

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3017, BROWNFIELDS ENHANCEMENT, ECONOMIC REDEVELOPMENT, AND REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2017, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3905, MINNESOTA'S ECONOMIC RIGHTS IN THE SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST ACT

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 631 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 631

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3017) to amend the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 to reauthorize and improve the brownfields program, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-40 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3905) to require congressional approval of any mineral withdrawal or monument designation involving the National Forest System lands in the State of Minnesota, to provide for the renewal of certain mineral leases in such lands, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. An amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-41 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources; (2) the further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, if offered by the Member designated in the report, which shall be in order without intervention of any point of order, shall be considered as read, shall be separately debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, and shall not be subject to a demand for a division of the question; and (3) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Wyoming is recognized for 1 hour.

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

□ 1245

GENERAL LEAVE

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 631, which provides a closed rule for consideration of H.R. 3017, Brownfields Enhancement, Economic Redevelopment, and Reauthorization Act of 2017; and a structured rule for H.R. 3905, Minnesota's Economic Rights in the Superior National Forest Act.

Mr. Speaker, brownfield refers normally to abandoned or closed commercial or industrial properties that may be contaminated because of their prior use. These sites often represent a tremendous amount of untapped economic potential. However, developing that potential is complicated by the presence of hazardous substances or contaminants.

The Environmental Protection Agency has estimated that there are more than 50,000 brownfields in the United States. The brownfields program has enjoyed broad bipartisan support and has been critical in converting these vacant sites into tax-generating properties and, eventually, well-paying jobs for American citizens.

As of May 1, 2017, the program has assessed 26,722 sites, and they have leveraged over 124,760 jobs. On average, Mr. Speaker, over \$16 is leveraged for every EPA brownfields dollar spent, and 8.5 jobs are leveraged per \$100,000 of EPA brownfields funds.

States all over the country have benefited from this grant program. In my home State of Wyoming, we put brownfield grants to use in cities like Casper, Cheyenne, Sheridan, Evanston, Kemmerer, Laramie, and Dubois.

Brownfield sites have been revitalized using these funds in places like the Minute Maid Park in Houston, Texas; development in the neighborhoods around Danville, Illinois; and the Grimalva Park at Santiago Creek in Orange, California.

The brownfields program has been expired, Mr. Speaker, since 2006, and it is high time we reauthorize this critically important grant program.

The brownfields program has enabled local communities to clean up and repurpose vacated sites, utilizing them for meaningful economic development, while responsibly cleaning up hazardous sites. This is an important step in maintaining and improving what has been a demonstrably effective program.

Mr. Speaker, the rule we consider today also provides for consideration of a very important bill, H.R. 3905, Minnesota's Economic Rights in the Superior National Forest Act, which was introduced by my colleague, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

H.R. 3905 requires congressional approval of any mineral withdrawal or

monument designation involving the National Forest System lands in the State of Minnesota and provides for the renewal of certain mineral leases in those lands.

This is necessary, Mr. Speaker, because in the final hours of the Obama administration, the administration withdrew hundreds of thousands of acres in Minnesota from mineral development and improperly terminated two Federal mineral leases.

The effect of this decision halted potential mining projects in Minnesota, robbing the region of 650 direct and 1,300 indirect jobs, as well as the tax revenue the mining operation would bring.

Mining jobs, Mr. Speaker, are good, high-paying jobs. The average mining wage in Minnesota is roughly \$25,000 a year higher than the average wage in the State.

Coming from a State where we mine more coal than any State in the Nation, I understand and appreciate the economic development mining projects can bring to a region. We also understand the burden that can be imposed by working with the Federal Government on these projects in Wyoming.

Roughly half my State, Mr. Speaker, is comprised of Federal lands. Receiving the appropriate authorizations to drill or mine on these lands can be a lengthy and cumbersome process that delays projects for many years.

Ultimately, Mr. Speaker, we must improve our Federal regulatory process so we can better harness the vast natural resources we have in our country, while still protecting and conserving our environment.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I encourage support for the rule for these important bills, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentlewoman from Wyoming for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of two bills.

The first piece of legislation, H.R. 3017, is a bipartisan compromise to extend the EPA's brownfields program. The successful brownfields program assists communities across this country in cleaning up contaminated sites to reduce pollution and health risks and spur economic development.

Although funding for this program has enjoyed broad support over the years, its authorization lapsed in 2006; 11 years ago. It is certainly long past time for this important program to be reauthorized. I appreciate the work of Republicans and Democrats on both the Energy and Commerce and Transportation and Infrastructure Committees in coming together to produce this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this is how the process is supposed to work. There was a hearing, and there was a markup. I should

say, for the RECORD, the majority could have issued an open rule, instead of a closed rule. But I am not even going to criticize that today, Mr. Speaker, because experts on this issue came together to negotiate it in a bipartisan manner, and the result is a good piece of legislation that I look forward to voting for later this week.

I commend Mr. MCKINLEY, Mr. TONKO, Mr. PALLONE, and all those who worked together, and I just want to say for the RECORD, as one who routinely gets up here and criticizes the majority for issuing closed rules and structured rules all the time, I do so not just as a knee-jerk reaction to what they produce in the Rules Committee. I do it because usually they do closed rules and structured rules to basically stifle a deliberative process. They do it to shut off debate and to shut out other people's opinions. Quite frankly, the majority's record on rules is abysmal.

In this case, what we are doing is bringing forward something that represents a bipartisan process. I wish this wasn't an anomaly. I wish that the majority would understand that, in the House of Representatives, the views of Democrats are just as important as the views of Republicans. If you want to get things done, you need to come together in the spirit of compromise and work together for the good of the American people, not just for the good of one political party, not just so you can issue a press release, not just so you can play gotcha games, but actually produce things that are meaningful.

If the Republican leadership would drop their all-or-nothing approach to governing more often, support genuine bipartisan negotiations and compromise, and open up the process on all pieces of legislation, both minor and substantial, we might be able to get something done around here. Maybe we could have more than 12 bills of any sort of real significance signed into law.

This rule also brings to the floor legislation, I am sad to say, that would do irreparable harm to our federally protected land by allowing a foreign company the ability to use a half-century-old lease to mine right next door to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness.

H.R. 3905 would allow a Chilean mining company, which is facing tens of millions of dollars in fines from the Chilean Government for their failure to protect nearby water resources, the ability to mine just upstream of pristine U.S.-protected land.

This is all based on a 50-year-old lease—a lease that didn't go through any environmental review because NEPA didn't exist yet. There are Members of this Chamber who weren't even born when this lease was signed.

My colleagues in the majority will claim that this bill will help create jobs, but what about the 22,000 jobs that the local protected land already supports?

What will happen to those jobs when the water is so polluted that no one can visit the recreational area around the mine?

The truth is, this isn't about jobs. It is about helping a few rich owners of mining companies line their pockets at the expense of the environment. In fact, the recipient of this Republican handout is a subsidiary of a Chilean company, Antofagasta, which is controlled by Chilean billionaire Andronico Luksic Craig. And get this: he just happens to be the landlord of Ivanka Trump and Jared Kushner, President Trump's daughter and son-in-law and senior advisers to the Trump White House.

You cannot make this stuff up. This is part of a pattern of sketchy deals and questionable business contacts involving the President and his family and their closest advisers.

Earlier this month, we learned that President Trump and his family made millions through a hotel in Panama financed by Colombian drug cartels and the Russian Mafia. We still don't even know how these new deals will boost President Trump's income or how his family profits off of the Presidency, because we are 312 days into his Presidency, and we still haven't seen his tax returns.

Imagine if this were Hillary Clinton. Imagine if this were Barack Obama. Imagine the screams on the other side of the aisle demanding transparency and an open process. But when it comes to covering up all these sketchy deals on behalf of this President of the United States, there is silence.

President Trump promised to drain the swamp, but, instead, he has created a cesspool. There are so many conflicts of interest, this administration is on a collision course with corruption.

Mr. Speaker, we have only 6 legislative days left before the government runs out of money, but the Speaker of the House thinks another corporate handout, this time to Jared Kushner and Ivanka Trump's landlord, is the most pressing issue that needs to be resolved in Congress this week.

If the Speaker wants some suggestions as things we ought to focus on this week, I know Democrats in this Chamber have a few. I can give you an example.

Democrats think we should be debating a funding bill to avert the coming shutdown on December 8, when the temporary spending bill expires.

Democrats want to debate and pass the Dream Act, ending the turmoil this President has caused by upending the lives of 800,000 young immigrant DREAMers and their families.

Democrats want to extend the Children's Health Insurance Program, known as CHIP, and community health centers, whose authorization expired 2 months ago.

Democrats think we ought to debate flood insurance reauthorization, which expires on December 8.

Democrats want to pass additional hurricane relief to help those who are

still recovering from devastating hurricanes in Texas, Florida, and Puerto Rico.

Democrats want to address funding for the Veterans Choice Program, which is set to run out of money before the end of the year.

But instead, here we are, considering yet another ridiculous, extreme antienvironment bill.

Mr. Speaker, my friends on the other side of the aisle love talking about returning this country to the way it used to be. I have seen the Make America Great Again stickers on many of their cars.

I can think of no pastime more important or more significant to our national heritage and identity than our wilderness and protected areas. My friends and colleagues who have spent time in the Boundary Waters tell me how stunning it is. They say it is one of the most beautiful places in our country. And we are going to risk polluting this national treasure with copper-sulfide acid drainage running into the streams that feed the Boundary Waters?

Worse yet, this bill makes these mining leases impossible to ever overturn, even should the Bureau of Land Management conclude its environmental assessment and rule against further mining in this protected national forest.

This is a slippery slope. If we continue to allow corporations to pillage our federally protected wilderness areas, we are opening the door to irreversible damage. What is next? Clear-cutting in Yellowstone Forest? Oil drilling off the coast of Acadia National Park?

Mr. Speaker, I beg my Republican friends to drop this assault on our public lands and urge the leadership of this House to bring up the urgent bills and priorities that we need to deal with before adjourning in less than 3 weeks' time.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this rule and to oppose efforts that will further degrade our natural resources.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to be clear about exactly what H.R. 3905 does.

H.R. 3905 does not eliminate environmental requirements. In fact, it will only allow mining as long as those strict environmental requirements are met. What it does do is allow Minnesota itself to advance its State and local economies.

I applaud my colleague from Massachusetts' commitment and dedication to working together to try and come up with solutions about things like, for example, funding the government. I will just point out that if Democrats were, in fact, so dedicated to working with Republicans to fund the government and to begin to come to a solution, to come to an agreement, perhaps

their leadership would have shown up yesterday at the White House to have meetings and discussions about funding the government. It is awfully hard to claim that you are very dedicated and committed to that concept if you don't have leaders who show up to the key meetings.

I would also point out, Mr. Speaker, my colleague has called our bills and our process here ridiculous and extreme.

□ 1300

I can't help but note that what is truly ridiculous and extreme, Mr. Speaker, are the massive increases in ObamaCare premiums that my constituents all across Wyoming are now facing.

My constituents are now facing a situation, because of ObamaCare, because of this health plan that was supposed to provide coverage for everybody, low-cost coverage for everybody, that was supposed to guarantee access, guarantee if you liked your doctor, you could keep him or her, guarantee that you would be able to afford healthcare, my constituents are now facing premiums that will bankrupt them.

They are now receiving bills that demonstrate that their premiums next year, for example, for a retired married couple of two, the lowest amount that they can pay under the ObamaCare Bronze Plan is \$2,700 a month. Now, that is absolutely unsustainable, and that is what is ridiculous and extreme.

What we are doing today is making sure that we pass legislation that reauthorizes the important brownfields program that restores rights to the State of Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCKINLEY), the sponsor of H.R. 3017.

Mr. MCKINLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule on H.R. 3017, the Brownfields Enhancement, Economic Redevelopment and Reauthorization Act of 2017. I am proud to be the sponsor of this bill, which has broad bipartisan support, as you have been hearing about. It will reauthorize the very successful EPA program, brownfields program, for the first time since it was enacted.

Like my colleague Mr. WOODALL said last night in the Rules Committee, even though the brownfields site program is something that we all support, and brownfields is something we all have in our districts, working out the details of legislation like this is not easy, but the fact that we are here today with a compromise bipartisan bill and no amendment speaks volumes of how much support there is for H.R. 3017 and the brownfields program.

There is no dispute that the EPA brownfields program has been a success. As you just heard from the gentlewoman from Wyoming, the program has resulted in over 27,000 properties being reassessed to start them on this road to being cleaned up, and it has resulted in over 129,000 new jobs.

Over the life of the program, the Federal dollars invested have resulted in over \$25 billion in leveraged private investment. This is a program we all should support, and we all should encourage our colleagues on the Appropriations Committee to fully fund this program in the future.

I have confidence that H.R. 3017 will make the brownfields program even more successful, and I urge my colleagues to be in support of the rule and to vote for the bill on final passage.

I want to thank my committee chairman, JOHN SHIMKUS, for his work and the staff's work in bringing this bill together in a fine, compromised fashion.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would like to just respond to my colleague from Wyoming, you know, when she raised the issue of why our Democratic leaders didn't show up to the meeting at the White House. Maybe she didn't catch the President's tweet in which the President made it very clear he didn't see a deal.

I am glad our leaders didn't show up because they are not props, and we in the minority are not props either to be rolled out, to give the appearance of bipartisanship or give the appearance that somehow you are working with us when, in fact, you are not.

The President showed his hand. He had no interest in a deal, no interest in working with us. And I would say that is one of the problems in this House of Representatives, that the reason why we are not more productive in getting things done and producing real legislation to help the American people is because there is no bipartisanship, very little. I made one exception to the issue on this brownfields legislation, but on the big bills, nothing.

The gentlewoman brought up the Affordable Care Act. You know, what was her solution to the Affordable Care Act? What was the Republican majority's solution to making the Affordable Care Act better? I mean, bringing a bill to the floor under the most closed process that you can possibly imagine, a bill that would throw 23 million Americans off of health insurance, what are my friends thinking?

When people talk about healthcare reform and improving the Affordable Care Act, they talk about lowering prices; they talk about more accessibility; they talk about more people getting coverage. What the Republicans brought to the floor was a bill that would throw 23 million Americans off of health insurance. That is their solution. That would take away essential benefits protection for people who desperately need health insurance to deal with this opiate crisis and a whole bunch of other things.

So we don't want any lectures about what is extreme and what is ridiculous in this House of Representatives. The way the majority conducts business in this House is extreme and ridiculous. The legislation, whether it is their at-

tempt to repeal the Affordable Care Act or even this tax bill that is a giveaway to corporate special interests and is going to raise taxes on people earning \$100,000, that is extreme, that is wrong.

So, Mr. Speaker, I would just say to my Republican friends, again, you know, if you want to get things done, if you want to work with us, you have got to treat us as more than just props. You have to enter into good faith negotiations. And I would say, if you did that, we actually might get some things done around here that might improve the quality of life for everybody in this country.

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I would just note, in response to my friend and colleague from Massachusetts, that if the gentleman's leaders are so fragile that they are scared off by a tweet, then probably they need some new leaders. And I don't suspect that his argument really is they couldn't go to the meeting because they were scared because of a tweet.

We do need to work together to get things done. We are hard at work doing that.

In that regard, Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS), the chairman of the Environment Subcommittee, who oversaw this bill.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman and my good friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, for the kind words.

What we did here was simple. It is not always simple to get through the legislative process, but what we attempted to do was reauthorize a bill that hadn't been authorized. Appropriated dollars were being spent.

It has been the focus of the Republican Congress to make sure we reauthorize programs, and we do that to fix things that have gone wrong over the years or because a changing environment has occurred.

The last time the bill was really authorized was 2002. Fast-forward 15 years, there are things changed. The authorization amount was set. We actually spent more than the authorization amount.

People love this program, but we have got to update it to the modern day, and we need to fix some of the items. Those are reflected in this bill, and I appreciate the Rules Committee hearing the debate, addressing some of the concerns, and deciding that this bill can come to the floor. As it was stated, no amendments were offered to debate on this floor, which I think is a great process.

Simply put, I have a friend from Houston, Texas, who is very proud of the Houston Astros, and he will cite Minute Maid Park. Minute Maid Park is on a brownfields. So if you looked at the World Series and you saw that beautiful facility, well, that is the result of the brownfields program that we are now trying to update and fix.

The stats are pretty clear. I mean, you get a \$16 return for every dollar we put in at the Federal level. That is a great return on investment. Jobs are increased by every projection, and even local land values around the brownfields, the property values increase around them. This and more will be debated and discussed when we bring the bill to the floor tomorrow. This rule helps us do that.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, one other thing I will end on, and I know we will have a lot of debate and frustration and controversy, but this did go through regular order. We had a hearing. We had a subcommittee mark. As Mr. MCGOVERN mentioned, we had a full committee mark. We invested with our Democratic colleagues—they brought some ideas; some were accepted; some were rejected; some of the ones that we had they rejected—and we have a pretty good product to bring as part of this rule.

I would ask my colleagues to support the rule so we can bring the bill to the floor, and I thank my colleagues on the Rules Committee for making it happen.

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

Mr. Speaker, I just want to again respond to my colleague from Wyoming when she again raised the issue as to why our leaders didn't show up to the White House. It is not because they have a fragile ego. It is because they didn't want to waste their time. It is because they didn't want to be a prop or just be there for a photo op. It is because they are actually focused on trying to do the people's business, and they are tired of the gamesmanship.

If the gentlewoman wants to talk about fragile egos, I would suggest that she observe the behavior of the man who is in the Oval Office. I mean, this is a guy who will get into a Twitter war with a basketball player's father.

I would say that, and I would just respectfully urge my Republican colleagues, now is the time for an intervention because we have serious business to deal with in this country: there are issues of war and peace; there are issues of domestic security; there are issues of economic security that we have to deal with; and instead, we are dealing with constant nonsense coming out of the White House. So it is time for the Republican majority to intervene and to say to the President, "Enough is enough."

Mr. Speaker, you know, for weeks, tax experts have been reporting that the Republican tax plans would raise taxes on millions of middle class families in order to cut taxes for the wealthy and corporations. Their proposed legislation may directly benefit President Trump and his family members to the tune of tens of millions of

dollars, according to independent analyses. President Trump has denied this, stating that he would be a bigger loser if the House GOP tax bill is approved.

Well, without his tax returns, we simply have no way of knowing exactly how much President Trump stands to gain from the tax bill. The American people deserve to know whether or not our President is directly benefiting from legislation that would hurt millions of Americans.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative ESHOO's bill, H.R. 305, which would require Presidents and major party nominees for the Presidency to release their tax returns.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as I stated earlier, there are so many conflicts of interest in this administration, and especially with this President. This administration is on a collision course with corruption. It is time for Democrats and Republicans to stand up and to be united and to demand a little sunshine on what the reality is.

To discuss our proposal, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ESHOO).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Ms. ESHOO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule, and I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so that the House can vote on my bipartisan legislation, the Presidential Tax Transparency Act. This bill codifies the longstanding, bipartisan tradition of Presidents and Presidential nominees disclosing their tax return information to the American people.

The Republican majority and the President are currently working in overdrive to pass a distorted tax bill that will raise the taxes on 82 million middle class families. It takes one's breath away.

I and many others have spoken at length about the harm this bill will do to the middle class, from targeting the mortgage interest deduction, to raising the cost of higher education and graduate school for student loans, to limiting the deductibility of State and local taxes. And, at a time when our country is recovering from several natural disasters, including major wildfires in California where 14,000 Californians have lost their homes, the House-passed bill eliminates the deduction for personal property losses resulting from natural disasters, which I find to be especially cruel.

While it is very clear that the Republican tax bill will harm the middle class, it is less clear how the bill will benefit one taxpayer in particular, if he pays any taxes: the President of the United States of America.

Mr. Trump is the wealthiest President in our Nation's history, but he is also the only President, going back to Gerald Ford and all Presidents moving forward who voluntarily put out their tax returns—he is the only one—to refuse to release his tax returns, a lapse in disclosure that is made all the more troubling given his all-out push for tax cuts for the wealthiest at the expense of the middle class and others in our country.

□ 1315

How can Americans have any confidence in what is going on? They are not fools. They understand that we are swimming around in conflicts of interest, and nothing is being done about it.

Today, Republicans have an opportunity. And while we cannot know exactly how the Republican tax bill will benefit the President, until he releases his tax returns, we can be sure that this tax bill, which is skewed toward the top 1 percent, will benefit the billionaire Commander in Chief and his family. What an example for the American people.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. ESHOO. The Republican tax bill cuts the tax rate for so-called pass-through businesses, which is how many of the Trump family's businesses are structured, including hotels, golf courses, and real estate developments. Specifically, the tax rate for passive business income, which is derived from licensing, royalties, and other arrangements that the Trump organization specializes in, will be cut from 39.6 percent to 25 percent in the Republican tax scam bill.

That same bill also repeals the alternative minimum tax, which we know from Mr. Trump's leaked 2005 tax return forced him to pay an additional \$26 million in taxes that year. Without the AMT, he is completely off the hook and would, essentially, have a measly 3 percent effective tax rate: another great example for the American people. It is no wonder they don't trust Washington, D.C.

Lastly, the Republican tax bill doubles the estate tax exemption to \$22 million, and guess who wins again? Mr. Trump.

Mr. Speaker, only with full disclosure of the President's tax returns will we know how much he and his family will benefit from this Republican tax scam. That is why I urge my colleagues to stand up for transparency, listen to the will of the American people, and vote on this bipartisan legislation.

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have a very tough job. They have to argue for policies that have failed and argue for policies that we have actually had to live through the failure of those policies over the last 8 years.

My colleague on the Rules Committee, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. McGOVERN), asked us to imagine if Hillary Clinton were President, and imagine if Barack Obama were President. Mr. Speaker, we don't have to imagine. We lived through Barack Obama's Presidency. We know that we would be, today, living through completely stagnant growth, a strangled military unable to meet its commitments around the world, out-of-control Federal agencies, a Federal Government that believed it had an obligation to run every aspect of people's lives across this country, and, at the same time, the Federal Government telling people that they were forced to purchase insurance they didn't want and they didn't need.

We know that has failed. We know that the whole system that the Democrats believed would work, in terms of bringing healthcare costs down, fundamentally failed. You cannot force people into the insurance pools. The concept was, if you forced the young, healthy people in, you would drop costs down for everybody. That is not what happened.

I have sympathy for them because it is a tough job that they are undertaking, but it is very important that we argue based on the facts on this floor, Mr. Speaker. In fact, the tax bill that I hope will come back from the Senate—the tax bill that we passed out of the House, and one that we will take to conference—reduces taxes for the middle class, reduces taxes for families all across this country, doubles the standard deduction, and takes steps towards making real what we know to be true, which is taxpayer dollars don't belong to the government, Mr. Speaker, taxpayer dollars belong to the American people.

If we allow people to keep more of their own money, they will invest that money, they will grow our economy, and they will create jobs. That is how we are going to get this economy growing and continue the expansion and economic growth that we have seen just since this President came into office.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that our friends on the other side of the aisle will soon get over their obsession with the 2016 election and actually work with the majority on genuine tax reform, genuine healthcare reform, and, of course, Congressman EMMER's good bill from Minnesota, H.R. 3905, which I am proud to stand up and support today, to expand employment opportunities for my home State of Minnesota.

Employers in the mining, energy, infrastructure, and manufacturing industries have been struggling to invest in projects and employees over the last 8 years.

In fact, when a business finally figures out a way to go forward, determining the economic feasibility of a project, and decides to invest, then the Federal Government comes in and changes the rules, forcing them back to square one. Minnesota is all too familiar with this process.

Last-ditch Federal, bureaucratic decisions are costing our citizens thousands of well-paying jobs, our communities tax revenue, and our State educational systems funding, and is costing many Minnesotans their way of life.

Over the past 100 years, Congress has studied and voted on where mining should and should not take place. Minnesota has a proud history of protecting the State's natural beauty, while also encouraging safe mining, providing jobs for our citizens, especially in the northeastern part of the State. That is why they call it the Iron Range.

We now have private companies that are willing to invest in Minnesota, employ our constituents, and grow our communities. And what has the Federal Government done? They put up a road block, without congressional intent or input.

The Federal Government is proposing to unilaterally ban mineral exploration and development on 235,000 acres of land that was meant to provide jobs in our State.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman EMMER's bill does not undo environmental studies, the bill does not fast-track mining, and it doesn't even approve a mine. It is simply a vote to let the State of Minnesota review and approve mining operations, based on each individual's projects, merits, and impacts.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. That is why the Laborers' International Union of North America, International Union of Operating Engineers, Associated General Contractors of Minnesota, Jobs for Minnesotans Coalition, North America's Building Trades Union, and United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, to name a few, support the bill.

Congress has always respected what activities should be allowed to occur in the several States. This legislation makes certain the public and the State of Minnesota retain that authority.

That is why I am proud to vote in favor of this rule and eventual passage of the MINER Act that allows Minnesotans more opportunity.

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

Mr. Speaker, my colleague from Wyoming talks about this great tax bill that the Republicans have proposed. I

would call her attention to an article in Politico/Morning Consult today, which said that 8 percent of Americans believe that the Senate should take the Republican House-passed tax bill and enact it as-is—8 percent. I don't know how much lower you can get.

I thought my friend's healthcare bill had terrible ratings. I think it was like 17 percent of the American people supported it. I don't know how she can walk around and be proud of what she is trying to do here when the vast majority of the people don't want what you are selling. They believe that these policies will be harmful.

We are supposed to be the House of Representatives—the people's House—not the House of corporations, to give out special deals to mining companies, or to pass tax bills that benefit corporations at the expense of middle class families, or to pass healthcare reform that is a giveaway to insurance companies and rips away health coverage from millions and millions of people. I mean, come on.

Mr. Speaker, as I said, we believe in transparency on this side of the aisle, and we need to know what is behind some of these proposes in this tax bill, to find out who is benefiting and who is not. We know a lot of middle class families will not benefit. They are going to see their taxes increase. But we would like to know whether or not this President is going to benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY).

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to offer a special welcome to the President of the United States as he visits my home State of Missouri, which has a great need for brownfield remediation.

I understand that President Trump's visit will focus on the indefensible, reckless Republican tax scam that will raise taxes on millions of middle class families. It will rob seniors, punish students, weaken higher education, strip healthcare coverage away from 13 million Americans, and explode the debt by charging an additional \$1.4 trillion on the national credit card.

Mr. Speaker, the majority likes to talk about family values, and there is no doubt that extremely wealthy families, like President Trump's, will reap millions from your GOP tax scam.

But what about real Americans who will pay more and get less?

I would like President Trump to show me why he wants to raise taxes on over 320,000 middle class families in Missouri. I would like President Trump to show me why he wants to bury 255,000 Missouri students, who hold student loans, even deeper in debt by eliminating the deduction for student loan interest. I would like President Trump to show me why he wants to harm 165,000 seriously ill Missouri taxpayers, who will no longer be able to deduct medical expenses. And I would like him to show me why, when asked about the State level impact of the

Trump-GOP tax scam, even the Republican chairman of the Missouri House Budget Committee, State Representative Scott Fitzpatrick of Shell Knob, told the St. Louis Post-Dispatch on November 9: "We cannot have a billion-dollar hole blown in the budget. We cannot afford that."

I would like President Trump to show me why he wants to impose double taxation on every Missouri taxpayer, who will no longer be able to deduct State and local income taxes.

And I would like him to show me why he wants to weaken Medicare by robbing it of over \$25 billion over the next 10 years to help pay for tax cuts for billionaires.

And, finally, I would like President Trump to show me how he intends to ever look middle class families in the face again when he promised to lower taxes for every American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. CLAY. Instead, this shameful GOP tax scam will ensure that the haves will have more, and everyone else will pay for it.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), the sponsor of H.R. 3905.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, today's debate on H.R. 3905, Minnesota's Economic Rights in the Superior National Forest Act, also known as the MINER Act, is not just important to the great State of Minnesota: this legislation is critically important to the United States.

The MINER Act will reverse the misguided last minute actions of the Obama administration to stop any exploration of one of the most valuable precious metal deposits in the world. The MINER Act will ensure that the people of Minnesota will have the opportunity for jobs and economic prosperity that would come if the deposit can ever be mined in an environmentally safe and responsible manner.

The MINER Act will renew the Federal Government's commitment and promise to the citizens of Minnesota. When the Superior National Forest was created in 1909, and later when the Boundary Waters Canoe Area was established in 1978, there was an express agreement between the Federal Government and the State of Minnesota that mining and logging could continue in the Superior National Forest.

□ 1330

In fact, according to the most recent Superior National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan, mining and logging are considered desirable conditions in the forest.

This is about more than 10,000 jobs, which are now at risk because of the lameduck actions of the Obama administration. This is about billions of dollars in revenue for Minnesota's econ-

omy and billions more in potential education funding for Minnesota's schools that are now on the line.

This is also about strategically important metals and minerals, which are used by Americans every day. The MINER Act, again, is about protecting Minnesota's right to explore and, if environmentally appropriate, to mine valuable precious metals—precious metals that are not only necessary to our everyday technology, but which are critically important to our Nation's national defense.

There are some who would like to deny Minnesota the right to explore and potentially mine these precious metals. They argue that any mining activity could negatively impact our beloved Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. This concern, however, ignores the fact that if a mine is ever proposed—and one has not, but if one is ever proposed—in the Superior National Forest, it would have to satisfy all current local, State, and Federal environmental review and permitting requirements before it could ever be approved to proceed.

We can and we will protect the Boundary Waters. I have no doubt we could find a way to preserve Minnesota's pristine landscape without permanently destroying any future job creation or economic development in Minnesota.

By passing the MINER Act today, we protect thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in revenue and education funding while leaving an extensive process intact to protect and preserve the environment and our State.

In conclusion, I encourage all of my colleagues to support the MINER Act, because we know that someday someone might find a way to mine these important precious metals in a safe and environmentally responsible way. And if that happens, Minnesota deserves the opportunity and the jobs and economic prosperity that will ensue.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "yes" vote on the rule and the underlying bill.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from Minnesota Governor Mark Dayton in opposition to H.R. 3905.

STATE OF MINNESOTA,
OFFICE OF GOVERNOR MARK DAYTON,
Saint Paul, MN, November 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I write in strong opposition to HR3905, which I understand has passed out of Committee and is being reviewed by House Majority Leadership for a floor vote. I implore you not to schedule a vote on this bill without a full vetting of the serious risks to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness from adjacent copper-nickel mining, the status of the two-year federal study currently underway, and the wishes of the majority of Minnesotans, who oppose copper-nickel mining in the immediate vicinity of the Boundary Waters.

HR3905 is a bill, "To require congressional approval of any mineral withdrawal or

monument designation involving the National Forest System lands in the State of Minnesota, to provide for the renewal of certain mineral leases in such lands, and for other purposes." HR3905 was introduced in response to the desires of a foreign mining company to use Congress to circumvent the deliberations of the U.S. Departments of Interior and Agriculture and their agencies, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), to determine whether copper-nickel mining can be conducted safely in this ecologically sensitive part of Minnesota.

The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness (BCAW) is America's most popular national Wilderness Area, drawing visitors from all over the world to Northeastern Minnesota to fish, hunt, and experience its interconnected pristine lakes, rivers and streams. Additionally, the BWCAW contributes enormously to Minnesota's social and economic well-being.

In January, 2017, the BLM and the USFS began a comprehensive two-year study to determine whether copper-nickel mining, with its toxic by-product, sulfide ore, is appropriate within the watershed and immediate vicinity of the BWCA. Specifically, this environmental review will determine whether the Superior National Forest lands next to the BWCAW should be removed from the federal mining program to protect the Wilderness from pollution and other environmental degradation caused by the resulting sulfide ore. The study considers a wide variety of factors, including scientific evidence, public input, economic considerations, ecological characteristics, and recreational value, among others.

I respectfully ask that you allow the completion of this important review process. Over 126,000 Americans have submitted public comments as part of it. Many attended three public meetings conducted earlier this year by the BLM and USFS. Moving HR3905 forward at this time would disregard the input of all Americans, who have participated in the process, as well as the views of the 79 percent of Minnesotans, who favor the two-year pause and environmental review of potential impacts to the BWCAW.

The BWCAW is crucially important to our state, and I believe strongly that future federal and state decisions about its future should be made only after the most careful and objective scientific review. I urge you to reject the attempts by a foreign mining corporation to short-circuit the review process underway, and to affirm the importance of a careful, objective analysis under the existing federal legal framework.

Continuing this review process is the best way to allow for well-informed federal and state decisions, which will affect many future generations of Americans. Industry should not dictate the stewardship of taxpayer-owned public lands, nor use Congress to short-circuit sound decision-making—especially regarding pristine Wilderness Areas like the BWCAW.

Sincerely,

MARK DAYTON,
Governor.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD a letter from the Sportsmen for the Boundary Waters in opposition to the bill; a letter from the National Parks Conservation Association; and a letter from the Girl Scouts of Minnesota and Wisconsin Lakes and Pines in opposition to this bill.

SPORTSMEN FOR THE BOUNDARY WATERS,
Ely, MN, November 29, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters, we urge

you to OPPOSE H.R. 3905, the so-called "Minnesota's Economic Rights in the Superior National Forest Act" when it is considered on the House floor.

Simply put, H.R. 3905 is a bill to allow sulfide-ore mining at the edge of the Boundary Water Canoe Area Wilderness (BWCAW), directly threatening one of America's most accessible and most-visited wilderness areas. At 1.1 million acres in size, the BWCAW is the largest wilderness east of the Rockies and north of the Everglades. This interconnected system of lakes, rivers, and streams provides unparalleled opportunities for solitude, recreation, hunting and fishing. The connections between Northern Minnesota's national forests, Boundary Water Canoe Area Wilderness, Voyageurs National Park, and Quetico Provincial Park makes this entire trans boundary area extremely susceptible to the threat of pollution from sulfide-ore mining, one of the most toxic industries in America, according to the EPA.

H.R. 3905 would require congressional approval of any mineral withdrawal or monument designation involving National Forest System lands in the State of Minnesota and would provide for the perpetual renewal of federal mineral leases in Minnesota, including two that were denied by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. The bill undermines the Antiquities Act, National Environmental Policy Act, Federal Land Policy and Management Act, Boundary Waters Wilderness Act, and other laws regulating mineral leasing in Minnesota's national forests.

Contrary to the bill's title, H.R. 3905 would do more harm than good for the economy of Northern Minnesota. Economic analysis by Key-Log Economics LLC shows that sulfide-ore mining on Superior National Forest lands in the watershed of the Boundary Waters could lead to the loss of nearly 5,000 jobs in tourism, 5,000 to 22,000 jobs in the rest of the economy, a \$1.6 billion loss in annual income, and a \$500 million reduction in private property values.

Specifically, we urge opposition to this bill because it would:

Renew two expired and undeveloped mineral leases on Superior National Forest lands next to the Boundary Waters and along lakes and rivers that flow directly into the Wilderness, advancing a foreign mining company's interests at the expense of beloved American public lands.

Void the December 2016 record of decision by the Forest Service withholding its consent to two mineral lease renewal requests in the Superior National Forest due to the unacceptable risks to this watershed, which according to the Forest Service holds 20 percent of the National Forest System's fresh water supply.

Undermine the National Environmental Policy Act by limiting review of these two mineral leases to a 30-day environmental assessment. Contrary to the bill language, there is no 'pending EA.' However, this section would override the ongoing two-year Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) initiated by the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management to carefully consider the potential impacts of sulfide-ore mining on the Boundary Waters watershed. The ongoing EIS is strongly supported by Minnesota's Governor Dayton and by the citizens of Minnesota. More than 79% of Minnesota voters support the study, while more than 126,000 citizens submitted comments during the scoping phase.

Amend the 1906 Antiquities Act by mandating Congressional approval for any national monument designations in Minnesota's national forests. The Antiquities Act is a bipartisan conservation law, which has been used by Presidents of both parties,

to protect irreplaceable federal lands from potential threats. Monument designation under the Antiquities Act have provided protections for areas including the Grand Canyon, Acadia, Zion, Muir Woods, and Olympic National Parks. Quite simply, this attack on the Antiquities Act is an attack against our national parks and monuments.

Amend the 1976 Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) by mandating Congressional approval for mineral withdrawals in Minnesota's national forests. Additionally, FLPMA intentionally left intact the presidential power to protect public lands as monuments.

Bar the Forest Service from complying with its legal obligations under the 1978 Boundary Waters Wilderness Act. In this Act Congress requires the Forest Service to maintain the high-water quality of the Boundary Waters and a Mining Protection Area within the Superior National Forest. The Forest Service concluded that sulfide-ore mining near the Boundary Waters would be "contrary to Congress' determination that it is necessary to 'protect the special qualities of the [BWCAW] as a natural forest-lakeland wilderness ecosystem of major esthetic, scientific, recreational and educational value to the Nation.'"

Make all mineral leases on Minnesota's national forests essentially perpetual. The 'perpetual' nature of these leases is material change in long-standing mineral leasing law and policy. The bill would also override the two laws (1946 and 1950) on mineral leasing in Minnesota's national forests that require Forest Service consent to any mining.

Ignore the request of the International Joint Commission that environmental review of impacts on trans boundary water quality and cumulative effects be studied and the requests of four tribal entities (the area is Ceded Territory).

Thank you for considering our concerns. In order to adequately protect iconic places like the Boundary Waters, Voyageurs National Park, and all of Minnesota's public lands, and bedrock environmental laws like the Antiquities Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, we urge you to OPPOSE H.R. 3905.

Sincerely,

Backcountry Hunters & Anglers, National Wildlife Federation, Theodore Roosevelt Conservation Partnership, Fly Fishers International, Minnesota Division Izaak Walton League of America, American Fly Fishing Trade Association, Pope and Young Club, keepitpublic.org.

NATIONAL PARKS
CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, November 6, 2017.

Oppose H.R. 3905: Minnesota's Economic Rights in the Superior National Forest Act.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: Since 1919, the National Parks Conservation Association (NPCA) has been the leading voice of the American people in protecting and enhancing our National Park System. On behalf of our more than 1.3 million members and supporters nationwide, I urge you to oppose H.R. 3905: Minnesota's Economic Rights in the Superior National Forest Act when it is reviewed at a markup by the Natural Resources Committee on Tuesday and Wednesday, November 7th and 8th.

NPCA strongly opposes this legislation as it undermines two decisions made by the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) regarding harmful sulfide-ore copper mining within the watershed of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Voyageurs National Park. The leg-

islation also carves out a special exception for Minnesota from protective provisions of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) and the Antiquities Act.

H.R. 3905 threatens the decision-making process already set in motion by the Forest Service to consider a twenty-year mineral withdrawal within the Superior National Forest in the Rainy River watershed. These public lands lie upstream of two prized and federally-protected areas, the Boundary Waters Wilderness and Voyageurs National Park. Both areas are easily threatened by pollutants from mining activities in this watershed given the exclusive drainage into their waters. Tens of thousands of people have already submitted comments on this matter and over 2,000 have participated in agency-sponsored listening sessions. This legislation could erase the remarkable outpouring of public support for clean water and public lands, and set a precedent for legislating a decision that could counter what our federal agencies and public want.

The legislation also threatens the BLM's decision, with advice from the Forest Service, not to renew two mineral leases on the edge of the Boundary Waters Wilderness held by Twin Metals Minnesota. Although the language of the legislation is unclear, it is possible its intent is to restrain Forest Service and BLM discretion on lease renewals while reinstating the Twin Metals leases. Congress has granted discretion to the Forest Service and BLM to assess the circumstances and surrounding environment of any mineral lease application, including applications for lease renewals. Based on this discretion, both agencies have determined that this region is too vulnerable for this type of risky mining, a type of mining never before allowed in Minnesota. Twin Metals would operate in the northeastern part of the state upstream of the Boundary Waters Wilderness that hosts some of cleanest water in America, and Voyageurs National Park, which encompasses over 84,000 acres of water relied upon by many native species.

NPCA also strongly objects to carving out a special exception for Minnesota from the protective provisions of the Antiquities Act and FLPMA. The Antiquities Act allows the president to establish national monuments on federal lands already owned by all Americans. Nearly every president since 1906 (eight republicans and eight democrats) has used the Antiquities Act as a bipartisan conservation tool to protect our nation's history and culture. The bill would eliminate this authority on federal lands in Minnesota, making it only the second state declared off-limits for national monuments declared by presidential proclamation. To carve out exceptions from this law is nothing short of a betrayal to the American people and the land and history we've spent generations protecting.

FLPMA establishes the authority of the Secretary of the Interior to withdraw land from leasing for up to twenty years. Any final Forest Service and BLM decision to move forward with a twenty-year mineral withdrawal would be based on a thorough, science-based process through the National Environmental Policy Act. H.R. 3905 would eliminate this authority solely for Minnesota, alone among the fifty states, and undermine the ability of the agencies to do their job, as appointed by Congress.

Thank you for considering our views on this important legislation. Please reject H.R. 3905 during this week's markup.

Sincerely,

ANI KAME'ENUI,
Director, Legislation and Policy.

GIRL SCOUTS OF MINNESOTA AND
WISCONSIN LAKES AND PINES,

November 26, 2017.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: I am writing to request you vote no on HR 3905, which is a bill that would stop a 2-year Forest Service study of environmental, economic, and social risks to the Boundary Waters from sulfide-ore copper mining on Superior National Forest lands in the headwaters of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area.

For over fifty years, Northern Lakes Canoe Base has offered wilderness canoe trips in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness (BWCAW). I guided Girl Scout canoe trips for five years and have directed our wilderness program for 7 years and am writing this letter to describe the strengths of this program to you and to underscore the fact that this one-of-a-kind program cannot exist anywhere other than the Boundary Waters.

Girls who come on our canoe trips may have had basic camping and canoeing experiences, but few have experience in wilderness travel. We typically serve 150-200 girls a summer.

In general, girls travel in wilderness areas less than boys. Even in 2017, girls are taught to think that the outdoors is no place for a girl because it is hard work, dirty, and going to the mall is just much easier. We teach teenage girls, in a girl-only environment, that their individual strength and the power of teamwork is far greater than they ever imagined. They also learn that hard-work and dirt is part of the fun on a Boundary Waters canoe trip, and they leave with an appreciation for the beauty of wilderness and an understanding of the challenges they now know they can overcome. Girl Scout wilderness canoe trips bring out the best in teenage girls; we see how creative, hardworking, and kind they can be to each other. It doesn't take much imagination to believe that these traits will follow them back to their everyday life.

We are a high quality, affordable program and pride ourselves in our thriftiness. We use our canoes for 20+ seasons and packs and paddles summer after summer. We do this so we can serve girls from all economic backgrounds, including local iron range and Native American communities.

For years we have received feedback from participants crediting their Boundary Waters experience for continued, life-long growth. Our program cannot exist somewhere other than the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. No other place on earth offers the perfect combination of accessibility and high adventure that the BWCAW offers. Many of our participants drive to Ely from Chicago, Milwaukee, and Minneapolis. Many others fly to Minneapolis and then rent a car to get to Ely. Unlike many other wilderness areas which may be high on a mountain range or only accessible by high-clearance vehicles, it is easy for a mom or dad to drive a van full of girls to the Boundary Waters, send them on a trip, and then pick them up a week later.

The Boundary Waters is also unique in that, unlike many other wilderness areas, visitors don't require any previous experience or training to have a safe, adventurous trip. Anyone seeking adventure and challenge belongs on a canoe trip, not just body builders and endurance athletes. We have even seen that a Girl Scout canoe trip sometimes inspires girls who may be uninterested in athletics or leadership to seek out her own creative ways to be active and healthy, leading to improved confidence and greater aspirations. Again, it doesn't take much imagination to conclude that girls who experience wilderness travel will go on to make the world a better place.

Girl Scouts canoe trip participants always remark that the solitude they find in the

Boundary Waters is unlike any they have found elsewhere, whether at their own Girl Scout resident camp or a state or national park. The quiet environment of a protected wilderness area gives them an opportunity to reflect on their life in a way that they could not in a non-wilderness setting. Girl Scouts end their canoe trip with a swagger to their step, ready to take on any challenge that comes their way.

Thank you for doing your part to preserve the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness by voting no on HR 3905. It means a lot to all of us in Ely whose programs and businesses are focused around wilderness travel.

Sincerely,

ANN MCNALLY,
*Northern Lakes Canoe Base
Summer Program Director/Guide.*

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

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and H.R. 3905, the Minnesota Economic Rights in the Superior National Forest Act.

17,000 jobs, \$3 billion for education, \$1.5 billion in annual wages, and \$2.5 billion annually for our economy are at risk if we don't pass H.R. 3905. Further, there are more than 4 billion tons of ore containing copper, nickel, and other metal resources within the area the previous administration tried to shut down, which represents the largest known undeveloped deposit of strategic and critical minerals in the world.

If left unchallenged, these political anti-mining and anti-education actions set precedent for a sweeping executive power grab that threatens communities throughout the country. Education will be significantly harmed, as Minnesota is projected to lose up to \$3 billion in royalty revenues for the State's permanent school trust fund that would support nearly 900,000 K-12 students statewide if the withdrawal application and canceled leases are not rejected.

As the President, on January 19, was leaving office, he actually proposed a massive land withdrawal in northern Minnesota, immediately placing 245,000 acres off limits to development potentially for 20 more years in the future.

In conjunction with this massive mineral withdrawal, the Obama administration's Bureau of Land Management inappropriately rejected Twin Metals Minnesota's application to renew two hard rock mineral leases in Minnesota's Superior National Monument.

Finally, I want to put to rest the false claim raised by the extremist groups that this bill would affect the 1.1-million-acre Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness that already has a significant buffer between it and the forest.

No one is advocating to mine in the wilderness or the surrounding buffer zones. In fact, the bill clearly states on page 4: "Nothing in this section may be construed as permitting the prospecting for development and utili-

zation of mineral resources within the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness or Mine Protection Area."

Congress has authorized mining in the forest by law two different times, and the 1986 Forest Service and 2004 Forest Plans both concluded mining is a desired condition in the Superior National Forest.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Members to support this commonsense, job-creating bill and to support the rule to bring this bill to the floor for proper adjudication.

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

Mr. Speaker, one of the reasons why many of us are opposed to H.R. 3905 is because we see it as a corporate giveaway that puts treasured public lands in the hands of a Chilean mining conglomerate.

So much of what comes out of this Congress is about rewarding those who are well-connected and well-off, rewarding corporations at the expense of average citizens.

I will go back to our previous question, which would force a vote. Everything would still move forward, but it would force a vote on a bill that was introduced by Ms. ESHOO that would require Presidents and Presidential nominees to release their tax returns.

It is not just the connections between the Trump family and this mining company that we have concerns about; it is the connections between this President and his administration and the tax bill that is being proposed that we know would raise taxes on millions and millions of middle class families and basically give a big tax cut to the wealthiest individuals and to corporate special interests and to corporations. We think that is all backwards, but I think the American people deserve to know who benefits and who doesn't.

Again, for the life of me, I don't understand why so many of my Republican friends have circled the wagons in opposition to transparency, in opposition to letting the American people know where this President's conflicts of interests are, and basically protect what I think may very well be multiple conflicts of interest and maybe conflicts of interest that lead directly into a collision course with corruption. This is a big deal.

All this legislation that we are talking about here today, there is a good piece of legislation, the brownfields legislation; a bad piece, that is this mining bill. This still goes forward, but vote with us to defeat the previous question so that we can bring up this other bill.

Now, my Republican colleague from Wyoming may say: Well, that is not what we are talking about here today. The Democrats are just trying to muddy up the discussion.

The reason why we have to resort to a procedural motion to bring up this bill to force the President and Presidential nominees to release their tax

returns is because the Rules Committee shuts everything down that this leadership doesn't want to see come to the floor. We can't bring this bill to the floor to require the President to release his tax returns under regular order and our normal process. They won't let us. We can't offer it as an amendment. They won't let us. This is the only way we can do it.

I would urge my Republican friends to stop defending the indefensible here.

This thing would apply not just to Donald Trump, it would apply to every President. We have never had to do this before because every other President has released their tax returns. This President, for some reason, doesn't think it is anybody's business.

Given the nature of the legislation coming out of this House of Representatives, I think the American people need to know and have a right to know.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

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

Mr. Speaker, I would just, once again, point out that we have important work that we are trying to get done here, we have important work we have got to do on behalf of the American people.

Mr. Speaker, elections have consequences, and we have an obligation to do what our constituents sent us here to do, and that includes a whole range of things that we have been very effective at doing, historically effective in this body since January in terms of deregulation, in terms of passing the repeal of ObamaCare, in terms of moving forward on tax cuts in terms of actually passing the legislation to cut taxes, and importantly also, Mr. Speaker, moving forward to provide the resources that our military needs.

We all watched just over the course of the last 24 hours as the North Koreans launched yet again another ICBM. We live in a dangerous world. It is increasingly dangerous, historically dangerous.

Those are the issues that we are focused on as Republicans and as Members of this House. Those are the issues that we need to focus our attention on.

Again, I think we have grown to expect, no matter what the rule is, no matter what the underlying bill is, we are going to hear the same thing from our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, not addressing the substance of these issues, not addressing the substance of the things the American people sent us here to do. I am very proud to stand here today doing exactly that.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule for H.R. 3905 as well as the underlying bill.

Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I had the opportunity to travel to Minnesota with Minnesota Congressmen EMMER and NOLAN and others to visit the Superior National Forest in northeast Minnesota.

While northeast Minnesota is a long way from the Fourth District of Arkansas, the people, areas, and the economics are somewhat similar. This is a rural area where local economies and constituencies depend on the ability to sustainably and responsibly harvest and mine the natural resources found there.

Unfortunately, the previous administration placed the wants of special interest environmental groups before the needs of Minnesotans and others who depend on natural resources management. In my opinion, they trampled our Article I constitutional authority of the legislative branch when doing so.

On January 19, 2017, one day before President Trump was sworn in, the Obama administration published a 235,000-acre Federal mineral withdrawal application in the Federal Register to impose a 20-year moratorium on lands within the Superior National Forest in northeast Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, this is in direct conflict with the will of Congress and the law going back to when the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness was established.

At the same time, the Obama administration wrongly rejected Twin Metals Minnesota's application to renew two hard rock mineral leases that were renewed in 1989 and 2004. The land in question is not in the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and it doesn't even border Boundary Waters. In fact, the land in question is outside a buffer area around Boundary Waters created by Congress to protect the Boundary Waters.

This politically motivated decision has the ability to destroy the local economy, kill job creation, significantly harm education in Minnesota, and sets a bad precedent.

I want to talk just a moment about the impact this decision will have on Minnesota education. If this withdrawal is allowed to take place, Minnesota is projected to lose up to \$3 billion in royalty revenues for the State's permanent school trust fund, supporting nearly 900,000 students.

Mr. Speaker, as someone who represents schools, communities, and counties that depend on programs like Secure Rural Schools and PILTs, I know the harm that will be brought on school districts, specifically rural school districts, should the withdrawal and application rejection go forward.

How much longer will we allow rural communities and education to suffer because a special interest group doesn't agree with forest management or mining, even though any projects will be carried out in compliance with all en-

vironmental regulations in a responsible manner?

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 3905 is a vital piece of legislation to not only Minnesota, but to other States and communities that depend on natural resource utilization.

It is also important for the legislative branch to remind the executive branch it is not their job to make law or to change laws made by Congress. For these reasons, I ask my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, if I could just inquire of the gentlewoman how many more speakers she has.

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two letters in opposition to H.R. 3905 signed by virtually every major environmental organization in the country.

NOVEMBER 8, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters, we urge you to OPPOSE H.R. 3905, the "Minnesota's Economic Rights in the Superior National Forest Act" scheduled for mark-up in House Natural Resources on Wednesday. Section 3 of this radical bill, which would require Congressional approval of any monument extension or designation involving National Forest lands in Minnesota, represents yet another direct attack on one of our nation's bedrock conservation laws, and flatly ignores the overwhelming public support for protecting unique and sensitive federal lands and ocean areas through national monument designations.

We urge the committee to consider the following during markup of H.R. 3905 this week:

Contrary to the Intent of the Law—The Antiquities Act was designed to allow for swift and necessary action, including when Congress is either unable or unwilling to act, to protect irreplaceable resources from potential threats. Not only has the law successfully protected some of our nation's most remarkable historical, cultural and natural treasures for a century, Congress intentionally left this presidential power intact when passing the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (signed into law by President Ford).

A Vote Against our Parks—Supporting any bill that would undermine the Antiquities Act is a vote against parks. Nearly half of America's national parks began as national monuments including the Grand Canyon, Acadia, Zion, Muir Woods, and Olympic National Parks; and over two-thirds of our national monuments are managed by the National Park Service. Quite simply, a vote against the Antiquities Act is a vote against our national parks and monuments.

Federal Lands Belong to All Americans—The Antiquities Act is used only to protect federal lands already owned by the American public. By carving out an exception for national forest lands within Minnesota, Section 3 of H.R. 3905 flies in the face of our nation's shared public heritage and disregards how dearly the public values iconic public lands and waters, like Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Voyageurs National Park.

Bipartisan History—A signature achievement of President Theodore Roosevelt, the Antiquities Act has been used by 16 presidents since its inception—8 Republicans and 8 Democrats.

Out of Step with the Public—This bill is wildly out of step with the American public's support for our national parks and monuments. Just this summer, a vast majority of the 2.8 million people who submitted comments on the issue raised their voices in support of keeping our national monuments protected just as they are. These voices made Secretary Zinke's national monuments public comment period the largest public comment period in the history of the Interior Department. Across the West, public support for protecting our national monuments has proven strong, and a significant majority of Western voters oppose more mining and drilling on public lands. According to Colorado College's Conservation in the West Poll, 80% of western voters support "future presidents continuing to protect existing public lands as national monuments." This poll reinforces other surveys that document widespread public opposition to congressional attacks on new parks. Americans want more protected public lands, not less!

Opposed by Diverse List of Hundreds of Organizations—As demonstrated by this letter as well as the attached letter signed by nearly 200 organizations, a diverse array of local and national organizations representing sportsmen, outdoor recreation businesses, local chambers of commerce, cultural heritage, historic preservation and conservation have consistently opposed efforts to undermine the Antiquities Act in any form.

Disregards Local Economies—Economic research shows that national monuments support the growth of local economies, bringing in tourism and recreation dollars and boosting the quality of life. The Outdoor Industry Association reported this year that public lands like our national monuments help support 7.6 million jobs in America, and \$887 billion in outdoor recreation activity.

Monuments Protect our Shared History and Culture—In response to broad community input, sites honoring America's military and outdoor heritage, as well as those expanding the diversity of our national park system to better recognize the contributions and histories of Native Americans, Hispanics and African-Americans have been designated under the Antiquities Act. These monuments include Fort Ord, Fort Monroe, Charles Young Buffalo Soldiers, Harriet Tubman Underground Railroad, Chimney Rock, Organ Mountains-Desert Peaks, Cesar E. Chavez and many more.

Recent attacks on national monuments, from President Trump's executive order, to Interior Secretary Zinke's hasty and arbitrary review of these magnificent places, to legislative proposals like H.R. 3905 are a smokescreen for other uses of these special places.

Thank you for considering our concerns. In order to adequately protect iconic places like the Boundary Waters, Voyageurs National Park, and all of Minnesota's shared public resources, we urge you to vote no on H.R. 3905.

Sincerely,

American Bird Conservancy, American Rivers, Boundary Waters Trust, Center for Biological Diversity, Conservation Lands Foundation, Defenders of Wildlife, Earthjustice, Earthworks, Endangered Species Coalition, Environment America, Environmental Law & Policy Center, Environmental Protection Information Center, Friends of the Earth, Hip Hop Caucus, League of Conservation Voters, National Parks Conservation Association, Natural Resources Defense Council, Northeastern Minnesotans for Wilderness, Sierra Club, Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, Tuleyome, The Wilderness Society, Wilderness Watch.

NOVEMBER 28, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of our millions of members and supporters, we urge you to OPPOSE H.R. 3905, the so-called "Minnesota's Economic Rights in the Superior National Forest Act," when it is considered on the House floor.

Simply put, H.R. 3905 is a bill to allow sulfide-ore mining at the edge of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness (BWCAW), directly threatening one of America's most-accessible and most-visited Wilderness Areas. At 1.1 million acres in size, the BWCAW is the largest Wilderness east of the Rockies and north of the Everglades. This interconnected system of lakes, rivers, and streams provides unparalleled opportunities for solitude, recreation, hunting and fishing. The connections between Northern Minnesota's national forests, Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, Voyageurs National Park, and Quetico Provincial Park makes this entire transboundary area extremely susceptible to the threat of pollution from sulfide-ore mining, one of the most toxic industries in America, according to the Environmental Protection Agency.

H.R. 3905 would require congressional approval of any mineral withdrawal or monument designation involving National Forest System lands in the State of Minnesota and would provide for the perpetual renewal of federal mineral leases in Minnesota, including two that were denied by the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management. The bill undermines the Antiquities Act, National Environmental Policy Act, Federal Land Policy and Management Act, Boundary Waters Wilderness Act, and other laws regulating mineral leasing in Minnesota's national forests.

Contrary to the bill's title, H.R. 3905 would do more harm than good for the economy of Northern Minnesota. Economic analysis by Key-Log Economics LLC shows that sulfide-ore mining on Superior National Forest lands in the watershed of the Boundary Waters could lead to the loss of nearly 5,000 jobs in tourism, 5,000 to 22,000 jobs in the rest of the economy, a \$1.6 billion loss in annual income, and a \$500 million reduction in private property values.

Specifically, we urge opposition to this bill because it would:

Renew two expired and undeveloped mineral leases on Superior National Forest lands next to the Boundary Waters and along lakes and rivers that flow directly into the Wilderness, advancing a foreign mining company's interests at the expense of beloved American public lands.

Void the December 2016 record of decision by the Forest Service withholding its consent to two mineral lease renewal requests in the Superior National Forest due to the unacceptable risks to this watershed, which according to the Forest Service holds 20 percent of the National Forest System's fresh water supply.

Undermine the National Environmental Policy Act by limiting review of these two mineral leases to a 30-day environmental assessment. Contrary to the bill language, there is no 'pending EA.' However, this section would override the ongoing two-year Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) initiated by the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management to carefully consider the potential impacts of sulfide-ore mining on the Boundary Waters watershed. The ongoing EIS is strongly supported by Minnesota's Governor Dayton and by the citizens of Minnesota. More than 79% of Minnesota voters support the study, while more than 126,000 citizens submitted comments during the scoping phase.

Amend the 1906 Antiquities Act by mandating Congressional approval for any na-

tional monument designations in Minnesota's national forests. The Antiquities Act is a bipartisan conservation law, which has been used by Presidents of both parties, to protect irreplaceable federal lands from potential threats. Monument designations under the Antiquities Act have provided protection for areas including the Grand Canyon, Acadia, Zion, Muir Woods, and Olympic National Parks. Quite simply, this attack on the Antiquities Act is an attack against our national parks and monuments.

Amend the 1976 Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) by mandating Congressional approval for mineral withdrawals in Minnesota's national forests. Additionally, FLPMA intentionally left intact the presidential power to protect public lands as monuments.

Bar the Forest Service from complying with its legal obligations under the 1978 Boundary Waters Wilderness Act. In this Act Congress requires the Forest Service to maintain the high-water quality of the Boundary Waters and a Mining Protection Area within the Superior National Forest. The Forest Service concluded that sulfide-ore mining near the Boundary Waters would be "contrary to Congress' determination that it is necessary to 'protect the special qualities of the [BWCAW] as a natural forest-lakeland wilderness ecosystem of major esthetic, scientific, recreational and educational value to the Nation.'" Make all mineral leases on Minnesota's national forests essentially perpetual. The 'perpetual' nature of these leases is material change in long-standing mineral leasing law and policy. The bill would also override the two laws (1946 and 1950) on mineral leasing in Minnesota's national forests that require Forest Service consent to any mining.

Ignore the request of the International Joint Commission that environmental review of impacts on transboundary water quality and cumulative effects be studied and the requests of four tribal entities (the area is Ceded Territory).

Thank you for considering our concerns. In order to adequately protect iconic places like the Boundary Waters, Voyageurs National Park, and all of Minnesota's public lands, and bedrock environmental laws like the Antiquities Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, we urge you to OPPOSE H.R. 3905.

Sincerely,

Allegheny Defense Project, American Bird Conservancy, American Canoe Association, American Rivers, Boundary Waters Trust, Center for Biological Diversity, Clean Water Action, Conservation Lands Foundation, Crow River Trail Guards, Defenders of Wildlife, Earthjustice, Earthworks, Endangered Species Coalition, Environment America, Environmental Law & Policy Center, Environmental Protection Information Center, Ernest C. Oberholtzer Foundation, Freemans Explore LLC, Friends of Bell Smith Springs, Friends of the Boundary Waters Wilderness, Friends of the Land of Keweenaw, Gila Resources Information Project, Great Old Broads for Wilderness, GreenLatinos, Heartwood, Kentucky Heartwood, Klamath Forest Alliance, League of Conservation Voters, Mining Impact Coalition of WI, National Parks Conservation Association, Natural Resources Defense Council, Northeastern Minnesotans for Wilderness, Save Lake Superior Association, Shawnee Forest Sentinels, Sierra Club, Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance, The Conservation Alliance, The Ernest C. Oberholtzer Foundation, The Wilderness Society, Tuleyome, W. J. McCabe (Duluth) Chapter, Izaak Walton League of America, WaterLegacy, Wilderness Watch, Wildlands Network.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, we oppose the overall rule, but I will say to the gentlewoman that we would have no problem even with the closed rule on the brownfields bill, which is one of the bills that I think has bipartisan support and reflects a legitimate process.

What we have a problem with is H.R. 3905, which we think is a corporate giveaway that puts treasured public lands in the hands of a Chilean mining conglomerate, and we think that is wrong.

I agree with the gentlewoman that we ought to be doing important business here, but I would argue that, rather than rewarding some Chilean mining conglomerate, the more important business would be making sure we keep the government open, because we have a government shutdown fast approaching on December 8.

I would say to the gentlewoman that we have got to pass the Dream Act and help 800,000 people whose lives have been thrown into turmoil because of this President.

□ 1345

We ought to extend the Children's Health Insurance Program. We ought to debate flood insurance. We ought to pass additional hurricane relief. We ought to address funding for the Vets Choice Program. That is more important, that is more vital to the national interest than basically rewarding some Chilean mining conglomerate.

Finally, I would say to my colleagues here that we will ask you to vote to defeat the previous question. We will ask you to defeat the previous question so we can bring up and have a vote on a bill that will require this President and all Presidents and all party nominees to release their taxes.

I think the American people have a right to know where the conflicts of interest are with this White House. I think they have a right to know who benefits from this tax bill that we know is a giveaway to corporations that will raise taxes on millions of middle class families. They have a right to know who benefits from this.

I am astounded that the bar keeps on getting lower and lower and lower for my Republican friends. I mean, we have daily offensive tweets. We have irrational statements that come out of this White House on a daily basis, and there is silence.

When it comes to transparency, when it comes to making sure that there are no conflicts of interest, my Republican colleagues will not even allow us to have a vote on basically requiring this President and all Presidents to release their tax returns. That is not passing judgment on this President. It would be a requirement of all Presidents and nominees.

Basically, it is saying, let the sunshine in. Let us make sure that there are no conflicts of interest. That ought to matter, because everything that comes out of this House seems to be di-

rected at helping those who are well-off and well-connected.

Every corporation is cheering when this House comes up with legislation, whether it is on tax reform or whether it is on helping mining companies, because it always seems to benefit those who are the most well-off.

Well, it is about time we put people first. It is about time the American people know what is going on in this government. Let the sunshine in. There is nothing wrong with that. We are doing it this way because it is the only avenue available for us to bring this to a vote, because the Rules Committee and the leadership in this House shuts off debate on issues that they find uncomfortable.

This is supposed to be the people's House, not the Russia House. We ought to be a place where we have deliberative engagements, where we discuss important issues, where we do things that benefit the American people.

I would say to my colleagues again, vote "no" on the previous question so we can have this debate. If you want to help the President cover up his tax returns, fine. You can vote "no," but we ought to have a vote.

I don't know why this is so controversial. It, to me, is a no-brainer. Vote "no" on the previous question and vote "no" on the rule.

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

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

I want to thank my colleagues, Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. EMMER, for their work on these important bills. I want to thank my colleague, Mr. MCGOVERN. I am glad to hear him say that they want to put people first.

Mr. Speaker, that is exactly what we are doing; whether we are talking about our tax bill, which is going to put money back in people's pockets; whether we are talking about repealing and replacing ObamaCare, which we have passed through this House; whether we are talking about defense spending that is going to protect the people of this Nation.

All across Wyoming, Mr. Speaker, I know my constituents are very grateful that we are now suddenly putting people first after years of putting the government first. We are not doing that anymore, Mr. Speaker.

It is true, this is the people's House. And in this House, Mr. Speaker, we ought to always live by and remember the rules of Alexander Hamilton: "Here, sir, the people govern."

In this House, Mr. Speaker, we are charged with carrying out the obligations of the people who elected us. The bills and the rule that we are debating today do just that. Both of these bills are absolutely critical for spurring economic development across our country.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of both the rule and of these underlying bills.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 631 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

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

SEC. 3. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 305) to amend the Ethics in Government Act of 1978 to require the disclosure of certain tax returns by Presidents and certain candidates for the office of the President, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided among and controlled by the respective chairs and ranking minority members of the Committees on Ways and Means and Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 305.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative

Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 189, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 640]

YEAS—227

Abraham	Brooks (IN)	Curbelo (FL)
Aderholt	Buchanan	Curtis
Allen	Buck	Davidson
Amash	Bucshon	Davis, Rodney
Amodei	Budd	Denham
Arrington	Burgess	Dent
Babin	Byrne	DeSantis
Bacon	Calvert	DesJarlais
Banks (IN)	Carter (GA)	Diaz-Balart
Barletta	Carter (TX)	Donovan
Barr	Chabot	Duffy
Barton	Cheney	Duncan (SC)
Bergman	Coffman	Duncan (TN)
Biggs	Cole	Dunn
Billirakis	Collins (GA)	Emmer
Bishop (MI)	Collins (NY)	Estes (KS)
Bishop (UT)	Comer	Farenthold
Black	Comstock	Faso
Blackburn	Conaway	Ferguson
Blum	Cook	Fitzpatrick
Bost	Costello (PA)	Fleischmann
Brady (TX)	Cramer	Flores
Brat	Crawford	Fortenberry
Brooks (AL)	Culberson	Fox

Franks (AZ)	Lewis (MN)
Frelinghuysen	LoBiondo
Gaetz	Loudermilk
Gallagher	Love
Garrett	MacArthur
Gianforte	Marchant
Gibbs	Marino
Gohmert	Marshall
Goodlatte	Massie
Gosar	Mast
Gowdy	McCarthy
Granger	McCaul
Graves (GA)	McClintock
Graves (LA)	McHenry
Griffith	McKinley
Grothman	McMorris
Guthrie	Rodgers
Handel	McSally
Harper	Meadows
Harris	Meehan
Hensarling	Messer
Hice, Jody B.	Mitchell
Higgins (LA)	Moolenaar
Hill	Mooney (WV)
Holding	Mullin
Hollingsworth	Newhouse
Hudson	Noem
Huizenga	Norman
Hultgren	Nunes
Hunter	Olson
Hurd	Palazzo
Issa	Palmer
Jenkins (KS)	Paulsen
Jenkins (WV)	Pearce
Johnson (LA)	Perry
Johnson (OH)	Pittenger
Johnson, Sam	Poe (TX)
Jordan	Poliquin
Joyce (OH)	Ratcliffe
Katko	Reed
Kelly (MS)	Reichert
Kelly (PA)	Renacci
King (IA)	Rice (SC)
King (NY)	Roby
Kinzinger	Roe (TN)
Knight	Rogers (AL)
Kustoff (TN)	Rogers (KY)
Labrador	Rohrabacher
LaHood	Rokita
LaMalfa	Rooney, Francis
Lamborn	Rooney, Thomas
Lance	J.
Latta	Ros-Lehtinen

NAYS—189

Adams	DeGette	Kelly (IL)
Aguilar	Delaney	Khanna
Barragán	DeLauro	Kihuen
Bass	DelBene	Kildee
Beatty	Demings	Kilmer
Bera	DeSaulnier	Kind
Beyer	Deutch	Krishnamoorthi
Bishop (GA)	Dingell	Kuster (NH)
Blumenauer	Doggett	Langevin
Blunt Rochester	Doyle, Michael	Larsen (WA)
Bonamici	F.	Lawrence
Boyle, Brendan	Ellison	Lawson (FL)
F.	Engel	Lee
Brady (PA)	Eshoo	Levin
Brown (MD)	Españat	Lewis (GA)
Brownley (CA)	Esty (CT)	Lieu, Ted
Bustos	Evans	Lipinski
Capuano	Foster	Loeb
Carbajal	Frankel (FL)	Lofgren
Cárdenas	Fudge	Lowenthal
Carson (IN)	Gabbard	Lowey
Cartwright	Gallago	Lujan Grisham,
Castor (FL)	Garamendi	M.
Castro (TX)	Gomez	Luján, Ben Ray
Chu, Judy	Gonzalez (TX)	Lynch
Ciilline	Gottheimer	Maloney,
Clark (MA)	Green, Al	Carolyn B.
Clarke (NY)	Green, Gene	Maloney, Sean
Clay	Grijalva	Matsui
Cleaver	Gutiérrez	McCollum
Clyburn	Hanabusa	McEachin
Cohen	Hastings	McGovern
Connolly	Heck	McNerney
Cooper	Higgins (NY)	Meeks
Correa	Himes	Meng
Costa	Hoyer	Moore
Courtney	Huffman	Moulton
Crist	Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)
Crowley	Jeffries	Nadler
Cuellar	Johnson (GA)	Napolitano
Cummings	Johnson, E. B.	Neal
Davis (CA)	Jones	Nolan
Davis, Danny	Kaptur	Norcross
DeFazio	Keating	O'Halleran

O'Rourke	Ryan (OH)	Takano
Pallone	Sánchez	Thompson (CA)
Panetta	Sarbanes	Thompson (MS)
Pascarella	Schakowsky	Titus
Payne	Schiff	Tonko
Pelosi	Schneider	Torres
Perlmutter	Schrader	Tsongas
Peters	Scott (VA)	Vargas
Peterson	Scott, David	Veasey
Pingree	Serrano	Vela
Polis	Sewell (AL)	Velázquez
Price (NC)	Shea-Porter	Visclosky
Quigley	Sherman	Walz
Raskin	Sinema	Wasserman
Rice (NY)	Sires	Schultz
Richmond	Slaughter	Waters, Maxine
Rosen	Smith (WA)	Watson Coleman
Roybal-Allard	Soto	Welch
Ruiz	Speier	Wilson (FL)
Ruppersberger	Suozi	Yarmuth
Rush	Swalwell (CA)	

NOT VOTING—17

Bridenstine	Jayapal	Pocan
Butterfield	Kennedy	Posey
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Smith (MO)
Graves (MO)	Long	Stivers
Hartzer	Lucas	Wagne
Herrera Beutler	Luetkemeyer	

□ 1413

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yes 228, noes 186, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 641]

AYES—228

Abraham	Comstock	Gowdy
Aderholt	Conaway	Granger
Allen	Cook	Graves (GA)
Amash	Costello (PA)	Graves (LA)
Amodei	Cramer	Griffith
Arrington	Crawford	Grothman
Babin	Culberson	Guthrie
Bacon	Curbelo (FL)	Handel
Banks (IN)	Curtis	Harper
Barletta	Davidson	Harris
Barr	Davis, Rodney	Hensarling
Barton	Denham	Hice, Jody B.
Bergman	Dent	Higgins (LA)
Biggs	DeSantis	Hill
Billirakis	DesJarlais	Holding
Bishop (MI)	Diaz-Balart	Hollingsworth
Bishop (UT)	Donovan	Hudson
Black	Duffy	Huizenga
Blackburn	Duncan (SC)	Hultgren
Blum	Duncan (TN)	Hunter
Bost	Dunn	Hurd
Brady (TX)	Emmer	Issa
Brat	Estes (KS)	Jenkins (KS)
Brooks (AL)	Farenthold	Jenkins (WV)
Brooks (IN)	Faso	Johnson (LA)
Buchanan	Ferguson	Johnson (OH)
Buck	Fitzpatrick	Johnson, Sam
Bucshon	Fleischmann	Jones
Budd	Flores	Jordan
Burgess	Fortenberry	Joyce (OH)
Byrne	Fox	Katko
Calvert	Franks (AZ)	Kelly (MS)
Carter (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Kelly (PA)
Carter (TX)	Gaetz	King (IA)
Chabot	Gallagher	King (NY)
Cheney	Garrett	Kinzing
Coffman	Gianforte	Knight
Cole	Gibbs	Kustoff (TN)
Collins (GA)	Gohmert	Labrador
Collins (NY)	Goodlatte	LaHood
Comer	Gosar	LaMalfa

Lamborn	Pearce	Smith (NE)
Lance	Perry	Smith (NJ)
Latta	Pittenger	Smith (TX)
Lewis (MN)	Poe (TX)	Smucker
LoBiondo	Poliquin	Stefanik
Loudermilk	Ratcliffe	Stewart
Love	Reed	Taylor
MacArthur	Reichert	Tenney
Marchant	Renacci	Thompson (PA)
Marino	Rice (SC)	Thornberry
Marshall	Roby	Tiberi
Massie	Roe (TN)	Tipton
Mast	Rogers (AL)	Trott
McCarthy	Rogers (KY)	Turner
McCaul	Rohrabacher	Upton
McClintock	Rokita	Valadao
McHenry	Rooney, Francis	Walberg
McKinley	Rooney, Thomas J.	Walden
McMorris	Ros-Lehtinen	Walker
Rodgers	Roskam	Walorski
McSally	Ross	Walters, Mimi
Meadows	Rothfus	Weber (TX)
Meehan	Rouzer	Webster (FL)
Messer	Royce (CA)	Wenstrup
Mitchell	Russell	Westerman
Moolenaar	Rutherford	Williams
Mooney (WV)	Sanford	Wilson (SC)
Mullin	Scalise	Wittman
Newhouse	Schweikert	Womack
Noem	Scott, Austin	Woodall
Norman	Sensenbrenner	Yoder
Nunes	Sessions	Yoho
Olson	Shimkus	Young (AK)
Palazzo	Shuster	Young (IA)
Palmer	Simpson	Zeldin
Paulsen		

NOES—186

Adams	Foster	Moore
Aguilar	Frankel (FL)	Moulton
Barragán	Fudge	Murphy (FL)
Bass	Gabbard	Napolitano
Beatty	Gallago	Neal
Bera	Garamendi	Nolan
Beyer	Gomez	Norcross
Bishop (GA)	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Halleran
Blumenauer	Gottheimer	O'Rourke
Blunt Rochester	Green, Al	Pallone
Bonamici	Green, Gene	Panetta
Boyle, Brendan F.	Grijalva	Pascarell
Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	Payne
Brown (MD)	Hanabusa	Pelosi
Brownley (CA)	Hastings	Perlmutter
Bustos	Heck	Peters
Capuano	Higgins (NY)	Peterson
Carbajal	Himes	Pingree
Cárdenas	Hoyer	Polis
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Prigle
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Quigley
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Raskin
Chu, Judy	Johnson, E. B.	Rice (NY)
Cicilline	Kaptur	Richmond
Clark (MA)	Keating	Rosen
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Roybal-Allard
Clay	Khanna	Ruiz
Cleaver	Kihuen	Ruppersberger
Clyburn	Kildee	Rush
Cohen	Kilmer	Ryan (OH)
Connolly	Kind	Sánchez
Cooper	Krishnamoorthi	Sarbanes
Correa	Kuster (NH)	Schakowsky
Costa	Langevin	Schiff
Courtney	Larsen (WA)	Schneider
Crist	Larson (CT)	Schrader
Crowley	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
Cuellar	Lawson (FL)	Scott, David
Cummings	Lee	Serrano
Davis (CA)	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Shea-Porter
DeFazio	Lipinski	Sherman
DeGette	Loebach	Sinema
Delaney	Lofgren	Sires
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Slaughter
DelBene	Lowey	Smith (WA)
Demings	Lujan Grisham, M.	Soto
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Speier
Deutch	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
Dingell	Maloney,	Takano
Doggett	Carolyn B.	Thompson (CA)
Doyle, Michael F.	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)
Ellison	Matsui	Titus
Engel	McCollum	Tonko
Eshoo	McEachin	Torres
Espallat	McGovern	Tsongas
Esty (CT)	McNerney	Vargas
Evans	Meeks	Veasey
	Meng	Vela
		Velázquez
		Visclosky

Walz	Waters, Maxine	Wilson (FL)
Wasserman	Watson Coleman	Yarmuth
Schultz	Weich	

NOT VOTING—19

Bridenstine	Kennedy	Posey
Butterfield	Lewis (GA)	Smith (MO)
Conyers	Long	Stivers
Graves (MO)	Lucas	Suozi
Hartzler	Luetkemeyer	Wagner
Herrera Beutler	Nadler	
Jayapal	Pocan	

□ 1421

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair will postpone further proceedings today on the motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or if the vote is objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

Any record vote on the postponed question will be taken at a later time.

REQUIRING COMPLETION OF TRAINING PROGRAM IN WORKPLACE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 630) requiring each Member, officer, and employee of the House of Representatives to complete a program of training in workplace rights and responsibilities each session of each Congress, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 630

Resolved,
SECTION 1. MANDATORY COMPLETION OF PROGRAM OF TRAINING IN WORKPLACE RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES.

(a) **REQUIRING TRAINING FOR ALL MEMBERS, OFFICERS, AND EMPLOYEES.**—

(1) **REQUIREMENT.**—Not later than 30 days after the date of the enactment of this resolution, the Committee on House Administration shall issue regulations to provide that, during each session of each Congress, each Member (including each Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress), officer, and employee of the House of Representatives shall complete a program of training in the workplace rights and responsibilities applicable to offices and employees of the House under part A of title II of the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 (2 U.S.C. 1301 et seq.), including anti-discrimination and anti-harassment training.

(2) **INCLUSION OF INTERNS, FELLOWS, AND DETAILEES.**—For purposes of this resolution, an individual serving in an office of the House of Representatives as an intern (including an unpaid intern), a participant in a fellowship program, or a detailee from another office of the Federal Government shall be considered an employee of the House.

(b) **DEADLINE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Under the regulations issued by the Committee on House Administration under subsection (a), an individual shall complete the program of training required under subsection (a) and file a certificate of completion of such training not later than—

(A) in the case of an individual who is serving as a Member, officer, or employee of the House as of the first day of a session of Congress, not later than 90 days after the session begins; or

(B) in the case of any other individual, not later than 90 days after the individual first becomes a Member, officer, or employee of the House during the session.

(2) **SPECIAL RULE FOR ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS.**—In the case of the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress, an individual shall complete the program required under subsection (a) not later than 180 days after the second session of the Congress begins.

(c) **ADDITIONAL MECHANISMS.**—The Committee on House Administration shall consider additional mechanisms to ensure compliance with the training requirement under subsection (a).

SEC. 2. STATEMENT OF RIGHTS AND PROTECTIONS PROVIDED TO HOUSE EMPLOYEES UNDER CONGRESSIONAL ACCOUNTABILITY ACT OF 1995.

The Committee on House Administration shall issue regulations to provide that each employing office of the House of Representatives shall post in a prominent location in the office (including, in the case of the office of a Member of the House or a Delegate or Resident Commissioner to the Congress, a prominent location in each office in the Member's congressional district) a statement of the rights and protections provided to employees of the House of Representatives under the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995, including the procedures available to employees of the House under such Act for responding to and adjudicating allegations of violations of such rights and protections.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. HARPER) and the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRADY) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HARPER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 630.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this House resolution. The resolution is one part of the Committee on House Administration's comprehensive review of the laws, procedures, and resources concerning workplace harassment in the House. A harassment-free policy and workplace is vital in creating that culture that will require everyone on Capitol Hill to work together effectively.

First and foremost, Mr. Speaker, there is no place for sexual harassment in our society, and especially in Congress—period. I believe as Members of Congress, we must hold ourselves to a higher standard, a standard that demonstrates we are worthy of the trust