are not allowed to spend any funds in the course of not doing any analysis. It is just illogical to prohibit the agency from spending money not to do something, but it is also pointless.

The employment impact analyses are already required under the Clean Air Act. The agency regularly undertakes them as part of rulemaking.

Mr. Chairman, why I look baffled is this amendment is impractical, and it is unnecessary. So it appears to me it is just another attempt to come to the floor and undermine the EPA's efforts to make sure that they are able to do their job.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. WEBER of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments. She actually raised a good argument for the amendment. I mean, we are telling the EPA that they need to do their job. No money can be spent in contravention of section 321(a). They can't go after a company, for example, if they haven't done the job analysis, and that is exactly what this amendment says.

So I simply want to reiterate what I said. The law says the administrator shall conduct continuing evaluations of potential loss of shifts employment. I don't understand what the administrator does not understand about "shall."

So it is a commonsense amendment. It actually reins in the EPA and keeps them from destroying more jobs as they seem wont—have the habit—to do.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 122 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEG0

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 122 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. GALLEG0. 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 issue a graz-

ing permit or lease in contravention of section 4110.1 or 4130.1-1(b) of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that will reaffirm Congress' support for the enforcement of grazing fees on public lands.

Grazing on public lands is a privilege, not a right. Ranchers who use these lands should abide by the law and pay their fair share. My amendment simply confirms that grazing permits or leases should not be issued to anyone who does not comply with BLM regulations.

Mr. Chairman, revenues from grazing fees go toward the management, maintenance, and improvement of public range land. The mass majority of ranchers are upstanding, responsible Americans. They understand the importance of these efforts and pay their fees on time.

But some ranchers are outright refusing to pay their grazing fees. That is completely unacceptable.

To be clear, my amendment does not penalize people for forgetting to repair a fence or neglecting to make a payment once or twice. Instead, this amendment will ensure that egregious violations of grazing regulations are not financed by the American taxpayer.

One particular rancher, who is well known to the media, continues to be more than \$1 million in arrears. He has ignored the executive and judicial branches of our government, expanding his herds further on to Federal lands.

While continuing to violate the law, he put the lives of local and Federal officials at stake during a dangerous standoff, for which he was indicted by a grand jury on charges including assaulting and threatening Federal officers. We are only now beginning to see the full extent of the damage he has caused to public lands as a result of this confrontation and his unauthorized grazing.

Mr. Chairman, my friends on the other side of the aisle talk a lot about upholding the law, yet they responded with silence, or even support, when this particular rancher and others brazenly broke our laws and put the lives of BLM officers at risk in an armed standoff.

Mr. Chairman, I can't help but notice a double standard in Republicans' support for ranchers who refuse to pay their fair share and Republican criticism of Americans who refuse to accept injustice in their communities.

This amendment offers my Republican friends the opportunity to stand up against those who have broken our laws with impunity. It sends a clear signal that egregious violations of grazing regulations will not be financed by the American taxpayer, and

it projects a clear message of support to the BLM officers who demonstrated discretion and restraint in the handling of the ranchers' protests.

Mr. Chairman, let's pass this amendment and uphold the basic principle that our laws should be applied fairly to everyone who lives in this country and uses its public lands.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CALVERT. I appreciate the gentleman yielding. I certainly agree with the gentleman that permit holders should meet all their existing requirements in order to renew their permits, and I would accept this amendment.

Mr. GALLEGRO. Mr. 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. GALLEGRO).

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

Mr. GALLEGRO. 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 Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 123 OFFERED BY MR. GRAYSON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 123 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. GRAYSON. 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 enter into a contract with any offeror or any of its principals if the offeror certifies, as required by Federal Acquisition Regulation, that the offeror or any of its principals—

(1) within a three-year period preceding this offer has been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against it for: commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain, or performing a public (Federal, State, or local) contract or subcontract; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes relating to the submission of offers; or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records, making false statements, tax evasion, violating Federal criminal tax laws, or receiving stolen property;

(2) are presently indicted for, or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a governmental entity with, commission of any of the offenses enumerated above in paragraph (1); or

(3) within a three-year period preceding this offer, has been notified of any delinquent Federal taxes in an amount that exceeds \$3,000 for which the liability remains unsatisfied.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 820, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GRAYSON. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is identical to other amendments that have been inserted by voice vote into every appropriations bill considered under an open rule under the 113th and 114th Congresses and, in the last few weeks, under a structural rule. If it is accepted, I will not ask for a recorded vote.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I like the gentleman's amendment. Criminals shouldn't get contracts. I accept the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GRAYSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 130 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 130 printed in House Report 114-683.

Mr. POLIS. 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 Bureau of Land Management to study or test the feasibility of, or implement, any sterilization program for wild horse and burro management with surgical sterilization.

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, wild free-roaming horses and burros are a living symbol of the historic and pioneer spirit of the West, like in my home State of Colorado.

□ 0000

My amendment will help to prevent the Bureau of Land Management from destroying this iconic symbol using funds allocated in this bill to be used for surgical sterilization of horses.

What distinguishes America's wild horses from their domestic counterparts is their natural behaviors and their complex social organizations. Surgical sterilization will take the wild out of wild horses by removing the horse's ability to utilize the reproductive organs that drive their natural behavior and changing their hormonal structure. It turns them into little more than pasture horses, destroying their complex social organizations and inalterably changing the free-roaming behaviors that Congress sought to protect when we passed the Wild and Free-Roaming Horses and Burros Act of 1971.

The way surgical sterilization of our horses is conducted under the guise of population control is simply cruel. A 2013 National Academy of Sciences study report identifies many strategies for fertility control and supports the use of PZP, or immunocontraception, which has been underutilized.

Rather than using taxpayer funds and do expensive roundups and expensive operations, we have effective dart-delivered birth control that is a fraction of the cost and is more humane and preserves the wild character of the herds. The National Academy of Sciences notes that sterilization is the least recommended of the approaches. There is not good data, it is untested in wild horses, and the risks associated are simply unnecessary.

BLM noted that fertility control is viable if used appropriately. It is important to maintain the population size of these herds. Of course, we can agree that some form of fertility control is needed.

Sterilization affects both male and female wild horses. In both cases experts have flat out said they are bad ideas. Ovariectomies, tubal ligations, and laser ablation are planned techniques to be used on wild horse mares. Two of the three techniques have never been performed on horses, let alone wild mares and fillies.

The National Academy of Sciences, once again, stated clearly that castrating stallions will cause loss of testosterone and consequential reduction in or complete loss of male type of behaviors necessary for maintenance of social organization, band integrity, and expression of a natural behavior repertoire. Scientists believe this mass sterilization program could essentially lead to the end of wild horses and burros in the West.

Luckily, BLM does have a better and cheaper tool. The PZP birth control vaccine is an example. It is deliverable by a remote dart. It is relatively cheap—\$25 a dose. The surgical interventions cost far more.

Numerous studies have demonstrated the cost effectiveness and efficacy of this vaccine in managing wild horse populations. But instead of expanding its use, the BLM has incorrectly reduced it over the last several years. Contraception alternatives have been available since the 1980s. But BLM, unfortunately, continues to ignore this approach despite the National Academy of Sciences report indicating these vaccines are the most promising fertility control methods to help limit the population growth for wild horses and burros.

Examples of successful use of PZP has been noted in the McCullough Peak herds in Wyoming and Assateague herds in Virginia and Maryland.

Look, these kinds of procedures destroy the wild nature of horses. They are a waste of taxpayer money, and they are inhumane. The National Academy of Sciences advised against the surgical removal of ovaries, warning

the possibility that ovariectomies may be followed by prolonged bleeding or infection makes it inadvisable for field application.

The final point I want to make is that this proposal by BLM has raised overwhelming opposition by the general public for whom our wild horses and burros are very popular. Over 20,000 citizens submitted comments in opposition to this plan. The public wants its wild horses protected, and, of course, we need to control the population, but we should not surgically mutilate our wild horses.

I would like to ask for the ranking member and chairman to work with me to make sure the BLM spends our taxpayer money more wisely and protects the iconic symbol of the American West.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding to me. I do so for the purpose of speaking to this problem we have.

I certainly thank my colleague from Colorado for his willingness to work with the subcommittee in agreeing to withdraw the amendment later in this discussion. I fully understand his concerns regarding the Bureau of Land Management's research program for wild horses and burros.

I value wild horses and burros. They are certainly, as you mentioned, an iconic part of our history in the West. But we have a problem, and I think we can agree to that. Right now we are spending \$80 million a year.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment, obviously not to speak in opposition, but to speak for the purpose of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, right now we are spending \$80 million a year in this appropriation bill. It will double to \$160 million in 4 years to store horses that we are presently doing. Also, as the gentleman is aware, we are concerned not just about the health of the herds—some of these herds are in very poor health—but also about the health of the range. Some areas are way overutilized.

So we need to work with the gentleman to find out a way to deal with this problem because we just can't continue to ignore this issue. It is a growing problem.

I was just over in Death Valley. We have in some cases irreversible environmental damage that is being done by wild burros in Death Valley. So I look forward to working with the gentleman to resolve this problem.

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

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his commitment to work with us protecting wild horses.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 131 will not be offered.

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. CALVERT) having assumed the chair, Mr. CHAFFETZ, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Com-

mittee, 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. PEARCE (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of representing constituents in business outside of Washington, D.C.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on July 12, 2016, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 4372. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 15 Rochester Street, Bergen, New York, as the Barry G. Miller Post Office.

H.R. 1777. To amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the "Former Presidents Act of 1958", with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President, and for other purposes.

H.R. 4960. To designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 525 N Broadway in Aurora, Illinois, as the "Kenneth M. Christy Post Office Building".

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 8 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until today, Thursday, July 14, 2016, at 9 a.m.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign travel during the second quarter of 2016, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DANIEL SILVERBERG, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 4 AND APR. 8, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Daniel Silverberg	04/04	04/08	India	1155.00	13505.00	14660.00
Committee total					1155.00		13505.00				14660.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

DANIEL SILVERBERG, June 15, 2016.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ALBANIA, EXPENDED BETWEEN MAY 26 AND MAY 31, 2016

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Hon. Mike Turner	05/27	05/30	Albania		831.00		7055.00				7886.00
Hon. Tom Marino	05/27	05/31	Albania		1108.00		13196.00				14304.00
Hon. Jim Sensenbrenner	05/27	05/30	Albania		831.00		15222.00				16053.00