

Carter (TX)	Huffman	Perlmutter
Cartwright	Hultgren	Peters
Castor (FL)	Hurd	Pingree
Castro (TX)	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Cheney	Jayapal	Poe (TX)
Chu, Judy	Jeffries	Poliquin
Ciциlline	Jenkins (WV)	Polis
Clark (MA)	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Clarke (NY)	Johnson (OH)	Quigley
Clay	Johnson, E. B.	Raskin
Cleaver	Joyce (OH)	Ratcliffe
Clyburn	Kaptur	Reed
Coffman	Katko	Reichert
Cohen	Keating	Renacci
Cole	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Collins (GA)	Kelly (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Collins (NY)	Kennedy	Ros-Lehtinen
Comstock	Khanna	Rosen
Conaway	Kihuen	Roskam
Connolly	Kildee	Ross
Cook	Kilmer	Roybal-Allard
Cooper	Kind	Ruiz
Correa	King (NY)	Ruppersberger
Costa	Kinzinger	Rush
Costello (PA)	Knight	Rutherford
Courtney	Krishnamoorthi	Ryan (OH)
Cramer	Kuster (NH)	Sánchez
Crawford	LaHood	Sarbanes
Crist	Lamb	Schakowsky
Crowley	Lance	Schiff
Cuellar	Langevin	Schneider
Culberson	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Cummings	Larson (CT)	Scott (VA)
Curbelo (FL)	Lawrence	Scott, David
Davis (CA)	Lawson (FL)	Serrano
Davis, Danny	Lee	Sessions
Davis, Rodney	Levin	Sewell (AL)
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Shea-Porter
DeGette	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
Delaney	Lipinski	Shimkus
DeLauro	LoBiondo	Simpson
DelBene	Loeb sack	Sinema
Demings	Lofgren	Sires
Denham	Long	Smith (NJ)
DeSaulnier	Love	Smith (TX)
Deutch	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
Diaz-Balart	Lowe y	Soto
Dingell	Lucas	Stefanik
Doggett	Lujan Grisham,	Stewart
Donovan	M.	Stivers
Doyle, Michael	Luján, Ben Ray	Suo zzi
F.	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
Duffy	MacArthur	Takano
Ellison	Maloney,	Takano
Engel	Carolyn B.	Taylor
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Tenney
Espallat	Marino	Thompson (CA)
Esty (CT)	Marshall	Thompson (MS)
Evans	Mast	Thompson (PA)
Faso	Matsui	Thornberry
Fitzpatrick	McCaul	Tipton
Fleischmann	McCollum	Titus
Fortenberry	McEachin	Tonko
Foster	McGovern	Torres
Frankel (FL)	McKinley	Trott
Frelinghuysen	McNerney	Tsongas
Fudge	Meeks	Turner
Gabbard	Meng	Upton
Gallego	Mitchell	Valadao
Garamendi	Moolenaar	Vargas
Gianforte	Moore	Veasey
Gohmert	Moulton	Vela
Gomez	Murphy (FL)	Velázquez
Gottheimer	Nadler	Visclosky
Gowdy	Napolitano	Walden
Granger	Neal	Walorski
Green, Al	Newhouse	Wasserman
Green, Gene	Nolan	Schultz
Grijalva	Norcross	Waters, Maxine
Gutiérrez	O'Halleran	Watson Coleman
Handel	O'Rourke	Weber (TX)
Harper	Olson	Welch
Hastings	Palazzo	Williams
Heck	Pallone	Wilson (FL)
Herrera Beutler	Panetta	Womack
Higgins (NY)	Pascrell	Yarmuth
Hill	Pascrell	Yarmuth
Himes	Paulsen	Yoder
Hollingsworth	Payne	Young (AK)
Hoyer	Pearce	Young (IA)
	Pelosi	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—17

Bass	Gaetz	Scalise
Black	Hanabusa	Shuster
Blackburn	Labrador	Speier
Cárdenas	Peterson	Wagner
DeSantis	Richmond	Walz
Duncan (SC)	Roby	

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

□ 1615

So the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 340, “yea” on rollcall No. 341, “nay” on rollcall No. 342, “nay” on rollcall Nos. 343 and 344, and “yea” on rollcall No. 345.

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 6147) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

PRIVILEGED REPORT ON RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. WALDEN, from the Committee on Energy and Commerce, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115–835) on the resolution (H. Res. 982) of inquiry requesting the President, and directing the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to transmit, respectively, certain information to the House of Representatives referring to the separation of children from their parents or guardians as a result of the President’s “zero tolerance” policy, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 2, AGRICULTURE AND NUTRITION ACT OF 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 2:

From the Committee on Agriculture, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. CONAWAY, THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, GOODLATTE, LUCAS, ROGERS of Alabama, AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, CRAWFORD, Mrs. HARTZLER, Messrs. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, YOHO, ROUZER, MARSHALL, ARRINGTON, PETERSON, DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, COSTA, WALZ, Ms. FUDGE, Messrs. MCGOVERN, VELA, Mses. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. O’HALLERAN.

From the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for consideration of sections 4204, 4205, and 9131 of the

House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Ms. FOXX, Mr. ALLEN, and Ms. ADAMS.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of subtitles A and B of title VI, sections 6202, 6203, 6401, 6406, 6407, 6409, 6603, 7301, 7605, 8106, 8507, 9119, 9121, and 11101 of the House bill, and sections 6116, 6117, 6202, 6206–09, 6301, 6303, 7412, 9102, 9104, 9106, 9111–13, 12408, 12627, and 12628 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. SHIMKUS, CRAMER, and TONKO.

From the Committee on Financial Services, for consideration of section 12609 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. HENSARLING, DUFFY, and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

From the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for consideration of title III of the House bill, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ROYCE of California, CHABOT, and ENGEL.

From the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of sections 2802, 6408, 8104, 8107, 8109, subtitles B and C of title VIII, 8402, 8502, 8503, 8506, 8507, 8509, 8510, 9111, 11614, and 11615 of the House bill, and section 2425, subtitle D of title VIII, sections 8601, 8611, 8621–28, 8631, 8632, 12515, 12601, and 12602 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BISHOP of Utah, WESTERMAN, and GRIJALVA.

From the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for consideration of sections 1601, 4022, 4026, 8502, and 11609 of the House bill, and sections 3113, 7128, 8623, 8630, 8632, 12301, and 12407 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. WALKER, COMER, and Ms. PLASKETT.

From the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for consideration of section 7509 of the House bill, and section 7409 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. ABRAHAM, DUNN, and Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

From the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, for consideration of sections 2404, 6223, 6224, 6503, 9117, and 9118 of the House bill, and sections 2415, 2416, 6124, 6304, and 7412 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. DENHAM, GIBBS, and Mrs. BUSTOS.

There was no objection.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on H.R. 6147, and that I may include tabular material on the same.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 996 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 6147.

Will the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. HULTGREN) kindly take the chair.

□ 1623

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 6147) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 39 printed in House Report 115-830 offered by the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 42 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 42 printed in House Report 115-830.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to terminate or restructure the Great Lakes Advisory Board, a Federal advisory committee chartered under the Federal Advisory Committee Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the committee for supporting me in my very important amendments last evening, and I have another very important amendment that is before the committee here today.

Mr. Chair, I urge support for my amendment that would prevent the administration from dismantling the EPA's Great Lakes Advisory Board. I am so pleased that this bill has again rejected the President's proposal to gut the GLRI, and this amendment would prevent them from dismantling the advisory board.

Mr. Chairman, this is a critical matter for anyone who drinks water. The Great Lakes provide drinking water to some 40 million people. Let me say that again. Forty million people depend on this resource for one of life's basic requirements, water, not to mention anglers and recreation.

As an old African proverb goes, water has no enemies. So, hopefully, the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative is something that we are going to recognize as having played a critical role in protecting and restoring one of America's greatest national treasures, a life-sustaining element, water.

Just to mention, not to bore people with a lot of statistics, but the Great Lakes contain about 21 percent of the world's surface freshwater and more than 80 percent, 85 percent, of the freshwater in North America. This is indispensable.

As critical as this funding is, it is also important that the EPA receive advice and input from local stakeholders regarding priorities under that program. The Great Lakes Advisory Board provides such advice.

EPA established the board in 2013 to provide independent advice to the EPA administration in its capacity as chair of the Federal Great Lakes Interagency Task Force. Some of the past activities of the advisory board have been providing the EPA with recommendations regarding what are the most significant stressors and needs for the Great Lakes ecosystem; providing the EPA with recommendations on ways to ensure effective public input into the Great Lakes action plan process; and providing advice on whether the GLRI should invest in efforts to understand long-term, future threats and communicate them to the Great Lakes community for action.

In light of reports of efforts to undermine the board, on a bipartisan basis, I joined colleagues in writing to the EPA earlier this year to make clear that we support the establishment and maintenance of the board. My amendment would put teeth behind this letter and make it clear to the administration what congressional intent is regarding this important advisory board.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, this bill is consistent with years past that provided robust funding for the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative. Therefore, this is an initiative I can support and we accept.

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentleman from California. He is a very effective leader on this issue. I appreciate him.

An effective Great Lakes Advisory Board is vital to ensuring that the GLRI remains successful and impactful today and in the years to come.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the final rule entitled "Oil and Natural Gas Sector: Emission Standards for New, Reconstructed, and Modified Sources" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on June 3, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 35824).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit funds from enforcing the Obama administration EPA methane rule. This rule is currently facing litigation uncertainty, and Congress must act to block this job-killing regulation estimated to cost our economy \$530 million annually.

While oil and gas production has increased more than 25 percent since 2005, related methane emissions have actually decreased almost 40 percent during the same time period.

It is counterproductive for the Federal Government to enact harmful regulations that cause inefficiencies, recklessly spend taxpayer dollars, and force hardship upon job-creating industries.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, the gentleman's amendment would block the EPA from regulating methane emissions from sources in the oil and gas sector.

Methane is a primary component of natural gas and is a potent greenhouse gas with global warming potential more than 25 times greater than carbon dioxide.

□ 1630

In 2013, nearly one-third of the methane emissions in the United States came from oil and gas production, processing, transmission, and distribution. There is no doubt, no doubt at all that methane contributes to the increased levels of greenhouse gas concentrations, which will contribute to long-lasting changes in our climate such as rising global temperatures, sea level rising, changes in weather and precipitation patterns.

Public health risks include more heat waves and drought, worsening smog, increased intensity of extreme weather events, and increasing the range of ticks and mosquitoes, which can spread diseases such as Lyme disease, West Nile Virus, and Zika.

The disgraced former EPA administrator, Scott Pruitt, tried to delay this rule, but the courts blocked that effort and ruled that the EPA cannot delay implementation. When is the majority going to stop the assault on the environment?

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, the EPA has imposed these substantial competitive barriers, despite the industry's significant reduction in methane emissions through their own initiatives and innovation.

What is not known is that through the EPA's own analysis, it shows that methane emissions from hydraulically fractured gas wells have actually fallen dramatically. According to EPA data—not my data, but EPA data—methane emissions from oil and gas production declined by 38 percent from 2005 to 2012, and methane emissions from hydraulically fractured natural gas wells have plummeted 73 percent since 2011.

Total methane emissions from natural gas systems actually are down 11 percent since 2005, despite the significant production increases over this time period. This is a prime example of market forces at work.

American producers developed innovative means of capturing additional methane because doing so means they have more product to sell. Profitability, rather than a top-down Washington regulation, drove this unprecedented emissions reduction.

In fact, in 2012 alone, voluntary methane emission reductions activities by the U.S. oil and gas industry generated \$364 million in additional revenue.

Unfortunately, the methane rule represents the kind of one-size-fits-all policy that will actually stifle innovation and discourage further investment in emission reduction technology.

Actually, as a result, the EPA's methane rule, if allowed to stand, will not only lead to economic harm, but environmental harm as well.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I believe I have the right to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

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

Mr. Chairman, EPA was directed by the President to take a second look at the methane rule promulgated by the Obama administration. In conjunction with that review, EPA attempted to

provide the regulating community with some certainty by postponing some implementation dates. However, the courts have blocked that from happening.

In light of these challenges, the time is ripe for a temporary pause on the enforcement of these requirements, so I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I am prepared to close.

Well, simply put, I urge our colleagues on both sides to come together and kill this job-killing regulation and support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, as I said, I oppose this amendment. Climate change threatens the health and welfare for current and future generations.

As the gentlemen have pointed out, Mr. Chairman, industry has moved—has moved, in part, because of pressure from the EPA, and, in part, because of just the financial loss of allowing this methane gas to escape into the atmosphere. It is dollars that are burning up.

These are precious resources that we are taking from the Earth, and we should make sure that we don't waste any of it, and that is why I think the EPA rule should not be delayed.

As has been pointed out, industry has the ability to capture this methane. It has the ability to make money from it, and I want to just make sure that we encourage everyone in the industry to move forward.

Mr. Chairman, let me give you an example. The Bakken Oil Field, which is in North Dakota—I am very familiar with it because I spent many a summer in that area—burns brighter than the entire metropolitan area of the Twin Cities at night because of the flares from the methane that are being burnt. That energy should be captured. It should be saved. We should be conservationists for future generations. We must take action, and I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to prepare, propose, or promulgate any regulation or guidance that references or relies on the analysis contained in—

(1) "Technical Support Document: Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in February 2010;

(2) "Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in May 2013 and revised in November 2013;

(3) "Revised Draft Guidance for Federal Departments and Agencies on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and the Effects of Climate Change in NEPA Reviews", published by the Council on Environmental Quality on December 24, 2014 (79 Fed. Reg. 77802);

(4) "Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Carbon, United States Government, in July 2015;

(5) "Addendum to the Technical Support Document on Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866: Application of the Methodology to Estimate the Social Cost of Methane and the Social Cost of Nitrous Oxide", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, United States Government, in August 2016; or

(6) "Technical Support Document: Technical Update of the Social Cost of Carbon for Regulatory Impact Analysis Under Executive Order 12866", published by the Interagency Working Group on Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases, United States Government, in August 2016.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. MULLIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funds from implementing the Obama administration's social cost of carbon rule. Congress and the American people have repeatedly rejected cap and trade proposals.

The Obama administration continuously used social cost of carbon models, which could be easily manipulated in order to attempt to justify new job-killing regulations.

The House has a clear, strong record of opposition to the social cost of carbon, voting at least 11 times to block, defund, or oppose the proposal, including H. Con. Res. 119, which we will be considering later this week.

A carbon tax would be passed along to consumers, undermining the success of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act we passed last year.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a very harmful rider, and it would prohibit the EPA from considering the social cost of carbon as part of rulemaking. The social cost of carbon is an estimate of economic damages associated with small increases of carbon dioxide emissions in a given year.

It represents the best scientific information available, incorporating the impacts from carbon pollution into regulatory analyses. Weakening or eliminating use of social cost of carbon as a tool for Federal agencies that would ignore the sobering cost of health, environment, and economic impacts of extreme weather, rising temperatures, intensifying smog, and other impacts.

We cannot afford to abandon science while trying to tackle climate change, so I strongly oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE).

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment. It would prohibit funds from being used to advance guidance or make rules that rely on Obama-era social cost of carbon guidance.

I have heard from folks in Montana who cannot get a permit to expand a coal mine because they didn't account for the carbon released by the trains that would carry the coal. I have heard of the difficulties of building railroad bridges because they might allow more coal to be transported.

We must stop relying on metrics that were designed by the keep-it-in-the-ground crowd. Similar language passed, on a bipartisan vote, here in the House last September. I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, garbage in equals garbage out. We have heard this on numerous occasions.

And in this instance, the international—or correction—the Interagency Working Group has chosen to disregard the policy decisions from OMB Circular A-4 regarding how they set the modeling. And as a result of that, they have—interestingly, the analysis generated by them would have been 80 percent lower than the mean SCC value if they had followed the guidance. And the result overstates the benefits by at least four times relative to what it would be if only the national benefits were considered as OMB directs.

This is a blatant pattern of disregard, Mr. Chairman, for the OMB guidance in order to inflate the SCC and beg the

question how many input decisions were responsible where responsible people could disagree were selected in order only to inflate the SCC value.

Let's restore the faith and vote for this amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for bringing this amendment. It is an important amendment to people that matter very much.

John Dingell is a man of integrity. I feel I know his heart. He has a huge heart, and we disagreed on many issues, but I know him as a man of integrity.

He was told he had to push through the cap and trade that would have gotten into costing people for this so-called cost of carbon, and he said it is not only a tax, it is a great big tax, and he lost his chairmanship.

But what John Dingell knows, what I know is when you start creating taxes on fuel, the people that get hammered the worst are the Nation's poorest among us. That is who it gets passed to. That is who gets crushed. Let's don't do this to the hardworking, poorest among us. Let's vote for the Mullin amendment.

Mr. MULLIN. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to reiterate again: We should be using the best scientific information available, and we should be incorporating the impacts from carbon pollution into regulatory analysis.

When we see children being hospitalized because of intense smog, more people suffering respiratory and heart disease, and other impacts from that, we all pay for that. Whether we pay for it in emergency room visits, we pay for it in our insurance, there are many ways in which we are individually paying for the pollution that is created, let alone recognizing the effects it has on climate change.

So, simply, again, we cannot afford to abandon science while trying to tackle climate change, and I strongly oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MS. MOORE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. There is appropriated for grants for lead reduction projects under section 1459B of the Safe Drinking Water Act (42 U.S.C. 300j-19b) \$10,000,000, to be derived from a reduction of \$10,000,000 in the amount provided in this Act under the heading "Environmental Protection Agency—Environmental Programs and Management".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wisconsin.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise today to offer an amendment to increase resources available to help address a scourge that is occurring in so many of our communities: lead poisoning.

My district is facing its challenges like so many in our country, and the Federal Government must do its part by ensuring that we provide the resources to address this scourge.

Two of the most prominent vectors are old housing and old water infrastructure, lateral lead pipes. My amendment would attempt to address just one of the sources of lead, old lateral lead pipes, while recognizing the need to address housing when the appropriate funding bill comes to the floor.

Mr. Chairman, we know that children throughout America are at risk of a major public health crisis given aging drinking water infrastructure and housing stock. In my district alone, there are tens of thousands of lead service lines that pose a threat to the public health of children.

We have heard so much about Flint, Michigan, but I can tell you that lead poisoning in my district mirrors that of Flint, Michigan. I mean, Mr. Chairman, there just are no safe levels of lead for children.

□ 1645

As noted in a recent report by The Pew Charitable Trusts: "In the absence of lead, hundreds of thousands of children would be more likely to realize their full potential thanks to higher grade point averages, a better chance of earning high school diplomas, and graduating from college, and a reduced likelihood of becoming teen parents or becoming convicted of crimes." Yet lead exposure remains a serious threat for far too many kids and their families in our country.

The only way to remove lead pipes as a source of lead contamination is to completely remove them. That is the goal that I joined with my former and dearly loved colleague, the late great Louise Slaughter, in writing to urge the EPA in March of this year to update its lead and copper rule to require

the full replacement of lead service lines.

But both public utilities and private homeowners are hard pressed to finance this needed work. It is my understanding that the average cost can be somewhere between \$6,000 to \$8,000 to replace such lines, which is an unimaginable sum for many of the households that our constituents live in.

My amendment would provide funding for one of the newest tools that Congress created in the 2016 WRDA bill to help communities address lead pipes. This program provides grants for lead reduction projects that help reduce the concentration of lead in drinking water by, among other uses, providing assistance to low-income homeowners to replace lead service lines.

Recognizing the need, Congress authorized the program at \$60 million per year; yet it received only \$10 million in the fiscal year 2018 omnibus appropriations bill. While I would like to get closer to the authorized level, my amendment is modest and pragmatic and would simply continue funding for this program at the fiscal year 2018 level.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, the fiscal year 2018 bill included \$10 million for EPA to establish a grant program to provide funds to States and communities for lead reduction projects as authorized in the 2016 WIIN Act.

I might also point out that we now have a WIFIA program that is in the bill, which will allow for communities throughout the country to leverage up to \$5 billion annually, and maybe more in the future, in their communities for such things as lead reduction within their towns and counties.

Mr. Chairman, therefore, this is an amendment we can accept, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his stewardship and for his recognition of the importance of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Wisconsin (Ms. MOORE). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 46 OFFERED BY MRS. MCMORRIS RODGERS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 46 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to implement, or to require the State of Washington to implement, the final rule entitled "Revision of Certain Federal Water Quality Criteria Applicable to Washington" published on November 28, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 85417).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from Washington (Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Washington.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to reverse the past administration's decision to implement unattainable water quality standards through the Environmental Protection Agency, EPA.

I want to be clear that this amendment is not about opposing clean water standards. This is an amendment to support the work that Washington State, which has an impeccable environmental record, undertook.

Washington developed their own standards for more than 190 pollutants after more than 3 years of research, outreach, and public feedback. These requirements would have already been some of the most rigorous nationwide, but EPA rejected them.

For example, Spokane, the largest city in my district, invested \$340 million in the first-of-its-kind water treatment facility. This facility was celebrated, and the Republican mayor was invited to the White House by President Obama to celebrate this investment as a model for cities to work with residents to meet new environmental standards.

The problem? Even this state-of-the-art facility would not be able to meet the immeasurable EPA standards.

Spokane Valley, another major city in my district, is facing an estimated \$1 billion for municipal and industrial compliance costs because of these rules. This will affect companies like Inland Empire Paper Company, which has been in business since 1911. Right now, the PCB standards that the previous administration imposed will force them to limit their cardboard recycling capabilities and force them to send these products to landfills.

We often hear the term "best available science." Well, these requirements cannot even be measured by the scientific community. They are unattainable.

It is not new for the EPA to abuse their power in the name of clean water. In Washington State, we saw this abuse of Federal authority with the What's Upstream? campaign and its efforts to misrepresent our farmers and ranchers.

When the Federal Government enacts a policy, it should not be pouring Federal dollars into lobbying for its support.

Requirements that can't even be measured are an abuse of trust, and it is vital that we fix this problem now,

which is why my amendment limits funds to implement EPA's water quality standards that preempt Washington State's.

This amendment will allow flexibility and reasonable guidelines for States to move forward with water quality standards that can be measured and met.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, as has been pointed out, this amendment would prohibit the implementation of Washington State's revised water quality criteria. This standard protects communities from exposure to toxic contaminants, such as PCB, arsenic, and mercury in the fish that they eat.

Being from Minnesota, Mr. Chairman, I understand fish advisories very well. I often see signs that limit fish consumption for pregnant women, and for children in particular.

This action, however, would ignore court decisions and the voices of Native American Tribes, Asian-Pacific Islander communities, and fishing interests, all of which agree that seafood consumption standards are necessary in order to protect public health and water quality. In fact, the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission has asked that Congress reject this amendment because it puts the treaty rights that have been protected and the resources of Tribes in Washington at risk.

Many native families subsist on the fish that they catch. Passing this amendment lowering water quality standards puts these families at greater risk of poisoning from their traditional foods.

There is a lot of funding in this bill and some of the other bills that we have on the floor, Mr. Chairman, that work to prevent diabetes or to lower risk from diabetes with high blood sugar. Tribal nations are finding that returning to native foods, such as fish, is a great and excellent way of preventing or reducing the effects of diabetes.

But after years of failure by Washington State to propose a protective standard, EPA finally put forth a standard which is more protective and meets the Clean Water Act requirements.

Now, I understand that the regulated community has always been uneasy about what stricter standards might be. The revised water quality criteria take steps to address their concerns.

The standard approved the use of new implementation tools, including a longer compliance schedule and intake credits. An intake credit means that, if the water comes to you with a pollutant and you don't discharge it, you are not responsible for having to remove it. So if you didn't pollute it, you are not responsible for cleaning it up.

This amendment would circumvent all of the work that has been done to devise a standard that protects public health and water quality.

Furthermore, Washington State officials believe that, despite the Congresswoman's good intentions—and I do believe that these are good intentions—this amendment would hurt the State of Washington. It would not actually help the dischargers.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS. I yield to the gentleman from California.

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

Mr. Chairman, I certainly support her amendment.

Under the previous administration, EPA proposed this stringent water regulation standard in Washington State without utilizing sound scientific data or evidence. In doing so, EPA created regulatory uncertainty and imposed unachievable permit levels on the State, which are costly and nearly impossible for industries to comply with.

I encourage the State, the Tribes, and the EPA to continue to work together to find agreeable standards that improve water quality and human health while, simultaneously, providing clarity to the impacted communities and industries. In the meantime, though, I certainly urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, when humans consume contaminated fish, it results in serious health impacts, such as cancer, organ damage and reproductive dysfunction, or impairment in brain development.

High fish-consuming communities—as I have mentioned, Native American Tribes and Asian-Pacific Islander communities—need the protections afforded by this revised water quality standard.

I would like to, for the RECORD, again state that this amendment is not supported by the State of Washington or the Tribal communities in the area.

I strongly urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. Clearly, more work needs to be done. I look forward to having this amendment not pass and for people to get down to doing the serious work that needs to be done to address the gentleman's concerns.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington (Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS).

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

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

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

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Washington will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MR. LOUDERMILK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 47 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the final rule entitled "Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Fuel Efficiency Standards for Medium- and Heavy-Duty Engines and Vehicles—Phase 2" published in the Federal Register on October 25, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 73478 et seq.), with respect to trailers.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LOUDERMILK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, under the Clean Water Act, Congress gave the Environmental Protection Agency the authority to regulate any air pollutant from any class or classes of new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines which may be reasonably anticipated to endanger public health or welfare.

To avoid any ambiguity, Congress further defined the term "motor vehicle" as a "self-propelled vehicle designed for transporting persons or property on a street or highway."

Until recently, regulators understood, as any reasonable person would, that the term "self-propelled vehicle" only applies to vehicles that can move on a roadway under their own power, such as cars, pickup trucks, semi trucks, SUVs, or vans. Never was a trailer, whether a utility trailer pulled by a pickup truck, a boat trailer pulled by a car, or a cargo trailer pulled by a semi considered a self-propelled vehicle, and, therefore, these were never under the regulatory authority of the EPA.

However, in 2016, without any authority of Congress, the EPA extended its regulatory authority and included cargo trailers in the rules for greenhouse gas emissions and fuel efficiency standards for on-road, heavy-duty vehicles and engines. This rule will require cargo trailers to add components that, in some cases, have shown to improve aerodynamics, resulting in some improvement in fuel efficiency. However, this blanket policy, which has resulted from regulatory overreach, is not only costly to consumers, but, in some cases, is counterproductive to the Agency's own mission of promoting clear, clean air policies and practices.

The additional weight of these aerodynamic components that are being mandated by the EPA will cause car-

riers to significantly limit the amount of cargo a single trailer can carry and still stay within DOT weight restrictions. Therefore, carriers have to put more trucks on the highway to carry the same amount of goods. Obviously, more trucks mean more carbon emissions without any measurable improved efficiency.

If the EPA is able to enforce this regulation, it will not only be counterproductive to the environment, but also very costly to American consumers.

□ 1700

The trucking industry has made significant strides in recent years to improve fuel efficiency and reduce air pollution, without the government mandates.

This amendment simply prevents the EPA from using any funds in this act to regulate trailers under the greenhouse gas rule. Congress never extended to the EPA the authority to regulate trailers under the Clean Air Act, because trailers are not and have never been considered self-propelled vehicles.

I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this commonsense amendment, so we can put an end to this blatant regulatory overreach.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. POE of Texas). The gentleman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this amendment would prohibit the EPA from implementing or enforcing its greenhouse gas and fuel efficiency standards for medium-and heavy-duty engines.

Specifically, this amendment carves out an exemption for trailers. These fuel standards were jointly developed by the EPA and the Department of Transportation, and they will improve fuel efficiency and cut carbon pollution to reduce the impacts of climate change.

In fact, the EPA and DOT estimate that these standards will lower CO₂ emissions by approximately 1 billion metric tons and cut fuel costs by \$170 million. And cutting fuel costs is always a good thing to go do.

These standards will achieve greenhouse gas emission reductions that are nearly equal to those associated with all the energy used by U.S. residents in 1 year.

These efficiency fuel standards have been in place since 2016, and companies around the world have already made massive investments in the cleaner technology. Blocking the rule now would have negative consequences for human health and the environment, but also for the economy.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to

the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH), and I thank him for his hard work on this amendment.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman very much, and I appreciate my colleague for introducing this amendment.

He is absolutely right. The Clean Air Act never gave the EPA this authority. They just created it out of thin air.

Their rationale is kind of interesting, because they took the authority that said that they could regulate new motor vehicles or new motor vehicle engines, and then the definition of new motor vehicle meaning any self-propelled vehicle designed for transporting persons or properties on a street or highway, and applied it to trailers. They are not self-propelled.

When I asked Janet McCabe, who was the Acting Director of the Air Division of the EPA, when she came in front of the Energy and Commerce Committee how in the world could they do this, and I presumed she wasn't a lawyer and she said: Well, yes, I am.

I was surprised, because the language is pretty clear. They don't have the ability to do that.

She said: Well, you can't haul any goods if the trailer is not attached to a truck.

That is not in the code. The code says that they only have authority over self-propelled vehicles. They created this out of whole cloth.

It doesn't make any sense to allow an agency to create law. That is our job, and I told her that that day.

I said: Look, you think this needs to be changed, bring in a bill, and we will discuss it.

They have never done that. They don't have authority. We shouldn't fund something that is clearly illegal based on the plain English reading of the terms.

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

Mr. LOUDERMILK. Mr. Chairman, I urge all of my colleagues to join the gentleman from Virginia and myself in support of what is a commonsense upholding of our constitutional authority as the legislative branch, and I encourage a "yea" vote on this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this rule promotes a generation of cleaner, more fuel efficient trucks. President Obama was right when he said: "We are the first generation to feel the impact of climate change and the last generation who can do something about it."

This amendment is harmful, and I urge my colleagues to reject it.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 48 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the threatened species listing of the Preble's meadow jumping mouse under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Preble's meadow jumping mouse is a tiny rodent with a body approximately 3 inches long, a 4- to 6-inch long tail, and large hind feet adapted for jumping. This largely nocturnal mouse lives primarily in streamside ecosystems in Wyoming and Colorado.

To evade predators, the Preble's meadow jumping mouse can jump up to 18 inches high, like a miniature kangaroo. But this little acrobat's most famous feat was its leap onto the endangered species list back in May 1998, a move that has since hindered development on the front range of Colorado, from Colorado Springs, Colorado, to the Wyoming border.

Among projects that have been affected are the Jeffco Parkway southeast of Rocky Flats, an expansion of the Chatfield Reservoir, and housing developments in El Paso County along tributaries of Monument Creek. Builders, landowners, and local governments in affected areas have incurred hundreds of millions of dollars in added costs because of this mouse. Protecting the Preble's mouse has even been placed ahead of protecting human life.

On September 11, 2013, Colorado experienced a major flood event that damaged or destroyed thousands of homes, important infrastructure, and public works projects. As a result of the Preble's mouse's listing as an endangered species, many restoration projects were delayed as Colorado sought a waiver.

Moreover, the scientific evidence simply does not justify these delays or the millions of taxpayer dollars that go toward protecting a rodent that is actually part of a larger group that roams throughout half of the North American Continent.

Several scientific studies have concluded that the Preble's mouse does not warrant protection because it isn't a subspecies at all and is actually related to one of the largest and most widespread genetic lineages of North American jumping mice. Even the scientist that originally classified this mouse as a subspecies has since recanted his work.

Moreover, the Preble's mouse has a low conservation priority score, meaning that the hundreds of millions of dollars already spent on protection efforts could have been better spent on other, more fragile species.

My amendment would correct the injustice that has been caused by the inaccurate listing of the Preble's meadow jumping mouse and would refocus the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's efforts on species that have been thoroughly scientifically vetted and that should be managed by the Endangered Species Act.

This amendment is supported by Citizens Against Government Waste and has previously passed the House of Representatives on three separate occasions, all by bipartisan votes. So I encourage my colleagues to, once again, support this commonsense amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

First, I would like to make the case that this is a rider, that this is authorizing on an appropriations amendment, and that the author of the amendment is in the majority.

The majority could have a hearing in the authorizing committee. It could come to the floor. It could pass on the floor. The Senate could move it. And it appears to me that President Trump is in a position to sign this into law, should he choose to do so.

So there is another alternative vehicle for moving the gentleman's amendment forward, and that is to do it legislatively and not put it on an appropriations bill. The Senate has chosen to put no riders on their appropriations bill.

But the amendment is before us. As pointed out, it would prohibit the Fish and Wildlife Service from implementing or enforcing the threatened species listing of the Preble's meadow jumping mouse under the Endangered Species Act, and it would restrict the Service from offering any of the critical protections to preserve the species.

Now, once a species is listed under the Endangered Species Act, it is the role of Fish and Wildlife, and it is primarily permissive, to help parties comply with the act as they carry out their activities.

I also want to make sure the RECORD is clear that Fish and Wildlife Service reviewed the information claiming an alleged taxonomic error in the listing of the species and found no evidence that the Preble's meadow jumping mouse is not a valid subspecies.

But under this amendment, the Service would not be able to continue to offer to recover this species, though the Endangered Species Act prohibitions would still apply. The Service

would not be able to work with agencies. The Service would not be able to work with developers. The Service would not be able to work with landowners and others to provide ESA compliance.

The Fish and Wildlife Service would be barred from issuing permits or exemptions. This means that landowners, industry, and other parties who might need to take the Preble's meadow jumping mouse incidental to their otherwise lawful activities, such as urban development, would become vulnerable to third-party lawsuits.

Additionally, this amendment would also limit the Service from undertaking the required status reviews of the subspecies or from any initial rulemaking to downlist or to delist the species, as appropriate.

Mr. Chair, I think it is pretty obvious that this amendment should go through a different way of coming to the floor, and that is through the authorizing committee.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, as you know, the House has spoken on this. In last year's conference report, we directed Fish and Wildlife Service to make this species among its highest priorities for consultation and permit processing. Obviously, the agency has not moved fast enough, and they need to get hopping.

So I am sure this amendment will squeak by with all of our support. I urge an "aye" vote.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

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

I will just conclude by saying, if the Fish and Wildlife Service worked together with developers, local communities, and other groups, that would be one thing. But when they come in with a hammer and say, you have to do it this way, that is really not working together. That has, unfortunately, been the experience of many parties on the front range of Colorado.

Mr. Chairman, I would urge that, once again, we support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Service has a statutory requirement to implement the Endangered Species Act. Defunding the agency's ability to fulfill its legal requirements makes it more vulnerable to lawsuits, and I know that that is something that we are all trying to avoid here. When you have lawsuits, it is an unnecessary cost for the taxpayers.

Now, the gentleman's amendment would undermine the Service's ability to work collaboratively with States, local governments, communities, and landowners, to conserve this imperiled species. The amendment would create

uncertainty for landowners and also make them vulnerable to lawsuits.

So we should not pass this amendment. We should be supporting the Fish and Wildlife Service efforts and not blocking the agency from doing its job.

Mr. Chair, my commitment to the chairman and to my walking partner in the tunnels as we all come over for votes is to work with them to make the Fish and Wildlife Service more responsible to the gentleman's concerns. But at this time, I have to oppose the amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 49 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the threatened species or endangered species listing of any plant or wildlife that has not undergone a review as required by section 4(c)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(c)(2)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

□ 1715

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

Mr. Chair, my amendment is straightforward. It simply ensures that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is following current law, specifically section 4(c)(2) of the Endangered Species Act, by conducting their review of all threatened and endangered plants and wildlife at least once every 5 years.

Time after time, the Federal Government refuses to follow the will of Congress when it enacted the Endangered Species Act. The government designates land as "critical habitat" despite not meeting the ESA definition, and the government consistently refuses to remove plants and animals from threatened or endangered status

even when those species are flourishing and no longer in need of ESA protections.

But you may ask yourself: How does the government know when a species should be removed from the endangered or threatened list? How does the government know if a species is recovering? The answer could be found in the ESA, and it is a requirement that the Federal Government review all plants or species that are currently listed as endangered or threatened every 5 years.

Under the Endangered Species Act, the purpose of a 5-year review is to ensure that threatened and endangered species have the appropriate level of protection. And because the ESA grants extensive protection to a species, including harsh penalties for landowners and other citizens, it makes sense to regularly verify if a plant or animal is being properly classified or if it should be delisted.

Despite this commonsense requirement, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service acknowledged earlier this year that it has neglected its responsibility to conduct the required reviews for nearly 1,000 species.

By enforcing the 5-year review, my amendment will ensure that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service is using the best available scientific information in implementing its responsibilities under the ESA, including incorporating new information through public comment and assessing ongoing conservation efforts.

This amendment is supported by Citizens Against Government Waste, the National Mining Association, and the American Farm Bureau, and it has previously passed the House of Representatives on three separate occasions, all by bipartisan votes.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in ensuring that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service follows the law, the letter of the law, in the Endangered Species Act and that we do not allow the agency to spend money that would violate current law.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to once again support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, the Service attempts to comply with the statutory mandate to review the status of listed species every 5 years to determine whether their classification as threatened or endangered is still appropriate. However, the Service has a backlog of such reviews due to funding limitations, such as the 42 percent listing reduction contained in this bill.

In this bill, the work that the Service would need to do to comply with what you want in this bill alone is cut \$8 million, so that just puts them farther behind.

In recent years, the Service has only been able to complete 100 to 120 reviews per year, which is less than half of what is needed to keep up with the requirement to review all the species every 5 years. So that falls on Congress for us not giving them the funds that they need to do the job effectively and efficiently as you are requesting, and the way to fix that is to give them the proper funding.

But as the gentleman might be aware, the chairman was given level funding this year. He did the very best that he could with what he had to balance things out in the interests of the requests he had from Members of the House, but this particular \$8 million cut just makes your problem even worse.

This amendment would not remove species, without reviews, from the list of the species protected by the ESA. So the ESA prohibition against take would still remain, as would the ability of citizens to sue to force compliance.

If funding cannot be used to enforce the ESA for species with late reviews, that will leave the species unprotected.

While the proposed language would prohibit the Service from working with agencies, developers, landowners, and others to provide ESA compliance through section 7 consultations or section 10 permits for Federal or private projects that could potentially affect the species, it would not affect the ability of third parties to sue those agencies or landowners and potentially join their projects due to the lack of ESA compliance.

Mr. Chairman, as I said about the last amendment, we don't need another rider or extraneous provision in this bill. It is already overburdened with many, many riders.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to take this language to the appropriate committees of jurisdiction and work through and see if we can make positive changes and create win-wins.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. And I would urge my colleagues, if they want the backlog to change, to help the chairman and me get more money into the allocation of this bill so the chairman and I can work to achieve those goals together.

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

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

Two quick responses, then I am going to yield some time.

When it comes to funding for the Fish and Wildlife Service, they are just going to have to basically do what every other private or governmental entity, family, and individual has to do, which is prioritize their spending. They have to live within their means. We all have to live within our means. They have to have the priorities where they can do the job with the money that they are given.

Number two, I think that maybe my colleague would agree with me that

outside environmental groups are largely to blame for bringing massive lawsuits that tie up a lot of the resources of the Fish and Wildlife Service so they can't be doing their business of protecting the species that they are already supposed to be caring for. So I think they really get a lot of the blame here as well.

Mr. Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I support this amendment. The root of the frustration with the Endangered Species Act is that species rarely get delisted, and people who are directly affected by a listing are condemned to a life of an additional Federal rule indefinitely.

Congress tried to prevent this by requiring the Fish and Wildlife Service to review the status of every listed species every 5 years and to down-list or delist species accordingly.

Today, the Service has a backlog of 892 species without a current 5-year review.

Without these 5-year reviews, species could be recovered and we wouldn't even know it. I find this simply unacceptable.

Unless the Service focuses its personnel on inherently Federal responsibilities under the ESA and non-Federal partners take the lead on actual recovery, we will never break the contentious and litigious cycle that we have now.

And, by the way, we have actually increased the ESA recovery budget in this bill for 5-year reviews. So let's get ESA working again.

Mr. Chair, I urge an "aye" vote on this amendment.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Mr. Chair, I would urge my colleagues to once again support this commonsense amendment, which we have done in the past three different times on a bipartisan basis.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to take any of the actions described as a "backstop" in the December 29, 2009, letter from EPA's Regional Administrator to the States in the Watershed and the District of Columbia in response to the development or implementation of a State's watershed implementation and referred to in enclosure B of such letter.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, today I rise to urge support for my amendment, which would reaffirm and preserve the rights of the States to write their own water quality plans.

My amendment simply prohibits the EPA from using its Chesapeake Bay Total Maximum Daily Load and the so-called watershed implementation plans to hijack States' water quality strategies.

Over the last several years, the EPA has implemented a Total Maximum Daily Load blueprint for the six States in the Chesapeake Bay watershed, which strictly limits the amount of nutrients that can enter the Chesapeake Bay. Through its implementation, the EPA has basically given every State in the watershed an ultimatum: either the State does exactly what the EPA says or it faces the threat of an EPA takeover of its water quality programs.

Congress intended that the implementation of the Clean Water Act be a collaborative approach, through which the States and the Federal Government work together. This process was not meant to be subject to the whims of politics and bureaucrats in Washington. Therefore, my amendment instructs the EPA to respect the important role States play in implementing the Clean Water Act.

I want to make it perfectly clear that this amendment would not stop the EPA from working with the States to restore the Chesapeake Bay, nor would it undermine the cleanup efforts already underway. My language only removes the ability of the EPA to take over a State's plan or to take retaliatory actions against the State if it does not meet EPA-mandated goals. Again, it ensures States' rights remain intact and not usurped by the EPA.

It is important to point out that the correlation between the EPA's outrageous waters of the United States rule and the Bay TMDL, at the heart of both issues is the EPA's desire to control conservation and water quality improvement efforts throughout the country and to punish all those who dare to oppose them.

The bay is a national treasure, and I want to see it restored, but we know that in order to achieve this goal, the

States and the EPA must work together. The EPA cannot be allowed to railroad the States and micromanage the process.

This amendment has passed the House with bipartisan support several times, and I urge my colleagues to once again vote to ask the EPA to respect the important role States play in implementing the Clean Water Act and prevent another Federal power grab by the administration.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this amendment would allow those who pollute the Chesapeake Bay to ignore the Environmental Protection Agency's water quality standards.

Restoring the Chesapeake Bay and its watershed continues to be a priority, and a priority for this committee to fund it. The EPA established the mandatory water quality standards and Congress has appropriated over \$1 billion for the Chesapeake Bay Program to help States, localities, and businesses meet those needs. This amendment would jeopardize that funding and have devastating effects on the health of the bay.

How long will the States and localities be able to meet their obligations that they agreed to in 2014 in the Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement if the Federal Government's financial assistance goes away?

This is a partnership. We should keep the partnership moving forward.

Furthermore, if this amendment were to become law, it would block the EPA's ability to enforce the court-ordered settlement requiring the farm community and agribusinesses to meet watershed specific pollution limits. It would not, however, relieve the farms and agribusinesses from the requirements in the settlement.

The State and local governments want to move forward. They want to keep the partnership moving. But the Farm Bureau and, in fact, some of the industrial operators they represent don't think that they should be responsible for controlling the pollution that they dump into our rivers and streams across the country.

The courts have sided with the EPA on this matter, and the Farm Bureau continues their pursuit to stop mandatory cleanups through judicial appeals and through this amendment.

There are enough special interest provisions for big business in this bill already. We don't need any more.

Mr. Chair, I urge defeat of this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, this amendment prohibits the use of funds to take retaliatory actions against individual States. Importantly, this amendment would not prevent the EPA from working with States to restore the bay.

In 1985, the States in the Chesapeake Bay region recognized the need to address pollutants in the bay and, through their own initiative, came together to conduct cleanup efforts. These State-driven efforts were largely successful. As a matter of fact, water quality improved almost 50 percent from 1985 to 2010.

However, in 2010, the EPA seized the States' authority to determine their own continued compliance and threatened to dictate Federal requirements if the States were unable to comply. This 2010 power grab, known as the Chesapeake Bay TMDL, directly contradicts the intent of the Clean Water Act.

The Clean Water Act clearly acknowledges State authority in water quality and requires cooperation rather than coercion between the States and the Federal Government.

These coercive methods have been tried and imposed and have failed. Actually, water quality has not improved since the federalization of the bay cleanup efforts.

It is simply imperative that we return the constitutional rights of the States to make their own water quality improvement decisions and restore the State control that has been shown to actually improve water quality. The future of the Chesapeake Bay depends on it.

□ 1730

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, it is my pleasure to yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I am happy to rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. This is another example of EPA overreach. It is my hope that my colleagues from Virginia and Pennsylvania can continue to work with the administration to find common ground on approaches that will improve water quality in a more flexible manner. I certainly support this amendment and I urge an "aye" vote.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chairman, in closing, let me just say, this amendment does not in any way take any resources away from any of the six States in the Chesapeake Bay region to improve water quality. What it does take away is the ability of the EPA to dictate to those States one way, their way, to do it.

The Clean Water Act was written with it in mind that the Federal Gov-

ernment would set the standards and the States would figure out how to meet those standards. And that flexibility has been taken away starting in the Obama administration, and it is time for this Congress to stop them from doing that so that we can have the kind of collaborative effort just described by the subcommittee chairman, Mr. CALVERT, and get back to doing things the right way.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, for more than 35 years, there has been a regional partnership created through the Chesapeake Bay Program, and it sought to restore and protect the Nation's largest and most productive estuaries. That is a partnership with the Federal Government which includes funding that is working together to achieve those common goals.

Now, I have nothing before me saying that the State of Virginia, or any of the regional partners, want to withdraw from this moving forward to continue to clean up this estuary. This amendment would undermine decades of work and decades of Federal dollars that the Federal Government has put in in partnership, and it would have devastating effects to the health of the bay and the economy it supports.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEG0

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

Sec. ____ No funds appropriated by this Act may be used to issue a grazing permit or lease in contravention of section 4110.1 or 4130.1-1(b) of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Chairman, grazing on public lands is a privilege—not a right—and ranchers who use these

lands should abide by the law and pay their fair share.

On average, Federal rates for grazing are more than 90 percent lower than what the private sector charges. In fact, these rates are so low that the government actually loses money administering the grazing program. My amendment would simply reaffirm that grazing permits or leases should not be issued to anyone who refuses to comply with BLM regulations, including the payment of fees.

Mr. Chairman, this is a narrow amendment, but it speaks to a broader principle. We can't claim to support the rule of law and then look the other way when ranchers like Cliven Bundy ignore their obligations.

Bundy thumbed his nose at the executive and judicial branches of our government, running up over \$1 million in unpaid fees. He then put the lives of local and Federal officials in danger during a standoff at his Nevada ranch.

Later, when two Oregon ranchers named Dwight and Steven Hammond, who also have a history of disregarding grazing regulations, were sent to Federal prison for fires they potentially set near Federal lands, members of the Bundy family led an armed occupation of the national wildlife refuge.

Mr. Chairman, President Trump recently pardoned the Hammonds, validating these violent tactics and insulting the courageous law enforcement officers who risked their lives during the confrontation in Oregon. With these pardons, Trump has effectively given his blessing to groups who intimidated, threatened, and occupied local communities. He has legitimized Bundy's extreme right-wing movements.

Make no mistake, Donald Trump is sending a clear message to militant and antigovernment organizations: You can break the law, threaten Federal employees, and endanger public safety with complete impunity. That is unacceptable.

Mr. Chairman, freeloading on Federal land is unlawful and unfair. Let's pass my amendment and reaffirm that the ranchers need to play by the rules just like the rest of us.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, this amendment previously failed by recorded vote in July of 2016. The amendment taxed ranchers and attempts to relitigate the Bundy matter.

DOJ was found to have withheld evidence and to have violated these ranchers' rights. There is no reason to relitigate this matter at this juncture. The regulations are already in place.

This is an unnecessary political amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GALLEGU. Mr. Chair, let's face it: Ranchers who refuse to pay what

they owe the Federal Government are freeloaders, pure and simple. If you don't pay your taxes, you go to jail. If you don't pay your mortgage, you get your house taken away. Ranchers are not more special than any other Americans. They are freeloaders, and they should pay for their freeloading. Congress should not stand for it. Let's pass my amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman brings up exactly the point I am trying to make. We are trying to relitigate a previously settled issue. It was actually found that these ranchers' rights were violated by the Department of Justice.

We started looking—the Hammonds were brought up. When we were actually looking at this case where they actually tried to look at the fire danger on their land, and it got beyond their lands and on to public land, they were fined exclusively and hardlined.

Where is the same type of justice given to the Forest Service or the BLM when their prescribed burn fires go out of hand and take private holdings? It is not the same. This isn't about freeloading. This is about a case where we need to look at how we take care of our public lands.

Mr. Chair, I ask everybody to vote against this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GALLEGU. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 52 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to repeal section 105(a)(2) or section 105(b) of the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act of 2006 (43 U.S.C. 1331 note).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer a straightforward amendment to prohibit any effort to redirect funds allocated under the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act, which is commonly known as GOMESA.

For those who don't know, GOMESA calls for a Federal revenue sharing agreement between the Federal Government and four Gulf States: Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, and Alabama. The program is designed to split up revenue from selected oil and gas lease sales in the Outer Continental Shelf of the Gulf of Mexico.

The neat thing about GOMESA is it ensures appropriate funding for the coastal areas that provide the workforce, assume the environmental risk, build much of the infrastructure, and support the offshore oil and gas industry. It only makes sense that the coastal areas should receive an adequate share of the revenue.

Previously, there have been administrative efforts to direct the money away from the Gulf States, and, instead, devote the resources to national projects. While I appreciate the Trump administration not including any such proposal in this year's budget, I still believe it is important for Congress to send a clear, bipartisan message that we do not support moving GOMESA funds away from the Gulf Coast.

In fact, just this year, the Department of the Interior disbursed almost \$188 million to the four Gulf oil and gas producing States. Alabama received \$21 million this year, and the two coastal counties in Alabama received an additional combined amount of \$5 million.

I have seen these GOMESA funds put to good use back in my home State of Alabama, whether it was for environmental rehabilitation protection projects or programs that boost the coastal tourism economy. GOMESA is working by supporting and promoting our Gulf Coast communities. If you talk to our local mayors and county leaders, they will tell you how critically important GOMESA funding is for their region.

It would be detrimental to go against congressional intent and redirect these funds away from our respective coastal communities. By including this amendment, we can make clear that Congress does not support reallocating these resources and show our strong support for the Gulf Coast.

Mr. Chair, I ask for an "aye" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 53 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 53 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to hire or pay the

salary of any officer or employee of the Environmental Protection Agency under subsection (f) or (g) of section 207 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 209) who is not already receiving pay under either such subsection on the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment on an issue I have worked on for several years on the Committee on Energy and Commerce as the authorizing committee.

In 2006, the Committee on Appropriations, without an authorization from the Committee on Energy and Commerce, included a provision in the annual Department of the Interior EPA Appropriations bill to allow the Environmental Protection Agency to begin using a special paid program that was explicitly and exclusively authorized for use by the Public Health Service Administration under the Department of Health and Human Services.

The special pay mechanism allows a government employee to leave the normal GS pay scale and receive nearly uncapped compensation. This provision was intended to be used only in unique circumstances for leaders in the healthcare industry who would never leave the private sector to work for the Federal Government except for those special, more competitive salaries.

Under current law, this justification can never be used at the Environmental Protection Agency. Indeed, some of the employees that the Environmental Protection Agency pays under title 42, the part of the U.S. Code that allows for this special pay, were previous government workers who were merely moved into the special pay scale because they desired more money.

The Environmental Protection Agency has claimed in the past that because the Environmental Protection Agency is a health organization, it may use this statute to pay special hires, and the Committee on Appropriations has agreed to let them, despite the authorizing committee's objection.

Originally, the Environmental Protection Agency was granted only a handful of slots to fill with title 42 hires. That number has now increased to over 50. The cost to the taxpayers for these employees is tens of millions of dollars.

This amendment would prevent the Environmental Protection Agency from hiring any new employees under title 42, or transferring any current employees from the GS scale to title 42. It would not effect current employees being paid under this provision. This would give the Committee on Energy and Commerce, the authorizing committee, the time it needs to ad-

dress whether the EPA truly deserves the special pay consideration.

The Government Accountability Office looked into the Department of Health and Human Services' abuse of title 42 several years ago, and found problems with the implementation of this program. Within the Department of Health and Human Services where, arguably, this could be allowed, why would Congress ever allow the Environmental Protection Agency to implement the same problematic pay structure?

□ 1745

In multiple hearings in the Energy and Commerce Committee, both former Administrator Lisa Jackson and former Administrator Gina McCarthy refused to give specifics regarding the program. A Freedom of Information Act request by the EPA union, the American Federation of Government Employees, sent to my office showed that title 42 hires at EPA are, in fact, sowing dissent among workers, with the union asking the Congress to stop this abusive and unfair hiring technique.

A report by the Environmental Protection Agency's own inspector general in 2015 discovered that the EPA did not properly demonstrate a need to use the title 42 hiring authority, nor did it provide clear and convincing justification for its continued use. This is further proof that the Environmental Protection Agency's use of the title 42 hiring authority must come to an end.

I have introduced legislation further clarifying that the Public Health Services Act, written for HHS, does not permit the EPA to use this language to hire employees under a special pay structure.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, as I said earlier, this amendment, like some of the other amendments that we have seen, could be handled in the authorizing committee, which the gentleman is a member of, if memory serves me correctly.

The gentleman is in the majority. Call up, have a hearing, pass legislation, and then do it in a way that doesn't add more burdensome amendments and riders to this bill. The Senate is also controlled by the same party in the majority, and the President is of that party. So I would encourage the gentleman to go through what I would call regular order.

This amendment would prohibit the EPA from hiring scientists using its title 42 authority, the flexible hiring mechanism that allows agencies to at-

tract and retain staff with outstanding scientific and technical skills.

This authority, as has been pointed out, is used by the EPA, the CDC, the NIH, and other agencies that require candidates who have specialized degrees in areas such as medicine, science, and engineering.

It is not always easy for the Federal Government to attract high-level professionals who have invested many years in school and could easily make more money in private practice or academia. In fact, we have heard that USGS and BLM quite often have problems keeping highly educated engineers in place because the private sector comes and offers them so much more money.

So the Federal Government has found it wise to allow these agencies to provide some additional funding to retain and recruit these employees. We should want to have the best and the brightest working for us and the American people—the best doctors, the best scientists, and the best engineers. So I am disappointed that the gentleman does not believe such highly specialized employees deserve the title 42 designation.

With our Nation facing crises like Lyme's disease, PFAS in our drinking water, and climate change, we should be investing in our scientists. We should be encouraging them to seek employment with the Federal Government.

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

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

It is a reasonable amendment. It only affects employees who are new hires in title 42 in the Environmental Protection Agency, not in the CDC and not in NIH. It is an amendment that would allow the authorizing committee an opportunity to catch up with what the Appropriations Committee has done without an authorization.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, once again, this amendment could go through a different order and not be placed onto an appropriations bill.

This is a shortsighted amendment. I think it deserves to have a fair and open vetting with the House concentrated on just what this would mean to the EPA. So I don't think we should attack Federal employees who sometimes have chosen to not receive as much compensation and devote their lives to public service.

Mr. Chairman, I urge defeat of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 54 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MR. EMMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 55 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to withdraw National Forest System lands within the Rainy River Watershed on the Superior National Forest from disposition under United States mineral and geothermal leasing laws.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment, which I am pleased to say that I intend to withdraw, because after months of hard work in this Chamber and with the administration, it is no longer necessary.

Minnesota is the proud home to the Iron Range, which boasts an abundance of natural resources and critical minerals. When it comes to protecting the environment while developing our economic assets, nobody does it better than Minnesota.

Despite this history, on its very last day in office, the Obama administration proposed to withdraw more than 240,000 acres of land in our State from mineral exploration and development. This last-minute action was an assault on our way of life, threatening thousands of jobs and billions of dollars in State revenue and school trust funding. It handicaps our national security by increasing our reliance on foreign sources of minerals.

That is why I offered this amendment to stop this foolish action.

This amendment is identical to one that was unanimously adopted by this Chamber last year and echoes the good news delivered by the President to thousands of Minnesotans on June 20 when he announced his intent to rescind this arbitrary withdrawal, which is now in process.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in opposition.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I understand that the amendment is going to be withdrawn, but let me explain what this language would have done. To the best of my knowledge, the leases haven't been permanently withdrawn yet.

This language would have prevented the Forest Service and the Interior Department from acting to protect our Nation's most visited wilderness area.

The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is located in northern Minnesota, and it is one of the last truly undisturbed wild places in America.

It is a national treasure, and it is under threat from sulfide-ore copper mining. The proposed mine is next to the wilderness. There is no buffer, and there is no barrier here. It is literally in the same water.

Sulfide-ore mining is the most toxic industry in America. It pollutes watersheds with acid drainage that contains arsenic, mercury, and lead.

The Forest Service recognized how damaging this type of mining could be to the Boundary Waters, so they proposed a 20-year halt to Federal mine leases in the watershed. They were urged to study this withdrawal by our Governor from Minnesota, Tribal Governments, and people from all across America who were worried that sulfide mining could destroy the surrounding waters and lands.

They have a right to be worried. All these mines have failed. In 2014, a sulfide-ore mine in British Columbia failed, dumping billions of liters of toxic sludge, causing permanent environmental damage.

So the Forest Service wisely decided to conduct a science-based assessment to see if mineral withdrawal would make sense for the water-intensive ecosystem of our Boundary Waters.

Now, Mr. Chairman, despite what you might hear about what the gentleman said, the proposed mining withdrawal is not some overreach or some past or current administration being out of line. In 1976, Congress established this exact review process under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. Congress intentionally provided a way to protect our country's natural treasures and vulnerable places.

If the gentleman's amendment would have come to the floor for a vote and would have passed again, it would have stopped that review process. It would make the withdrawal study meaningless, because it dictates the outcome.

If this amendment had been on the floor and it would pass, the withdrawal of the Boundary Waters from sulfide-ore mining would have been off the table no matter what the study would have said is best for the wilderness.

In every conversation I have had, and I have had many, with Secretary Zinke and Secretary Perdue, they have told me the same thing: The study should be completed.

So I hope my colleagues and the President would reject having these leases go through without having a study.

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), who is my colleague from Minnesota and coauthor of this amendment.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. EMMER for yielding.

The lady, for whom I have enormous respect, has failed to mention the fact

that this or any other project anywhere in the country, let alone the State of Minnesota, would be, nevertheless, subject to endless reviews by the Environmental Protection Agency, some of which take up to 10 and 12 years. So it is not as though we are approving a mining project here. It is going to have to undergo rigorous review.

As my colleagues from Minnesota know, I was an original sponsor of the 1978 Boundary Waters Wilderness legislation. I am very proud of that fact.

I want everybody to know here that, at the time, we made a solid commitment to preserve and to protect some 1.1 million acres out of the Superior National Forest for the BWCA, to protect it from all manmade harm and damage to the environment. But we also made a commitment to reserve the remainder of the Superior National Forest for mixed-use purposes and specifically cited recreation and forestry.

The U.S. Forest Service described mining as a desirable-use purpose. In fact, that was the forestry service at that time.

Our word is our bond in this business. This amendment will uphold that hard-fought compromise. The simple truth is that we have been mining on the Iron Range for 130 years, yet we have the cleanest water in the State of Minnesota and perhaps the country. We are going to do everything we can to make sure that we keep it that way.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 2 minutes remaining.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, let me first start off by saying that I have great respect for my colleagues, both Representative EMMER and Representative NOLAN, and the rest of our delegation, Representative MCCOLLUM included.

This has been an ongoing debate.

I just want to make sure folks understand, know, and can appreciate—and I know the gentleman is going to withdraw the amendment—that hundreds of thousands of people have been weighing in on this ongoing public process, and their comments should not be ignored. That is the bottom line. Nor should we be ignoring a science-based assessment of the best management practices that are important for one of Minnesota's and the country's national treasures.

We should be open to new types of mining in Minnesota, but only when those necessary environmental reviews are met.

I refer to the Boundary Waters as Minnesota's Yellowstone. There is a reason for that. It has a national perspective with hundreds of thousands of

Americans visiting it each and every year, whether it is canoeing or fishing. That is where some of my best memories in my life have taken place.

So I want to make sure—we owe it to ourselves and future generations—that we rely on science before undertaking any activity that would disrupt this fragile ecosystem.

Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentlewoman for yielding me time, and I want to thank my colleagues for their ongoing discussion on this issue.

Mr. Chair, once again my colleagues, Representatives EMMER and NOLAN, are offering this amendment. And while I appreciate my friendship with my Minnesota colleagues, I once again oppose this amendment and rise in opposition.

Minnesota has a rich history of taconite mining that dates back generations. However, this amendment is not about taconite mining, it's about copper-nickel mining, which has never been done before in Minnesota and is being proposed within the watershed of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, which is one of America's most visited wilderness areas.

An environmental review is currently underway to study the viability of mining this close to the Boundary Water Canoe Area and this amendment would defund that review less than a year before its scheduled completion in 2019.

Hundreds of thousands of people, on both sides of the issue, have weighed in on this ongoing public process. Their comments should not be ignored. Nor should we be ignoring the science-based assessment of best management practices for one of Minnesota's national treasures.

We should be open to new types of mining in Minnesota, but only when the necessary environmental reviews are met.

The Boundary Waters Canoe Area is Minnesota's Yellowstone. Hundreds of thousands of Americans visit it on fishing and canoe trips annually. Some of the best memories of my life have taken place in the Boundary Waters.

We owe it to ourselves and future generations to rely on science before undertaking any activity that could potentially disrupt this fragile ecosystem. I oppose defunding the ongoing environmental review and ask others to vote against the amendment.

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), who is the chairman of the Appropriations Committee's Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, now you know how it feels about California water. I got the drift of this thing.

Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's interest on this issue and appreciate the variety of opinions about it. I thank the gentleman, as well as the gentlewoman from Minnesota, who is the subcommittee's ranking member, for her willingness to work with the committee. As we work together to try to move forward with this bill, I hope a compromise will be found.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

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

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman for his work and continued support on this issue.

To make a few closing points, nothing about this amendment would allow for mining in the Boundary Waters, period.

□ 1800

In fact, to demonstrate the disconnect and level of misinformation on this issue, my colleagues who stand in opposition to this amendment worked to have report language accompany this bill which incorrectly calls attention to a "proposal" to withdraw lands within the Boundary Waters Canoe Area, despite the fact there is no such proposal and it remains unlawful to mine within the Boundary Waters.

Nothing about this amendment eliminates any existing environmental protections. This amendment reinforces the commonsense reality that economic growth and environmental protection do not have to be mutually exclusive.

I am pleased to have the support of the House on this very important issue during this 115th Congress. I am pleased to have the pledged support and continued commitment from the administration to end this withdrawal. I am pleased that we will soon be able to get Washington out of the lives of thousands of hardworking Minnesotans.

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

Mr. Chair, I withdraw the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I reserved my time. The gentleman has withdrawn the amendment. Even though the amendment has been withdrawn, I don't have the right to close or I would have used my time.

Could the Parliamentarian instruct me as to if my time is actually gone.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman's time has elapsed because the amendment was withdrawn.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, we do have a tradition of mining in Minnesota—taconite mining is the new mining—and I just want to reiterate the fact that these leases are for mining and the company that is looking to mine is sulfide-ore mining.

But, Mr. Chairman, I want to close by sharing some words from the founding members of Kids for the Boundary Waters. I have their handwritten notes. To have handwritten notes from America's young adults these days is pretty special.

From Callie: "This unique place shaped my life. The Boundary Waters helped me to realize my potential."

From Henry: "I have watched year after year as families like my own have grown together in this wilderness."

From Julia: "The pristine, untainted waters of the Boundary Waters are essential to the quality and uniqueness of the journeys of visitors."

From Tommaso: "I am more committed than ever to help preserve and protect this beautiful and unique ecosystem for future generations."

From Elsa: "Once the watershed faces sulfide-ore copper mining, it will never be the same."

From Joseph, who started this organization during his fight with leukemia: "What cancer has taught me for sure is that sometimes life only gives you one chance to get things right, and this is our one chance to protect the Boundary Waters."

I urge my colleagues and others to join me in standing with these young, inspiring people and to oppose the lease renewal.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 56 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the rule entitled "National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone" published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on October 26, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 65292).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to deal with the new rule entitled, "National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone," which affects several Wisconsin counties that I represent along Lake Michigan.

Since the original CLEAR Act came into effect, the Environmental Protection Agency has had the authority to regulate air emissions from stationary and mobile sources. They have—and this is a good thing—over time, progressively come up with new rules, making the standards more and more stringent for the counties along Lake Michigan.

If you are ruled a nonattainment, it is a burden. It is a burden on industry that has to spend substantial amounts of additional money dealing with stricter and stricter standards, putting them at a competitive disadvantage compared to other parts of the country and other parts of the world. It is also

a difficult thing for individual motorists who find their cars have to be repaired. It is very expensive.

Some of it is easy for people who have a high salary to deal with. Maybe they don't have an older car. But I have always felt that some of this disproportionately affects the people who are just struggling to get a goal in life.

Therefore, when the EPA comes up with new standards, it is not without effect. They need to come up with new standards they proposed a couple of years ago.

The purpose of the amendment is to prevent them from spending money promulgating these new standards so that our industries may have a predictable situation and not be at a competitive disadvantage.

I should point out that, insofar as the counties along Lake Michigan are ruled a nonattainment, it may be through no fault of their own. In part, for historical reasons, they have monitored the ozone by placing the monitors real near Lake Michigan, where there are artificially high amounts of ozone.

Secondly, we have a situation where, insofar as there are pollutants in the area, almost all of them come from south of Wisconsin, out of Chicago or areas further south. As a practical matter, it can be almost impossible, or even impossible, for these Wisconsin counties to deal with these problems.

I have been working with the Environmental Protection Agency on this issue. After introducing the amendment, I have continued to work with the Environmental Protection Agency.

While I would like to deal with this problem statutorily, I realize it would be probably better for all concerned if the Environmental Protection Agency, as well as the business community in Wisconsin, and I could reach a conclusion.

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

Mr. Chair, I withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana). The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. CONNOLLY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 67 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to propose or issue any modification to any regulation established in the final rule of the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency entitled "Disposal of Coal Combustion Residuals From Electric Utilities" (80 Fed. Reg. 21301 (April 17, 2015)).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, it is in the spirit of bipartisan, common-sense, and modest safeguards that I sought to offer this amendment that would protect the 2015 Federal coal ash rule.

Sadly, late last night, Acting EPA Administrator Wheeler helped cement the toxic legacy of former Administrator Pruitt's reign over the EPA by rolling back Federal coal ash standards, making this amendment moot.

I remind my colleagues that the Obama-era Federal coal ash rule was not rushed nor was it onerous. In fact, some think it didn't go far enough. After years of debate, input from community and industry stakeholders, and nearly half a million public comments, the Obama administration finalized stringent but pragmatic Federal coal ash regulations to deal with post-closure requirements, groundwater monitoring, and public reporting.

The Pruitt proposal, which was announced only 5 months ago, included very few hearings, very little outreach to the public, and last night was finalized. That is warp speed, even for the Trump administration's swamp-driven EPA antiregulation movement. So, no, the 2015 rule was not rushed; the Pruitt rule most certainly was.

I also remind my colleagues of the catastrophic 2008 Kingston, Tennessee, coal ash spill and why the Federal Government got in this business to begin with. The Kingston spill was a devastating event. The breach released 5 million cubic yards of coal ash, covering 300 acres in toxic sludge, damaging and destroying homes and property, resulting in \$1.2 billion in cleanup costs, mostly borne by the public.

The lasting health consequences of that spill, some of which are still unknown, are even worse. Residents still suffer from respiratory illnesses and other side effects. Arsenic levels where the coal ash runoff was disposed of were measured at 100 times, Mr. Chairman, higher than the amount allowed under the Safe Drinking Water Act. The EPA has already said such exposure significantly increases risk of cancers.

Earlier this year, lawyers filed suit in Federal court alleging that more than 180 members of this Superfund cleanup now face severe health effects, and 30 individuals have died from the cleanup of this toxic waste.

These coal ash spills continue to occur across the country, Mr. Chairman, including in my home State of Virginia, where a neighboring State, North Carolina, had a coal ash pond that spilled more than 39,000 tons of toxic ash and 24 million gallons of wastewater into the Dan River.

Though much of the public and media attention to this spill was focused on North Carolina's regulatory shortcomings, Virginia was exposed to the dangers of the coal ash spill. As a result, Virginia's Department of Environmental Quality secured a \$2.5 million settlement against Duke Energy Caro-

linas, a fraction of the cost of the cleanup.

What has happened in Virginia, North Carolina, and Tennessee can happen in any one of our communities that have or are near coal ash impoundment ponds, which is why we must protect the 2015 Federal coal ash rule. Unfortunately, that is not what happened last night.

What happened last night will weaken groundwater monitoring and cleanup requirements without considering the widespread evidence of significant groundwater contamination recently revealed by industry's own data. Already, under the 2015 rule's reporting requirements, coal ash waste sites across the country displayed evidence of contaminating groundwater. Under Pruitt's proposal, that data may not even see the light of day. We may not know. We are not going to monitor.

Surely, if there is anything we here in Congress can agree on, it is the right of all people to have access to safe drinking water. As a result of the 2015 Federal rules, States are working to close legacy coal ash impoundments and protect water. Under the new finalized agreement that modified that rule last night, that is now in jeopardy. Because of that action, we are going to have to address coal ash in a different way, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, because of that action, I will be forced to withdraw this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 68 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

LIMITATION

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to require changes to an existing placer mining plan of operations with regard to reclamation activities, including revegetation, or to modify the bond requirements for the mining operation.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, Alaska has a long history of placer mining operations, beginning in the early 1800s and continuing through today. In fact, Alaska is one of the few places left, including California, that has placer mining operations.

Most placer mining operations are small, but it as a robust industry in Alaska, providing hundreds of jobs and contributing to the growth of rural Alaskan communities.

The Bureau of Land Management's Fortymile plan, finalized in the last days of the previous administration, upended decades of successful placer mining land management in the Fortymile Planning Area.

The Fortymile plan imposed an overly complex regulatory framework on small-scale placer mining operations as part of an ongoing effort to discourage mining activity in the area.

The Fortymile miners previously agreed to environmental remediation standards, and under the new plan proposed by the BLM, they are expected to reclaim land that they have not mined and mitigate in ways they did not agree to in their approved operation plans.

They are expected to remediate land that was impacted by placer mining over 100 years ago, which adds to their financial burden and makes it economically impractical for miners to continue their operations.

This language has been included in the appropriations report language by unanimous consent for the last 2 years. This is a necessary piece of legislation and amendment to this bill to make sure the BLM recognizes that miners do have obligations, they have met their obligations, and the agencies have gone against them.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Alaska has been enlightening me more about placer mining, and I appreciate learning more; but I have some questions that remain unanswered, so that is why I have opposition to the gentleman's amendment.

□ 1815

I understand that between 400 and 600 miles of BLM-managed streams have historic or active placer mining impacts, and there is a legacy of historic claim with reduction of ecosystem function.

Now, BLM continues various outreach activities, including public meetings and interactions with individual miners, and is working with industry to incorporate best management practices and new reclamation techniques to accelerate stream recovery. I think that would be a good thing.

Of course, reclamation activities may be necessary, and what they are looking to do is to increase the cost to the miners, which the gentleman is objecting to, if I understand correctly, in order to get these streams and ecosystems back up to function.

This amendment would prohibit assessing the cost of the reclamation areas to placer miners who are profiting from mineral extraction on BLM-managed land.

I personally believe the American taxpayer should not shoulder the burden of the restoration costs, that responsible parties should.

So the gentleman will probably be enlightening me over the next couple of months on what he thinks might be able to be worked out so that both parties feel that the burden is not overburdensome, but there is adequate reclamation going forward.

Mr. Chair, at this time I have to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the Dean of the House's amendment and his dedication to the sound management of natural resources on behalf of constituents in his State.

Obviously, mining, and certainly placer mining, is unique to Alaska. Alaska certainly has a unique history when it comes to mineral extraction, probably more than any other State in the Union. It is certainly a big part of Alaska's economy and the economy of the United States. It is a mutually beneficial enterprise.

This amendment is similar to the ones adopted by voice vote in FY17 and FY18, so I certainly urge my colleagues to adopt it by a voice vote yet again.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the comments from the chairman, and especially the comments from the gentlewoman who understands and has opposition. I would like to remind everybody, again, the reclamation was taking place, the mitigation was taking place. They changed the rules after they agreed on it.

This is not a newly mined area. This has been mined before. In fact, I just came from there on the Fourth of July. Chicken, Alaska. This is where this mine is. Lots of mom-and-pop operations, retired people. Chicken, Alaska. You know why they call it "Chicken"? They couldn't spell "ptarmigan." That is why they call that small community that.

They are trying very hard, but very frankly, the BLM came in with this plan. It is not working. In fact, they are spending very large amounts of money trying to implement their reclamation concept when it doesn't work. And I will challenge anybody to show that these miners are not doing their best, but their proposal is trying to put them out of business. I just think that is wrong.

If I thought they were doing some harm, I would definitely not be for them. I have been there. I have seen it. I have watched what they are trying to do. An agency, I think, has forgotten their role, and they don't support mining. BLM is supposed to. And they have made it very nearly impossible for, very frankly, a mom-and-pop operation to do so.

So I hope the gentlewoman can see her way to allowing this amendment to this bill.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 59 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to give formal notification under, or prepare, propose, implement, administer, or enforce any rule or recommendation pursuant to, section 115 of the Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. 7415).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, I want to start by thanking Chairman CALVERT for this opportunity.

Mr. Chair, this amendment prohibits the EPA from using funds for actions pursuant to section 115 of the Clean Air Act. Section 115 of the Clean Air Act allows the agency to mandate State emissions levels to whatever level the agency deems appropriate if, in collaboration with a foreign government, they determine endangerment and if the other government has a reciprocal agreement to prevent or control these emissions in their own nation.

Now, this is a backdoor provision that allows the agency to vastly expand its regulatory authority and encroach on the constitutional rights of the States to regulate their own energy sectors, based on the actions of a foreign nation and the whims of the executive branch.

It is irresponsible to allow unelected bureaucrats at the EPA to retain the ability to seize such an expansive authority. If the U.S. government wants to pursue such a policy, one that, in my opinion, is constitutionally suspect, it should be done through an explicit congressional delegation of authority on a case-by-case basis.

A similar amendment has passed the House during the interior and environmental appropriations packages for the

previous 2 fiscal years, Mr. Chairman. I urge my colleagues to take back our Article I authority and support this amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, it has been pointed out that this amendment would block the EPA from regulating air pollution under section 115 of the Clean Air Act, which deals with international pollution and allows the United States to work with other countries on transboundary pollution issues.

Being a State that borders Canada, we enter into agreements with them many times to make sure that both of our countries are working together in the best interest of their citizens.

This gentleman has offered this amendment for a number of years. It used to be the amendment to torpedo the climate change agreement, but President Trump took care of that, so I am a little unclear as to why it is continuing to be offered.

Section 115 could be a tool in our toolbox for a path to achieve reduction targets for greenhouse gases. The gentleman's amendment would prohibit both the EPA and the Trump White House from even developing a well-considered recommendation as to whether or not to use this authority.

The President might, in some circumstances, want to work with another country to address something. This to me is just the latest in a long line of attacks on clean air and on the EPA's authority to respond to the urgent threat of climate change.

A vote for this amendment is another vote, in my opinion, for climate denial and to block action to curb carbon pollution that is driving our dangerous climate change.

We see the hurricanes getting stronger, the wildfires raging stronger, and now we are seeing the glaciers melt.

Mr. Chair, so I would urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and to leave this tool in the toolbox for the Republican administrator at EPA, as well as for the Republican person who is serving in the White House. Let's leave them one tool in the toolbox in case they want to take it out and use it.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, are we or are we not a sovereign Nation? I think that most people would agree that we are, and, as such, we don't take issue with the Congress, with the administration doing its job to keep our air clean and to make treaties and provisions with other nations.

But what we do take issue with is other nations working with, potentially, this administration, any admin-

istration, that comes up with an agreement not ratified by the American people, not ratified by this body or the body on the other side of the Capitol to encroach upon the constitutional rights of States to regulate their own environmental emissions, as provided.

So it is not a question of whether we think that the climate isn't changing, man has something to do with it, or whether it should be regulated or how it should be regulated. It is a question of the authority vested in the Constitution, in these bodies, and the ones that are not.

It is not the place of unelected bureaucrats or individuals to make an agreement with some other nation, then to impose itself on the States individually. That is all we are saying here. It has passed on numerous occasions because it is good.

The President got us out of the Paris climate agreement, but that doesn't mean that some other administration in the future might make another agreement that, yet again, the American people had no part in; neither did this body. So this just ensures that if that is the case, we have the protection that this body should provide.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 60 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to treat the New Mexico meadow jumping mouse as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, in the West, water is the key to everything. One small family, the Gosses—I met them my first year in Congress in 2003—has been fighting a 30-year, protracted battle with the Forest Service over the water and access to the water.

They have been to two different courts, and the courts said, yes, the water is theirs. The Forest Service responded to the first court by fencing the water in. They said the 23 acres around it was their acreage and they couldn't walk their cows to get to the water.

The Gosses went back to court, and found that the court said, okay, they don't have a right to walk the cows on your 23 acres, but they do have a right to move the water to the cows through a pipe or a ditch. The Forest Service responded by electrifying the fence.

That is the kind of fight that we are in right now. A couple years ago, I stood out over that water for about 2½ or 3 hours with the Forest Service, the Gosses, and we all negotiated that the fences could be brought in, that accommodations could be met, that we could find habitat other places. And it was all agreed we would get to the water.

Then, subsequently, the Fish and Wildlife Service said, well, there is a jumping mouse. They admitted themselves that the science was not very good, that they had never seen one of the jumping mice there, but they thought it might be there. They admitted that the science was very terrible.

Despite the lack of any scientific evidence, despite everything, now that area has been shut back off.

There are many areas where the jumping mouse could have a critical habitat, but the agency just refuses to do it.

So my amendment is quite simple. It simply says that the New Mexico meadow jumping mouse cannot be listed as endangered or threatened until they do some better science. It is a very straightforward amendment where we are trying to find the balance between the Endangered Species Act and the need for jobs, the need for an economy in the West. And that revolves around open spaces, ranchland, water. It all comes together in this one single issue.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment clearly would prohibit Fish and Wildlife Service from implementing or enforcing the endangered species listing of the New Mexico jumping mouse under the Endangered Species Act. It would restrict the Service from offering critical protections to preserve the species.

This amendment is harmful. Once a species is listed under the Endangered Species Act, the role of Fish and Wildlife is primarily permissive, helping parties comply with the act as they carry out their activities.

Now, the majority of the habitat of the New Mexico jumping mouse is on Federal land, and Fish and Wildlife is working with the Forest Service to develop conservation measures that will protect the mouse while allowing livestock grazing on Forest Service lands and assuring adequate water for these cattle.

Since the endangered species listing, members of the livestock community

have voiced concern about their impacts to people who recreate and make their livelihood on Forest Service lands, which result from addressing the needs of the mouse.

The Fish and Wildlife Service has established three working groups to address these concerns, and they have come up with some creative solutions, like establishing cattle lanes to assure cattle can have access to water while protecting the vegetation necessary for the survival of the mouse.

We have been in contact, and we find that there is a lot of excitement and there is a lot of cooperation going on. So I would like to work with the Service to make sure that we give this a full chance of working.

□ 1830

Under this amendment, the Service would not be able to continue to recover this species, though all the Endangered Species Act prohibitions would still apply. So the Service wouldn't be able to continue to recover the species under this amendment, but all the other activities of the Endangered Species Act would still apply. So the Service wouldn't be able to work collaboratively any longer with stakeholders to provide ESA compliance.

The Service has a statutory requirement to implement the Endangered Species Act. Defunding the Agency's ability to fulfill these legal requirements just makes the Agency and the Federal Government more vulnerable to lawsuits, which is an unnecessary cost for American taxpayers.

Additionally, this amendment would limit the Service from undertaking a required status review of the subspecies or from initiating any rulemaking to downlist or even delist this species, when it became appropriate.

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, with respect to the gentlewoman, if the science underlying the decision was sound, and even the Agency itself has admitted that the science was seriously flawed—if the stakes were not so high—the entire listing of species would demand sound science. So this is a serious problem throughout the West and throughout the United States.

If it weren't a matter of being able to provide jobs and have economies in these big rural areas of New Mexico, and there are no other tax bases in those areas, so as we crowd out the ranchers, then counties simply don't have the revenues to survive themselves.

If the stakes weren't these, then I would listen more closely to the gentlewoman's arguments. But as it is, I just don't think that we can sustain a decision like this. If the Fish and Wildlife Service had showed up at that meeting where we found other critical habitat within a couple of miles, it is just that critical habitat didn't block access to this source of water, the only source of water in that section of the

ranch, and these are ranches that are on mountain ranges.

So you have the inability for cows to cross the mountain ranges over to the next range. Also, it is miles in between some of the loading stations and the water stations.

So these are things that compel me to say that we have to find something different here. We want the Agency to reconsider it, to look for better science, to look for better critical habitat.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman wasn't here earlier, because he was attending to other work and now has come down to do his amendment, but I have been making the case that this type of authorizing language, these types of debates and discussions, should be taking place in the authorizing committee where we can bring in the Service, bring in the ranchers, find out what we need to do better to create win-wins.

When we just come and put things on the appropriations bill, it doesn't allow for that full vetting. It doesn't allow us that opportunity to work with the chairman of the Appropriations Committee after the authorizing committee is coming through and figuring out where we need to adjust the budget, or what we need to do, or how we need to do oversight to make sure that the Fish and Wildlife Service is doing things that the gentleman is talking about.

So, an interesting thing, we got some information from the Service, and the Service has been working with the research community to expand the survey of the jumping mouse outside its currently known occupied areas. The goal of this expansion effort is to document additional populations. If they document additional populations, we could possibly move toward downlisting or delisting the species, as appropriate. But your amendment, unfortunately, would block that.

I would like to see this type of amendment be brought up under the majority—the majority is the same in the Senate, and the majority is in control of the White House—and have an opportunity to do the right kind of oversight to make sure that, when we are doing legislation with the best of intentions—if this survey were to come back and say that we could downlist or delist the species, this amendment would prohibit us from doing it.

So, at this time, I will oppose the gentleman's amendment. But I thank him for bringing this attention to the floor, and I will look more into it.

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, again, I respect the gentlewoman's opinions and observations.

I would point out that these are 1907 water rights, which, in New Mexico, water rights are given, and the earlier, the better. So they can't get access be-

cause of the listing of a species. The science is very flawed.

The Agency had the opportunity to go out to the forest with us. And that day, they simply turned down the opportunity to meet with us. We had the State forester, the head of the U.S. Forest Service of New Mexico there. We had the regional forester. Everyone was there except the people who really needed to be there. They refused our invitation.

I have been working on this single issue for 14 years myself, so it is not like we haven't been discussing the issue at length.

Again, with that, I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 61 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 62 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act shall be used to draft, propose, finalize, implement, enforce, or carry out any rulemaking on the lesser prairie-chicken (*Tympanuchus pallidicinctus*) under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, this issue is very similar to the last one.

As we approached the year 2013-2014, discussions were going on with Fish and Wildlife Service about the potential listing either as endangered or threatened of the lesser prairie chicken. We began to ask for volunteers. We asked for farmers and ranchers, for oil and gas companies, to work together to really come up with a collaborative plan in order to avoid the listing for the lesser prairie chicken as either threatened or endangered, and the industries responded very well.

To date, partners in that effort have contributed more than \$64 million in enrollment and mitigation fees. They have agreed to conserve more than 150,000 acres of habitat.

It was at that point that the Fish and Wildlife Service said, okay, this is the best effort we have had in this collaboration nationwide. They were all ecstatic. Then they turned around about a month later and simply listed the lesser prairie chicken.

Again, the science was somewhat lacking in that. So, in 2015, a Federal district court looked at the issue, and they vacated the finding and said that the Fish and Wildlife Service took no account of the ongoing conservation.

Keep in mind that the conservation efforts actually have been working. Just this year, the number of birds is up from 30,000 to 39,000, so almost a 25 percent increase in the population. That is exactly what these collaborative efforts were intended to do.

The court found that the Fish and Wildlife Service didn't conduct a proper analysis and that the analysis they did was neither rigorous nor valid.

So we are simply asking, in this amendment, that the lesser prairie chicken not be listed, that it be delisted.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, in 2016, the Service officially removed the lesser prairie chicken from the Federal list of endangered and threatened wildlife in accordance with the September 2015 court order vacating the Service's 2014 delisting determination, as the gentleman pointed out.

Now, the administration action was taken in light of the decision not to appeal the court's ruling. So they decided they weren't going to appeal, but they were going to try to move forward.

So the Service is currently conducting a species status assessment to characterize the current and future conditions of the lesser prairie chicken. The assessment takes into account both the threats and conservation efforts.

When I was in Nevada—I wasn't in your State, sir, but I was in Nevada with one of our other colleagues—I saw amazing work that was being done in collaboration, in fact, with an energy company, amazing work being done.

The gentleman from Nevada was unable to produce one prairie chicken for me to see that morning when we were out, but I believe that they are there and that the conservation is working, in spite of the fact that I didn't get to see one lesser prairie chicken.

But going back, the draft report was shared with peer and partner reviews, and the Service is working with them to get feedback. If the Service deter-

mines the listing of the lesser prairie chicken as threatened or endangered is warranted, it is unlikely that any rule-making could be completed before 2018. So that would take 2 years, in which Congress could take action.

I would like the Service to be able to continue working closely with its partners, including State fish and wildlife agencies, the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agency, the U.S. Department of Agriculture, industry, private landowners, and other partners, in the interest of conserving the lesser prairie chicken.

So what the amendment does, and why I am objecting to it, it halts, it stops, that transparent process that is working properly, that I saw in the field working properly and providing ample opportunity for public comment in how we could move forward.

So this amendment would make the decision. It would make the decision final about the conservation of the species on the basis of what is not, in my opinion, good science. So, at this time, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I hope all partners continue to work together.

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. ESTES).

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to support amendment No. 62 to H.R. 6147. This amendment modernizes the Endangered Species Act and recognizes voluntary conservation efforts to protect the lesser prairie chicken.

In 2015, the species native to western Kansas was inaccurately listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act due to a multiyear drought. Since then, Kansas farmers and ranchers have devoted millions of dollars toward successful conservation through a range-wide plan. This along with increased rainfall has led to an increase in the lesser prairie chicken population.

However, recently, the push to list the species as endangered was restarted, disregarding these voluntary efforts. I am glad this amendment recognizes the private conservation efforts toward the lesser prairie chicken. I co-sponsored a similar measure in the farm bill, and I appreciate Representatives PEARCE and MARSHALL for offering this amendment. I ask my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment.

In 2015, a Federal court ordered the Fish and Wildlife Service to remove the lesser prairie chicken from the list of threatened and endangered species. Environmental activists immediately petitioned the Agency to list the species again, and the Agency, having

been stung by the court, concluded that the petition had merit.

Now the Agency is on the verge of listing the species yet again, and it will end up in court again, where it will be delisted again. Rinse and repeat.

Folks, how many times must we repeat this cycle before people start working together? How much money must be wasted fighting each other before we realize that our money is better spent actually helping the species?

This amendment calls a timeout on the madness, at least for one species. That is why I am urging an "aye" vote.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, again, I would point out that the collaboration was unprecedented across the Nation. What is going to happen, if this collaboration fails, is that others are going to say, okay, that collaboration process simply doesn't work.

Though, again, the courts, we are simply agreeing with the court findings in the matter that the Fish and Wildlife Service failed to ask very important questions and needs to reaccomplish the evaluation.

All in all, the States and local areas can and will pitch in to help the species survive. But the heavy-handed approach coming from the Fish and Wildlife Service simply, again, is going to kill jobs and kill the potential of collaborative efforts.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 1845

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 63 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out Proclamation 7320 entitled "Establishment of the Ironwood Forest National Monument" issued by the President of the United States on June 9, 2000.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment that supports recreational shooting, K-12 education, and responsible energy development by prohibiting funds for the Ironwood Forest National Monument that was unilaterally designated under the Antiquities Act.

By looking at the map here, it is very clear that this monument was a political land grab meant to prevent responsible energy and mineral production, as well as multiple use on Federal lands. You couldn't construct something even worse than that.

As you can see, the monument boundary starts in the right corner here in the yellow and includes a large mineral deposit that includes molybdenum, manganese, gold, and peripheral lead-zinc-silver.

The boundary then works its way up and also encircles the purple, which is a significant copper deposit.

Continuing to move up to the green, the monument encompasses significant amounts of lead, zinc, and silver veins.

Moving further up the map to the next yellow, the monument encircles the entire Silver Bell Mine and operations, as well as other claims, and also encompasses massive mineral deposits that contain molybdenum, manganese, gold, and peripheral lead-zinc-silver.

Moving to the blue and to the top left of the monument, the boundary almost entirely encircles two large veins that contain barium, lead, and silver.

Essentially, all the colored areas on the map are off limits to new energy and mineral exploration and development as a result of the monument land grab.

Proponents claim the 188,619-acre monument is necessary to protect a stand of ironwood trees covering 640 acres. Let me repeat that. Proponents claim the 188,619-acre monument is necessary to protect a stand of ironwood trees covering 640 acres.

Wow. If this unilateral monument designation was not political, it would have had a significantly different boundary and been much smaller.

There is nothing glamorous about this monument, and it was an unconstitutional taking by then-Secretary Babbitt and the Clinton administration, pointblank.

The Arizona Mining Association, Arizona Rock Products Association, Arizona Mining Industry Gets Our Support, and the Southern Arizona Business Coalition recently asked for this monument to be modified significantly, stating: "One-third of the area encompassed in the Ironwood Monument is either State trust lands or privately owned. These lands have effectively lost all economic potential as a result of the national monument designation. . . . At the time of the designation, the State government estimated that it would lose \$100 million in mineral rights. This does not include financial losses to private companies or the lost employment potential for the mines."

Asarco and Liberty Star Uranium and Metals Corporation of Tucson have also asked for this monument to be significantly altered.

Further, the Ironwood Forest National Monument has caused harm to the common schools beneficiary, K-12 education, by locking up these lands, preventing multiple use, and stopping important revenues from flowing to the educational coffers.

The Ironwood Forest National Monument enacted a complete ban on recreational shooting. No utility corridors are allowed in the monument. One-quarter of the monument can be closed to human entry for over one-third of the year due to the presence of sheep, and nearly 10,000 acres of this monument are completely locked up at all times. Further, the monument constitutes an attack on ranchers by negatively impacting grazing.

This monument designation was an unconstitutional taking. Asarco invested \$72 million prior to the monument designation in hopes of expanding the mine. They will likely invest several hundred million more, create new jobs, and grow the economy if the mine is no longer within the monument boundary.

The Arizona Game and Fish Department has not been able to fully implement vital management activities within the monument boundaries, including fencing to protect wildlife, predator control, law enforcement wildlife investigations, and responses to illegal wildlife activities.

In November, 24 Members of Congress sent President Trump a letter recommending a recession of this monument amongst other monument recommendations. That letter was endorsed by the American Farm Bureau Federation, Americans for Responsible Recreation Access, the National Cattlemen's Beef Association, and the Public Lands Council.

This amendment is endorsed by the American Exploration and Mining Association, American Encore, AMIGOS, Asarco Mining, the Competitive Enterprise Institute, Free Market America, the Arizona Farm Bureau, Arizona Liberty, the Arizona Pork Council, Concerned Citizens for America, Eagle Motorcycles, Rim Country Custom Rods, the Southern Arizona Business Coalition, and Yavapai County Supervisor Jack R. Smith, amongst others.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and ranking member for their time and for their good work on this bill.

I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment that seeks to eliminate the Ironwood Forest

National Monument, which is in my district. The fact that it is in my district is secondary to the callous disregard to the public input, the wishes of the people of southern Arizona, the history of the area, and the biodiversity that this amendment attacks.

This amendment effectively repeals the monument, returning the lands back to multiple-use status, and opening them up for unfettered mining and other harmful activities.

The sponsor of the legislation says that it is necessary to restore access for recreational shooting and to generate revenue for local schools, which I understand is a nod to the potential revenue garnered from future mining operations that he envisions will pop up once the monument is eliminated. He speaks for the mining industry, not Arizonans, and certainly not my constituents.

A recent poll found that 73 percent of the people of Arizona oppose eliminating protections for national monuments. Arizonans don't want mining in their monuments, but that doesn't seem to matter to the sponsor of this amendment, who will seemingly do whatever it takes to roll back public lands protections.

I also take issue with the sponsor of the amendment's notion that this amendment is about protecting access for recreational shooting. When the monument was established, recreational shooting was allowed, as it is on a large percentage of public lands. Unfortunately, some bad actors forced local land managers to rethink access for the entire shooting community. People were shooting up endangered cacti, leaving bullet hole-ridden sofas and other trash throughout the desert. Those were used as targets.

One of the great things about living in Tucson and southern Arizona is that we are surrounded by public lands. Our protected desert landscapes support wildlife and an abundant biodiversity to a wide range of recreational activities.

Unfortunately, this amendment views these rare landscapes as commodities, only available for extraction of resources and nothing more. It is kind of a corporate radar approach and mentality to our shared public assets and lands: use them, abuse them, discard them, and see how much we can make out of them, in terms of money.

The spirit of conservation and preservation is very important to the people of southern Arizona, and this is one of our special places. This amendment is an attack on the people, its history, and our traditions in southern Arizona. This amendment is an attack on the Antiquities Act, and this amendment is an attack on our public lands.

This monument was created in the year 2000 by President Clinton after the Pima County Board of Supervisors, the elected officials for the county, petitioned for it; the Tohono O'odham Nation petitioned for it; the people of southern Arizona petitioned for it; and that monument was created.

The vice chairman of the Tohono O'odham Nation, Mr. Verlon Jose, said, today: "The Tohono O'odham have lived in this region since time immemorial, and the Ironwood Forest National Monument has tremendous cultural and historical importance. More than 200 important archeological sites with remains from our ancestors are within the monument, including two areas listed on the National Register of Historic Places. We must oppose misguided efforts to withhold funding from Ironwood, as it would have a devastating effect on efforts to protect this national treasure."

Mr. Chairman, the issue here today is about trying to relive and undo a decision that was made with public participation, public input, the support of local elected officials, the support of affected Tribes, and do it for the specific interests of a mining company that feels they have a right, even though it is a foreign-owned company, to come in on our public lands, withdraw minerals, pay no royalties, and exploit the area.

The Ironwood Forest National Monument is a landscape treasure. It is a rare treasure, and it needs to be maintained. I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, look at how this monument is connected and concocted. I think every which way. You couldn't make a worse definition for a monument.

What it basically does is it goes to the far side to catch these two minerals over here. Down here in the middle, it goes to the far edge. This is called gerrymandering for minerals. This is a political bias based upon takings from the people of Arizona.

Remember, I responded by saying: Listen, one-third of this designation was private and State lands. These are part of the dedication to the citizens of Arizona.

So when you look at this, this is the worst concocted. This is the vanity of, actually, atrocities of monuments gone haywire.

Now, I am happy to work with the gentleman from southern Arizona to rightsize this monument. I would be happy to do that. But this concoction is a blatant exercise in overjurisdiction of the Federal Government and misutilizing the Antiquities Act.

Mr. Chairman, I ask everybody to vote for my amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 64 OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 64 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used in contravention of Federal Acquisition Regulation 6.101(a) with respect to aviation helmets.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, this is really pretty simple.

A constituent came to me with a problem concerning procurement for aviation helmets. He has a manufacturing company here in the United States, but he is not able to sell his helmets to the Department of the Interior.

His helmets are not inferior. They are used by many industries. They are used in many countries. But he is not on the approved list for Federal agencies. Currently, the approved list includes only one manufacturer.

My amendment will change this by providing additional options through competition. The amendment requires compliance with the Federal acquisition regulation policy that ensures a full and open process in procuring aviation helmets.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this great amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. DENHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 65 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this act may be used by the Secretary to modify operations of the New Melones reservoir authorized in section 10 of the Flood Control Act of 1944 (58 Stat. 887, 901) for the purposes of executing any component of the

State Water Resources Control Board of California's Bay-Delta Water Quality Control Plan.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment prevents a huge water grab by the State of California from farmers and communities in California's Central Valley.

Under Sacramento's new plan, residents and farmers, alike, will suffer skyrocketing rates that will cripple our local economy, our farms, and our communities. Specifically, the State is mandating 40 percent of the water from Stanislaus, Tuolumne, and Merced Rivers to be flushed out into the ocean.

□ 1900

Currently, we are losing about 25 percent of our current water being flushed out by these mandated flows. This will increase it to 40 percent. This water feeds the Central Valley Project and the farmers that rely on it. My community relies on this water for drinking, to operate our local businesses, and for green power. This powers our local communities.

The amendment prevents the State from robbing water from the Valley and protects the New Melones reservoir from depletion. The New Melones is a Federal facility that provides water for the Central Valley, and generates hydropower for Californians.

The Bay-Delta Plan will drain significantly more water from New Melones each year than it currently releases, leaving the reservoir completely dry some years. The reservoir will be unable to meet its water obligations to the federally-authorized Central Valley project, which is critical to moving water all across the Central Valley. Lower water levels will reduce the ability to generate power.

My amendment prevents Federal dollars from contributing to this misguided plan, and the State from robbing our water. We need more water in the valley, not less.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. This amendment seeks to block collaborative water management in California. Such management is aimed at benefiting all water users, cities, farmers, Tribes, the fishing industry, and recreation interests.

Specifically, this amendment blocks Federal compliance with the California Bay-Delta Plan, which is a plan being developed by the State of California to prevent the collapse of California's iconic salmon fisheries, and to preserve all beneficial use of the State's water.

After a decade of research and public outreach, the State government is close to finalizing the Bay-Delta Plan. It will increase water flows into the California Bay-Delta from the San Joaquin River. The increased flows will improve salmon survival and prevent an unfolding ecological crisis in the Bay-Delta, which is key for the environment for the Bay and the Pacific Northwest fisheries, one of the most valuable and unique ecosystems in the world.

While multiple factors have contributed to recent salmon declines, a key factor has been unsustainably large water diversions from the California rivers. The Bay-Delta seeks to address this by reducing diversions and increasing river flow.

Mr. Chair, this obviously is an amendment which the author is very passionate about. This also is something that the State of California has engaged in.

This amendment, in my opinion, once again, should be something that should be handled in an authorizing committee so the State of California can come in, the gentleman and his proponents of what the State is doing can have a discussion, and then the authorizers can work their will and let the appropriators know whether or not to move forward on this.

To do this amendment here shuts out a full, transparent discussion about what should or should not take place in the State of California, where the California citizens all across the State have had input with their elected officials on how to move forward.

So this amendment seeks to undermine what appears to be a successful implementation of the Bay-Delta Plan, which California has seen as a necessary step toward preventing precious fishery declines and the loss of thousands of jobs that rely on healthy fish and functioning ecosystems.

Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK). The reservoir resides in his district.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from California for bringing this amendment to the floor.

The gentlewoman from Minnesota misses an important fact, and that is that the current massive water diversions have done absolutely nothing to improve salmon populations.

By taking those diversions to 40 percent unimpaired flow to the ocean, in practical terms, this means that New Melones and Don Pedro reservoirs in my district will be drained to their dead-pool levels each fall.

It would destroy what's left of agriculture in California's Central Valley, destroy the tourism these reservoirs attract in my region, and create catastrophic water shortages in one of the most water-rich regions of the Nation.

We don't build these reservoirs to dump water into the ocean. We build them to store surplus water from wet years so that we have it in dry ones.

This is insanity. It is the result of years of greens-gone-wild radicalism in California. This amendment assures that the Federal Government will not participate in such nonsense.

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

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, in rising to support my colleague, Mr. DENHAM, on this amendment, I note that the California State Water Board is contemplating their next water grab, and how disconnected from reality these regulators are.

In the latest plan, they want to take 40 percent of the flows from San Joaquin. Concurrently, they have a pending proposal to also increase the volume of flows from the Sacramento River, in my region, that washes out to the ocean, all under the guise, the failing guise of protecting fish. They are contemplating 45 to 65 percent of unimpeded flow.

We already know that when it comes to protecting people or fish, Sacramento always decides to choose the latter. This plan defies even basic common sense or fairness.

Instead, it relies on questionable science to impose arbitrary restrictions, with no solutions to address the loss of habitat for native species, or even the predators in the delta, which we already know to be a major threat to the fish population. Up to 90 percent of the affected species are devoured by these predator fish.

It offers no recourse for the devastating impact it will have on jobs and local economies.

I would like to remind the regulators, California voters overwhelmingly supported the effort to direct \$2.7 billion for water storage projects, recognizing the need to invest in infrastructure such as Sites Reservoir.

If that project already existed, the reservoir would be nearly full right now, providing enough water to serve 3.6 million Californians for an entire year, and relieve the stress on the Sacramento and Central Valley water systems.

Mr. Chair, we need some common sense. I urge my colleagues to support Mr. DENHAM's amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, could I inquire as to how much time both sides have?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COMER). The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 2½ minutes remaining. The gentleman from California has 1 minute remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McNERNEY).

Mr. McNERNEY. Mr. Chair, I understand my colleague's position on this. Water is a scarce commodity. You

want to have access to water. You want to plant your trees. You want to feed your stocks and all that.

But what you are not saying is what is going to happen if you continue to take more water from the delta. The delta is a finite water supply. The more you take water from the delta, the more saltwater from the ocean comes in and poisons our facilities, our docks, our fishing, it changes the whole environment. And we are going to cost jobs if you do that, so it is really a balance.

Now, I think it is okay to work together to find a proper amount of water to ship out and a proper amount of water to stay in the delta. When we have bigger rain events, the water pushes the saltwater back out toward the ocean. It clears out water a little bit.

So, I mean, it is not like we are just trying to save water to hurt you guys. That is not what is going on here. We have our own interests to take care of.

This is always a fight. What we need to do is sit down and compromise and find some way to get through this so that we don't end up hurting one another, which is what happens.

Again, I understand the position you are in. I understand the need for water. California is a dry State. We have years and years of drought. But continuing to demand access to water when there is only a finite supply, every year you want more, that is not going to work. It is just not going to work.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chair, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, our State Water Board is out of control. Our State Water Board is involved in a political operation to remove farming out of the State of California.

This amendment would attempt to put a stop to the reckless State plan and continue the current New Melones operations. This is something we need to act on and act on immediately. We are in crisis.

I am a strong advocate for Mr. DENHAM's position and, certainly, for his constituents, and I am glad to support this amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, at this time I will make my remarks to close.

This amendment is an attempt to get the Congress involved in undermining a State's rights and its prerogatives.

The Federal Government should be assisting California in ways to restore the State's rivers and recover needed fisheries, instead of trying to interfere with obstruction from Washington. I often hear my colleagues say that Washington should get out of the way. In this case, I totally agree.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Chair, the gentleman talks about a compromise. I will not compromise and allow our people to go without water, people that

have no drinking water, only to have FEMA come in and bring bottled water. I will not shut down our farms. That is not a compromise.

This is a Federal project that has our water for our community that now they want to double the amount that goes out to the ocean. It is a waste. It is harmful to our community. It will shut down our agriculture, and it will leave people without potable drinking water.

This is insanity to try to say that you are saving the fish when there is no science. This will harm the fish. Without water, without green power, and without cold water, you will kill the very fish that you are trying to save.

I believe that our farms deserve this, our communities deserve this, and our people must have it to survive.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. ABRAHAM

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 66 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS TO RESTRICT CERTAIN USE OF GENETICALLY MODIFIED CROPS IN NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGES

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce any prohibition or limitation of any kind in a cooperative agreement referred to in section 29.2 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations, on the planting of genetically modified crops in a national wildlife refuge.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. ABRAHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, the Fish and Wildlife Service regularly enters into cooperative agricultural agreement with farmers to plant and raise crops on farm fields on national wildlife refuge land. Those agreements require that the farmers leave a portion of that crop standing over the winter in order to provide cover and forage for wildlife. In the spring, those farmers plow up everything and start all over again.

In 2014, the Fish and Wildlife Service began to prevent farmers who entered into these agreements from planting GMO seed. This action was not based on facts, it was not on rules, and this action is harmful to both wildlife and to the farmers who are providing that food and cover.

GMO crops are proven safe. They use less water. They use less pesticides.

They use less fertilizer, and they feed much of the world, both humans and animals.

Wildlife groups like Ducks Unlimited support this amendment, and I ask for your support, too.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

□ 1915

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, this amendment clearly would prohibit Fish and Wildlife Service from enforcing limitations or prohibitions on the use of genetically modified seed in commercial agricultural operations conducted on national wildlife refuges.

As the gentleman pointed out, in 2014, a decision to curtail the use of genetically modified seeds or crops, GMOs, for use on National Wildlife Refuge System lands by 2016 grew out of several years of litigation successfully brought against U.S. Fish and Wildlife.

During the term of the litigation, the courts did not allow the use of GMOs. As a result of this restriction, the refuges found that they were able to meet their biological objectives and accomplish their wildlife management purposes without the use of GMOs and that GMO use could be curtailed nationwide.

This approach avoids costly litigation for the taxpayers and the need for additional site-specific compatibility determinations and NEPA analysis of GMO crops. It is a saver of the taxpayers' dollars.

Fish and Wildlife Service has proven over several years that they can accomplish their wildlife objectives without the use of GMOs. However, Fish and Wildlife policy on biological diversity, integrity, and environmental health does allow for the use of GMOs when it is essential to accomplish the refuge purposes and is approved by the Regional Refuge Chief.

This amendment jeopardizes the current FWS policy that is based on years of experience. We should be supporting Fish and Wildlife Service and its efforts, not blocking the agency from doing its job.

Mr. Chair, once again, this is the appropriations portion of Fish and Wildlife. This clearly is something that has gone through the court system, that has gone through authorization. It is a policy discussion and it should be done in the policy committee. It should be done where people can come in and testify and have their debate in full transparency. It should be done then and brought to the floor.

Mr. Chair, the majority controls the House, the Senate, and the White House. I would encourage the author of the amendment to not use the appropriation bills to put more riders on.

The gentleman may or may not be aware, Mr. Chair, that the Senate has

no riders on its bill at all. And I believe that this could really put the chairman and myself, as the ranking member, possibly at a disadvantage when we go to reallocate those precious dollars, with all the requests that we have had on the floor over the past 2 days, when we go into doing what our job is, the appropriations.

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

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I support the amendment.

The National Academy of Sciences was established by Congress in 1863 in the midst of the Civil War to provide independent, objective advice to the Nation on matters related to science and technology.

The Academy, in 2016, released a comprehensive literature review on the science of genetically engineered crops, or GMOs as they are commonly referred to. The Academy found zero scientific evidence that GMOs are any more or any less safe for human consumption and the environment than organisms modified by more traditional genetic methods, like selective breeding.

This amendment blocks an outdated policy made during the last administration which pandered to extreme environmental groups by feeding into the unfounded fears of GMOs. This amendment is an opportunity to rise above fear-mongering and make sound policy based on science and rationality.

Mr. Chair, let's do the right thing and vote "aye."

Mr. ABRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, I just ask that my colleagues support this commonsense amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 67 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is prohibiting the use of appropriated funds to eliminate the Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnership, or

programs, that are for the reforestation of urban areas. In fact, I celebrate and support the increase in funding. This amendment is particularly helpful, I hope, to create the legislative history of the importance of the urban reforestation program.

Mr. Chair, I thank the ranking member as well as the chairman of this committee for recognizing the importance of urban reforestation.

This amendment emphasizes the importance of the Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnership in urban forests and preserves our ability to return urban areas to healthy and safe living environments for our children. I have offered similar amendments because I want an ongoing creation of legislative history to ensure that this program is kept.

In the past 30 years alone, we have lost 30 percent of all of our urban trees, a loss of over 600 million trees. Eighty percent of the American population lives in dense quarters of the city. Reforestation programs return a tool of nature to concrete areas that can help remove air pollution, filter out chemicals and agricultural waste in water, and save communities millions of dollars in stormwater management costs.

I have certainly seen the devastation of droughts right in large cities. In particular, Houston, a couple years ago, lost many, many trees in a severe drought that we experienced over the summer. It took many community investors—when I say that, nonprofits—and Federal dollars to restore green life to Houston.

We know that asthma is on the rise. In people below the Federal poverty threshold, we see asthma increasing. Asthma comes when children have to be subjected to polluted air.

Some of the reasons individuals at lower income may have increased risk of asthma are increased exposure to indoor and outdoor pollutants, cigarette smoking, secondhand smoke exposure, and nearby industrial pollutants and highway traffic.

The good news is that trees provide the source of oxygen that is so necessary, and it comes about through a scientific process that I will discuss a little bit later.

We have a headline here from Science Daily that says: “Cities and Communities in the U.S. Losing 36 Million Trees a Year.”

And then another headline: “Researchers Suggest Reforestation Around Urban Areas to Reduce Ozone Levels,” which enhances, creates, makes worse the asthma that many of our children suffer from.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak in support of my amendment to Division A of H.R. 6147, the Interior and Environment Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2019 and to commend Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their leadership in shepherding this bill through the legislative process.

Among other agencies, this legislation funds the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park

System, and the Smithsonian Institution, which operates our national museums including the National Zoo.

Mr. Chair, my amendment is simple but it sends a very important message from the Congress of the United States.

The Jackson Lee Amendment emphasizes the importance of Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnerships and urban forests, and preserves our ability to return urban areas to healthy and safe living environments for our children.

Similar amendments were offered and accepted in the Interior and Environment Appropriations Acts for Fiscal Year 2018 (H.R. 3354), Fiscal Year 2017 (H.R. 5538), Fiscal Year 2016 (H.R. 2822), Fiscal Year 2008 (H.R. 2643), and Fiscal Year 2007 (H.R. 5386), and were adopted by voice vote.

Mr. Chair, surveys indicate that some urban forests are in serious danger.

In the past 30 years alone, we have lost 30 percent of all our urban trees—a loss of over 600 million trees.

Eighty percent of the American population lives in the dense quarters of a city.

Reforestation programs return a tool of nature to a concrete area that can help to remove air pollution, filter out chemicals and agricultural waste in water, and save communities millions of dollars in storm water management costs.

I have certainly seen neighborhoods in Houston benefit from urban reforestation.

In addition, havens of green in the middle of a city can have beneficial effects on a community's health, both physical and psychological, as well as increase property value of surrounding real estate.

Reforestation of cities is an innovative way of combating urban sprawl and deterioration.

Mr. Chair, a real commitment to enhancing our environment involves both the protection of existing natural resources and active support for restoration and improvement projects.

Several years ago, American Forests, a leading conservation group, estimated that the tree cover lost in the greater Washington metropolitan area from 1973 to 1997 resulted in an additional 540 million cubic feet of storm water runoff annually, which would have taken more than \$1 billion in storm water control facilities to manage.

Trees breathe in carbon dioxide, and produce oxygen.

People breathe in oxygen and exhale carbon dioxide.

A typical person consumes about 38 pounds of oxygen per year.

A healthy tree, say a 32 ft tall ash tree, can produce about 260 lb of oxygen annually—two trees supply the oxygen needs of a person for a year.

Trees help reduce pollution by capturing particulates like dust and pollen with their leaves.

A mature tree absorbs from 120 to 240 pounds of the small particles and gases of air pollution.

Trees help combat the effects of “greenhouse” gases, the increased carbon dioxide produced from burning fossil fuels that is causing our atmosphere to “heat up.”

Trees help cool down the overall city environment by shading asphalt, concrete and metal surfaces.

Buildings and paving in city centers create a heat-island effect.

A mature tree canopy reduces air temperatures by about 5–10 degrees Fahrenheit.

A 25 foot tree reduces annual heating and cooling costs of a typical residence by 8 to 12 percent, producing an average annual savings of \$120 per American household.

Proper tree plantings around buildings can slow winter winds, and reduce annual energy use for home heating by 4–22 percent.

Mr. Chair, trees play a vital role in making our cities more sustainable and more livable.

The Jackson Lee Amendment simply provides for continued support to programs like Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnerships that reforest our urban areas.

For all these reasons, Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the Jackson Lee Amendment and thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their courtesies, consideration, and very fine work in putting together this legislation.

[From Science Daily, Apr. 18, 2018]

CITIES AND COMMUNITIES IN THE US LOSING 36 MILLION TREES A YEAR

Source: USDA Forest Service—Northern Research Station

Summary: Nationally, urban/community tree cover declined from 42.9 percent to 42.2 percent between 2009–2014. This translates to losing an estimated 36 million trees or approximately 175,000 acres of tree cover annually.

Scientists with the USDA Forest Service estimate that between 2009 and 2014, tree cover in the Nation's urban/community areas declined by 0.7 percent, which translates to losing an estimated 36 million trees or approximately 175,000 acres of tree cover annually. Pavement and other impervious cover increased at a rate of about 167,000 acres a year during the same period, according to research by USDA Forest Service scientists.

Nationally, urban/community tree cover declined from 42.9 percent to 42.2 percent. Twenty-three states had a statistically significant decrease in tree cover, with a total of 45 states showing a net decline. Trees improve air and water quality, reduce summer energy costs by cooling homes, reduce noise, mitigate runoff and flooding, and enhance human health and well-being, making them important to human health and urban and community infrastructure. The annual benefits derived from U.S. urban forests due to air pollution removal, carbon sequestration, and lowered building energy use and consequent altered power plant emissions are estimated at \$18 billion.

The study by Dave Nowak and Eric Greenfield of the USDA Forest Service's Northern Research Station, “Declining urban and community tree cover in the United States,” was published in the journal *Urban Forestry and Urban Greening*.

A table showing tree cover and impervious cover change by state is available at: <https://www.nrs.fs.fed.us/news/release/resources/cities-communities-losing-tree-cover/>

“Urban forests are a vital part of the nation's landscape,” said Tony Ferguson, Director of the Forest Service's Northern Research Station and the Forest Products Laboratory. “Forest Service research puts knowledge and tools into the hands of urban forest managers that supports stewardship and the wise allocation of resources.”

States or districts with the greatest annual net percent loss in urban/community tree cover were Rhode Island and the District of Columbia (minus 0.44 percent), Georgia (minus 0.40 percent), and Alabama and Nebraska (minus 0.32 percent each). States with the greatest annual net loss in tree cover were Georgia (minus 18,830 acre/year), Florida (minus 18,060 acre/year) and Alabama (minus 12,890 acre/year).

Three states—Mississippi, Montana and New Mexico—had slight, nonsignificant increases in urban/community tree cover. Nationally, Maine has the highest percent tree cover in urban/community areas with 68 percent tree cover. At 10 percent tree cover, North Dakota ranked as having the lowest percent urban/community tree cover.

“Urban forests are an important resource,” said Nowak. “Urban foresters, planners and decision-makers need to understand trends in urban forests so they can develop and maintain sufficient levels of tree cover—and the accompanying forest benefits—for current and future generations of citizens.”

As of 2010, urban land occupied 3 percent, or 68 million acres, of the United States, while urban/community land occupied just over 6 percent of the United States, or 141 million acres.

Overall, urban/community impervious cover had a statistically significant increase from 14.5 percent to 15.1 percent (an increase of 0.6 percent). States with the greatest annual net percent increase in impervious cover were Delaware (0.28 percent), Iowa (0.26 percent), and Colorado, Kansas and Ohio (0.24 percent each). States with the greatest annual net increase in impervious cover were Texas (17,590 acre/year), Florida (13,900 acre/year) and Ohio (8,670 acre/year).

[From Phys.org, Sept. 9, 2014]

RESEARCHERS SUGGEST REFORESTATION
AROUND URBAN AREAS TO REDUCE OZONE
LEVELS

(By Bob Yirka)

A team of research conservationists with members from several universities in the U.S. is suggesting in a paper they've had published in Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, that urban areas could benefit by investing in cost effective reforestation efforts around urban areas that currently suffer from high ozone levels. Planting trees, they suggest could help cities bring those levels down.

The researchers note that despite aggressive efforts by many metropolitan areas to lower ozone levels in ground level air, levels remain high, causing the populations that live in them to live with an increased risk of health problems—prior research has indicated that as many as 152,000 premature deaths each year can be attributed to the damage ozone inflicts on lungs. Current efforts to combat ozone levels are aimed at the source, factory emissions, etc. Laws limiting emissions have not kept up with growth however, leading to increases in ozone levels.

The researchers suggest a different approach—remove the ozone by planting trees. They suggest that land be purchased on the outskirts of cities with high ozone levels to be converted to forest—trees they note, remove both ozone, and one of its precursors.

To bolster their point, the researchers looked at the Houston metro area in Texas, a part of the country with consistently high ozone levels. Land that is currently used for agriculture on the outskirts, they claim, could be purchased and replanted with trees, creating a 1.5-square-mile forest. They estimate that over a 30 year period, the reforested area could reduce ozone and precursors in ground-level air by 310 tons. They also note that if fast growing trees were planted, timber harvests could help make up initial outlays and loss of local revenue from agricultural products.

The researchers also plotted potential targets on a map of the U.S., highlighting areas where reforestation would likely do the most good—along the 1-95 corridor in the northeast, for example, and around Chicago, Detroit and many parts of California. The team concludes by noting that if something isn't

done, the problem of ozone pollution is only likely to get worse in the face of both continued growth and as global warming exacerbates the problem.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, although the base bill already continues to support this program at the fiscal year 2018 level, I am happy to accept this amendment, as I have for the past 2 years.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from California.

As I indicated, I think that creating the additional legislative history of the importance of this particular program is what I hope will strengthen it.

May I ask, Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the ranking member, to discuss the urban reforestation program, and I thank her for her leadership.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Texas for this opportunity. I also thank the chairman of our subcommittee for accepting the amendment.

Mr. Chair, many cities don't have urban wildlife refuges nearby, and to address that challenge, the Service has 21 Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnerships spanning the country. These partnerships have nourished an appreciation of wildlife conservation to new audiences, and I have seen them in action, empowering local community organizations to inspire conservation in local parks and other natural areas.

I just want to list a few of these urban partnerships that can be found: New Haven; Chicago; Houston; Providence; Seattle; Baltimore; Los Angeles; Albuquerque; Santa Barbara; Yonkers; New Orleans; Denver; Philadelphia; Atlanta; Springfield, Massachusetts; Anchorage; Cincinnati; the twin cities of St. Paul and Minneapolis, St. Paul being my hometown; Elizabeth, New Jersey; West Palm Beach, Florida; San Juan; and Alamo, Texas.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to learn more about this program.

Once again, I thank the gentlewoman for the time, and I thank Chairman CALVERT for accepting this amendment.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, let me conclude my remarks by saying I have certainly seen neighborhoods in Houston benefit from urban reforestation. In addition, havens of green in the middle of a city

can have beneficial effects on a community's health, both physical and psychological, as well as increased property values of surrounding real estate. But when you have had a drought, you know how important this program is. Reforestation of cities is an innovative way of combating urban sprawl and deterioration.

Finally, let me say, photosynthesis, how many of us remember that in our classrooms? I love that process. That happens in plants, generally involves the green pigment chlorophyll, and generates oxygen as a byproduct, cleaning the air. That is what these programs do in urban America.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON LEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 68 printed in House Report 115-830.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member and the chairman of this committee for considering my amendment.

My amendment is prohibiting the use of appropriated funds to limit museum outreach programs administered by the Smithsonian Institution. Again, for programs like this, this is to advocate and create the legislative history of the importance of these programs, and I am glad to have this amendment presented to the Congress at this time.

Mr. Chair, in order to fulfill the Smithsonian's mission—the increase and diffusion of knowledge—the Smithsonian seeks to serve an even greater audience, and this has come about over the years by bringing the Smithsonian to enclaves of communities who otherwise would be deprived of the vast amount of cultural history offered by the Smithsonian.

The Smithsonian's outreach program serves millions of Americans, thousands of communities, and hundreds of institutions in all 50 States through loans of objects, traveling exhibitions,

and sharing of educational resources via publications, lectures, presentations, training programs, and websites.

Let me say from personal experience, one of my predecessors, the Honorable Mickey Leland, that many people know died in an airplane going into an Ethiopian mountain trying to bring food to starving people in Eritrea and Ethiopia, had introduced the first bill for a museum dealing with slave history. He did not live to see that legislation go forward, but later, JOHN LEWIS introduced the legislation to create the Smithsonian Museum of African American History and Culture.

We have it today, and it is a museum that has seen more people attend it, and the outreach is crucial: the board members, who are so proud to be a part of it, and the Congressional Black Caucus, that was the anchor of passing this legislation. Now we have an outstanding exhibit on Oprah Winfrey, and all are there to see this historic figure and many others.

It is important that the Smithsonian Air and Space Museum and many others have the opportunity to reach out to Americans and let them know of these very special resources, these assets that are here.

So this is a very important emphasis to have, and I would like to make sure that we continue to do it robustly so that more Americans can know their history.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

Thank you for this opportunity to speak in support of my amendment to Division A of H.R. 6147, the "Interior and Environment Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2019."

Let me also thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their leadership in shepherding this bill to the floor.

Among other agencies, this legislation funds the Smithsonian Institution, which operates our national museums, including the Air and Space Museum; the Museum of African Art; the Museum of the American Indian; and the National Portrait Gallery.

The Smithsonian also operates another national treasure: the National Zoo.

Mr. Chair, my amendment is simple but it sends a very important message from the Congress of the United States.

The Jackson Lee amendment simply provides that:

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

This amendment is identical to amendments I offered to the Interior and Environment Appropriations Acts for FY2017 (H.R. 3354) and FY2016 (H.R. 2822) that were approved by voice vote.

Mr. Chair, the Smithsonian's outreach programs bring Smithsonian scholars in art, history and science out of "the nation's attic" and into their own backyard.

Each year, millions of Americans visit the Smithsonian in Washington, D.C.

But in order to fulfill the Smithsonian's mission, "the increase and diffusion of knowledge," the Smithsonian seeks to serve an

even greater audience by bringing the Smithsonian to enclaves of communities who otherwise would be deprived of the vast amount of cultural history offered by the Smithsonian.

The Smithsonian's outreach programs serve millions of Americans, thousands of communities, and hundreds of institutions in all 50 states, through loans of objects, traveling exhibitions, and sharing of educational resources via publications, lectures and presentations, training programs, and websites.

Smithsonian outreach programs work in close cooperation with Smithsonian museums and research centers, as well as with 144 affiliate institutions and others across the nation.

The Smithsonian's outreach activities support community-based cultural and educational organizations around the country.

They ensure a vital, recurring, and high-impact Smithsonian presence in all 50 states through the provision of traveling exhibitions and a network of affiliations.

Smithsonian outreach programs increase connections between the Institution and targeted audiences (African American, Asian American, Latino, Native American, and new American) and provide kindergarten through college-age museum education and outreach opportunities.

These outreach programs enhance K–12 science education programs, facilitate the Smithsonian's scholarly interactions with students and scholars at universities, museums, and other research institutions; and disseminate results related to the research and collections strengths of the Institution.

The programs that provide the critical mass of Smithsonian outreach activity are:

1. the Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service (SITES);
2. the Smithsonian Affiliations, the Smithsonian Center for Education and Museum Studies (SCEMS);
3. National Science Resources Center (NSRC);
4. the Smithsonian Institution Press (SIP);
5. the Office of Fellowships (OF); and
6. the Smithsonian Associates (TSA), which receives no federal funding.

To achieve the goal of increasing public engagement, SITES directs some of its federal resources to develop Smithsonian Across America: A Celebration of National Pride.

This "mobile museum," which will feature Smithsonian artifacts from the most iconic (presidential portraits, historic American flags, Civil War records, astronaut uniforms, etc.) to the simplest items of everyday life (family quilts, prairie schoolhouse furnishings, historic lunch boxes, multilingual store front and street signs, etc.), has been a long-standing organizational priority of the Smithsonian.

SITES "mobile museum" is the only traveling exhibit format able to guarantee audience growth and expanded geographic distribution during sustained periods of economic retrenchment, but also because it is imperative for the many exhibitors nationwide who are struggling financially yet eager to participate in Smithsonian outreach.

For communities still struggling to fully recover from the economic downturn, the ability of museums to present temporary exhibitions, the "mobile museum" promises to answer an ever-growing demand for Smithsonian shows in the field.

A single, conventional SITES exhibit can reach a maximum of 12 locations over a two- to three-year period.

In contrast, a "mobile museum" exhibit can visit up to three venues per week in the course of only one year, at no cost to the host institution or community.

The net result is an increase by 150 in the number of outreach locations to which SITES shows can travel annually.

And in addition to its flexibility in making short-term stops in cities and towns from coast-to-coast, a "mobile museum" has the advantage of being able to frequent the very locations where people live, work, and take part in leisure time activities.

By establishing an exhibit presence in settings like these, SITES will not only increase its annual visitor participation by 1 million, but also advance a key Smithsonian performance objective: to develop exhibit approaches that address diverse audiences, including population groups not always affiliated with mainstream cultural institutions.

SITES also will be the public exhibitions' face of the Smithsonian's National Museum of African American History and Culture, as that new Museum comes online.

Providing national access to projects that will introduce the American public to the Museum's mission, SITES in FY 2008 will tour such stirring exhibitions as NASA ART: 50 Years of Exploration; 381 Days: The Montgomery Bus Boycott Story; Beyond: Visions of Planetary Landscapes; The Way We Worked: Photographs from the National Archives; and More Than Words: Illustrated Letters from the Smithsonian's Archives of American Art.

To meet the growing demand among smaller community and ethnic museums for an exhibition celebrating the Latino experience, SITES provided a scaled-down version of the National Museum of American History's 4,000-square-foot exhibition about legendary entertainer Celia Cruz.

Two 1,500-square-foot exhibitions, one about Crow Indian history and the other on basket traditions, will give Smithsonian visitors beyond Washington a taste of the Institution's critically acclaimed National Museum of the American Indian.

Two more exhibits, "In Plane View" and "Earth from Space," provided visitors an opportunity to experience the Smithsonian's recently opened, expansive National Air and Space Museum Udvar-Hazy Center.

For almost 30 years, The Smithsonian Associates—the highly regarded educational arm of the Smithsonian Institution—has arranged Scholars in the Schools programs.

Through this tremendously successful and well-received educational outreach program, the Smithsonian shares its staff—hundreds of experts in art, history and science—with the national community at a local level.

The mission of Smithsonian Affiliations is to build a strong national network of museums and educational organizations in order to establish active and engaging relationships with communities throughout the country.

There are currently 138 affiliates located in the United States, Puerto Rico, and Panama.

By working with museums of diverse subject areas and scholarly disciplines, both emerging and well-established, Smithsonian Affiliations is building partnerships through which audiences and visitors everywhere will be able to share in the great wealth of the Smithsonian while building capacity and expertise in local communities.

The National Science Resources Center (NSRC) strives to increase the number of ethnically diverse students participating in effective science programs based on NSRC products and services.

The Center develops and implements a national outreach strategy that will increase the number of school districts (currently more than 800) that are implementing NSRC K–8 programs.

The NSRC is striving to further enhance its program activity with a newly developed scientific outreach program introducing communities and school districts to science through literacy initiatives.

In addition, through the building of the multi-cultural Alliance Initiative, the Smithsonian's outreach programs seek to develop new approaches to enable the public to gain access to Smithsonian collections, research, education, and public programs that reflect the diversity of the American people, including underserved audiences of ethnic populations and persons with disabilities.

For all these reasons, Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of the Jackson Lee Amendment and thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their courtesies, consideration, and very fine work in putting together this excellent legislation.

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

□ 1930

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise to approve the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I have no objection to the gentlewoman's amendment. It was accepted last year by voice vote, and I encourage adoption of the gentlewoman's amendment. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Texas has 2½ minutes remaining.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM), the ranking member, and thank her again for her leadership.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank the gentlewoman from Texas for the time, and I would like to commend the chairman of the subcommittee for accepting this amendment.

The chairman and I know the importance of museums and the wealth of knowledge that they share with the American public. And when we have the Smithsonian Day at our hearings, when the chairman puts the gavel down, everybody is in attendance to see what the Smithsonian is going to bring to the history lesson that it is going to share with the Members of our committee.

We are inspired, just as these museums inspire people of all ages, to better understand our world, and our place in it.

I am very pleased that the Smithsonian is going to be able to go forward

with its public outreach programs, including exhibitions, programs, and online resources, which anybody can access. It ensures that as many Americans as possible can benefit from their vast collections.

At the Science Museum of Minnesota, we call it "Museum in a Box," and I am glad the Smithsonian is going to continue with that.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, let me thank the gentlewoman for really letting us know what a joy the Smithsonian is, even in front of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. Chair, I want to emphasize that the Smithsonian outreach programs increase connections between the Institution and targeted audiences: African Americans, Asian Americans, Latinos, Native Americans, and new Americans, and provide kindergarten through college age music education and outreach opportunities.

Mr. Chairman, I failed to say that when we were putting this together, once the African American museum was established, the museum personnel leadership, Dr. Lonnie Bunch, went on the road across America collecting artifacts from African Americans and historic families to put in this museum, real items of slave history and the history from through the years, through the centuries, and it made the museum a living example of the history of our time here in the United States.

That has been done by the Smithsonian in many different groups. And so I would offer this article that says: "New National Data Reveals the Economic Impact of Museums Is More Than Double Previous Estimates."

The American Alliance of Museums released two groundbreaking reports revealing indisputable evidence that museums contribute more to the United States economy than previously thought and have widespread support.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

I would like to include in the RECORD this American Alliance of Museums report dated February 13, 2018.

[From the American Alliance of Museums, Feb. 13, 2018]

NEW NATIONAL DATA REVEALS THE ECONOMIC IMPACT OF MUSEUMS IS MORE THAN DOUBLE PREVIOUS ESTIMATES

(By Laura Lott)

ARLINGTON, VA.—The American Alliance of Museums (AAM), the only organization representing the entire scope of the museum community, today released two groundbreaking reports revealing indisputable evidence that museums contribute more to the United States economy than previously thought and have widespread public support that transcends political affiliations and geographic locations.

Armed with the two new reports and a wealth of data, on February 27 hundreds of museum professionals will visit with members of Congress and their staff to ask them to support funding for vital federal agencies and tax incentives for charitable donations. The Fiscal Year 2019 budget proposal announced by President Trump yesterday calls for the elimination of multiple agencies that support the arts and humanities.

"Never before in the 112-year history of the Alliance have we possessed such comprehensive and statistically robust studies to support what we've always known," said Alliance President and CEO Laura Lott. "Our legislators, policymakers, funders, and trustees can be confident in the fact that museums are important economic engines that support jobs and bring revenue to their local communities. In addition, our studies show that the American public is overwhelmingly supportive of museums in general, and specifically supports maintaining or increasing their federal funding."

TWO REPORTS REINFORCE THE VALUE OF MUSEUMS

The first study, Museums as Economic Engines, reveals that museums support 726,000 jobs in the United States, and directly employ 372,100 people, more than double that of the professional sports industry, according to the Bureau of Labor Statistics. The study, conducted by Oxford Economics with the support of the Andrew W. Mellon Foundation, shows that for every \$100 of economic activity created by museums, an additional \$220 is created in other sectors of the US economy as a result of supply chain and employee expenditure impacts. These impacts mean that museums contribute approximately \$50 billion to the US economy each year, a number that's more than twice previous estimates.

The report is also the first to show that US museums generate more than \$12 billion per year in tax revenue to federal, state, and local governments. The museum field's largest economic impact is on the leisure and hospitality industry (approximately \$17 billion), but it also generates approximately \$12 billion in the financial activities sector and approximately \$3 billion each in the education/health services and manufacturing sectors.

Museums provide important economic impacts to every part of the nation. The top 10 states driving this impact are geographically diverse and account for 57 percent of the gross value added to the national economy. States with the highest economic impact from the museum sector included California (\$6.6 billion), New York (\$5.4 billion), and Texas (\$3.9 billion). However, those that rely most heavily on museums due to their relatively higher concentration include the District of Columbia, Hawaii, Wyoming, and Alaska.

The second report, Museums & Public Opinion, examines the opinions of Americans concerning museums, their educational and economic value, as well as their thoughts about federal funding and support for museums in their community. Conducted jointly by AAM and Wilkening Consulting, the study was fielded by the market research experts at Ipsos and polled more than 2,000 Americans. The survey results overwhelmingly demonstrate the high degree to which Americans believe in and support their museums, regardless of political affiliation, geographic location, and whether they visit museums or not:

97 percent believe that museums provide valuable educational experiences to their communities

89 percent recognize the important economic contributions and jobs that museums bring

96 percent would approve of elected officials who act to support museums including acting to maintain or increase federal funding.

"The data speaks clearly: whether urban or rural, conservative or liberal, or a museum-goer or not, Americans treasure the museums in their communities and want elected officials to support them," Lott said.

Findings from the two reports will be discussed by leaders from the Alliance and its research partners February 26 at Museums Advocacy Day in Washington, DC and May 7 at the Alliance's Annual Meeting & Museum Expo in Phoenix.

CONGRESSIONAL HONOREES

During Museums Advocacy Day, the Alliance will present awards to legislators who have demonstrated exemplary support for the nation's museums:

Senator Lisa Murkowski (R-AK) used her position on the Senate Appropriations Committee to advocate for funding for key federal agencies. She is also an original cosponsor of legislation that would reauthorize the Institute of Museum and Library Services.

Representative Suzanne Bonamici (D-OR) is a co-founder of the Congressional STEAM Caucus, and a leader in seeking funding that will help school districts provide a well-rounded education.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to support the Jackson Lee amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. JODY B. HICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 69 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Environmental Justice Small Grants Program of the Environmental Protection Agency.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, the Office of Environmental Justice, also known as the OEJ, was established within the Environmental Protection Agency, the EPA, in 1992, in order to assess environmental concerns with the potential of affecting disadvantaged communities.

To bring about this goal, the OEJ set in motion the Environmental Justice Small Grants Program in 1994. While this grants program initially sought to overcome environmental issues that could hurt underprivileged communities, it has, unfortunately, devolved into a platform for political activism, in addition to offering services typically powered by State and local governments.

Furthermore, in recent years, the Environmental Justice Small Grants Program has been used for purposes entirely unrelated to the office's stated mission. Examples would be: funding

educational programs on urban gardening, creating healthy environments for nail salons, or the so-called negative consequences of automobile dependency.

While some of these projects may be commendable, the bulk are not within the scope of the constitutional responsibilities delegated to the Federal Government.

Our country currently shoulders \$21 trillion in debt and we should not be subsidizing what would otherwise be State initiatives and local projects. It is for these reasons that I have introduced my amendment to discontinue funding for the OEJ Small Grants Program. This will allow the EPA to refocus millions of taxpayer funds toward the Agency's core mission over the next decade, and I would ask my colleagues to support this amendment. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee). The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I want my colleagues to listen closely to what this amendment does. It prohibits funds to support the EPA's Environmental Justice Small Grants Program, which, since its inception in 1994, has awarded funding to local and Tribal organizations working with communities facing environmental justice issues.

These grants support and empower low-income communities to understand and address exposure to environmental harms and risks.

If there is a problem, if there is a grant that hasn't been done properly, then it is Congress' responsibility to do oversight. So, in my opinion, there should be no Member of this body that supports cutting these critical funds. If there are problems, we should be re-requesting oversight.

This is a case of David versus Goliath. With this amendment, small communities would be left defenseless when confronted with corporations that come in and sometimes cause illness due to their underlying pursuit of profit over human health.

Examples of these programs supported by these grants are: a program to promote Baltimore residents' awareness of lead health risks and lead abatement services. It is important to provide education:

Working with the residents in Puerto Rico to clean up coastal areas and reduce solid waste and aquatic debris. I was just recently in Puerto Rico watching the EPA work and clean up the debris, the unimaginable debris of the hurricanes that went through last year.

Working in Lawrence, Massachusetts, in one of the poorest and most populated cities in New England to educate families about lead contamination in soil, and, yes, sometimes that means knowing what is in the garden, what is in the yard, what is in the play-

ground, as children touch soil contaminated by lead and then touch their faces and their mouths. The negative effect of growing vegetables in lead-contaminated soil can be life changing for children.

Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would, again, just reiterate the fact that this grant program is not doing the job that it was designed to do. It is not even doing things that are related to the stated mission. It is a waste of taxpayer dollars, and for that, it is not something that we should continue funding.

It has lost its purpose. It has lost its mission, and it just simply is not necessary to continue funding. When we talk about the issues happening in Puerto Rico or other parts of the world, we have FEMA and we have other avenues to deal with serious problems like what happened in Puerto Rico and other places in our country, and those means are working effectively.

But to simply waste funds on a grant program that directly is involved in activities unrelated to their own mission statement, is not something that we should be involved in. As a result, this amendment has been endorsed by a number of organizations, such as: the Competitive Enterprise Institute, Heritage Action, Citizens Against Government Waste, Club for Growth, FreedomWorks, Free Market America, and a host of organizations who are concerned about the direction our country is going financially and are supportive of stopping the waste here.

So I ask my colleagues to support this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I would gently remind the gentleman from Georgia that Puerto Rico is a territory of the United States. It is not a foreign entity.

I would like to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), my dear friend and chairman of the committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman, and I must rise in reluctant opposition.

I wish I could have worked with the gentleman on this amendment, but this amendment reaches a little too far and is inconsistent even with the Trump administration's position.

This year the President requested \$2 million for the Environmental Justice Small Grants Program which would provide financial assistance to low income, minority, and Tribal populations, which we deal with quite often.

This amendment would prohibit EPA's ability to issue grants altogether, which means all of the Office of Environmental Justice funds would be allocated to the payroll and personnel and could result in the hiring of more EPA staff, and I am sure that is not your intention. And so there would be

no savings according to the CBO. Zero. No savings at all in this amendment. I don't believe that is your intent.

Because the amendment would have unintended consequences, I must oppose the amendment.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate these comments. What we are dealing with would simply do away with funding of the small grants part of this program where those funds are not being used according to the mission.

Mr. Chair, I continue to ask for support from my colleagues, keeping in mind the multiple organizations that are supportive of this amendment. I ask my colleagues to support this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire how much time I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota has 2 minutes remaining.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman very much and I am glad that she emphasized the work that the Environmental Justice grants have done in Puerto Rico, and the fact that they are citizens of the United States.

But I have seen what the Environmental Justice grants have done because they are small. As Mr. CALVERT indicated, the administration recommended \$2 million. These grants are small, and they help communities clean up. They help communities deal with violators of environmental rules, both in the State and Federal, mostly State, and gives them the ability to clean and deal with neighborhood issues. That is how small these grants are.

It also has provided assistance to Environmental Justice clinics that can work with community organizations on how to petition for something that is both an eyesore and environmental damage, to rid it of it, or to get the entity, the corporation, the small business, whatever it is, to clean it up. It makes it better for all concerned.

Mr. Chair, I would just ask and recognize that this is part of civic participation, and these grants should be allowed.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I just have to ask the question. Tragedies like the water crisis in Flint, Michigan, demonstrate the issues surrounding environmental justice to continue to persist in our country. So the question is: When did it become partisan to ensure children drink clean water?

This amendment ignores the need to identify and address disproportionately high adverse human health and environmental effects on minority and low-income populations. I urge, I implore the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Chair, if he suspects that there is waste in this program, let's do the oversight together.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and to stand with communities and the disenfranchised over corporations.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE).

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

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

□ 1945

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 70 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to pay attorney's fees pursuant to a settlement in any case, in which the Federal Government is a party, that arises under—

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment, which seeks to crack down on the practice commonly known as sue and settle.

When Federal agencies settle lawsuits with outside advocacy groups behind closed doors, the outcome is pretty much what you would expect: costly new regulatory burdens with taxpayers picking up the tab.

That is exactly how sue and settle works. Federal agencies accept lawsuits from outside advocacy organizations and, rather than defend themselves, proceed to settle that lawsuit in a closed-door agreement, resulting in new and more costly regulations.

It is bad enough that the taxpayer ultimately pays for these regulations, but under current law, it is the taxpayer footing the bill for attorneys' fees for these outside organizations. That is absurd.

My amendment prevents American taxpayer dollars from being used to pay the legal fees of outside advocacy

groups for settlements under the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act. Organizations can still sue whomever they want, but they cannot do it on the backs of taxpayers.

Fortunately, we are making progress to end this practice. In the House, we have passed this amendment several times before, and the Trump administration has taken notice of our efforts. The Trump administration sees this practice for what it is: an abuse of our regulator process that must be reined in.

The EPA announced last fall that it will no longer pay attorneys' fees as part of the settlement process and will ensure stakeholders have input and a more transparent settlement process. This amendment will help bolster the administration's efforts to stop this abusive practice.

The Trump administration realizes that nowhere is the cost of these settlements more painful than in the environmental regulatory context. The result of these lawsuits is hundreds of new regulations and tens of millions—even billions—of dollars in compliance costs.

If that isn't bad enough, as part of the agreements, agencies are often required to reprioritize their agendas, allocating limited resources to the priorities of these interest groups rather than priorities designated by Congress or ones that have received public and stakeholder input.

The American people are tired of our unaccountable Federal Government, and we have the opportunity to do something about it. This is a necessary step to rein in overregulation and bring transparency back to the regulatory process.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I am a little confused, because it would be only when the Trump administration would decide to be a party of a lawsuit that this judgment would ever be used. So I would assume that you would trust the Trump administration to be overly judicious before involving itself with any suit, would you not?

I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. I support the Trump administration, but I also support our duty under the Constitution to make sure we tell the executive what to do.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, Mr. Chairman, that is why I am confused, because this would be the Trump administration. The gentleman said, if I heard him correctly, Mr. Chair, that he would expect the Trump administration to be very judicious in using this.

So I find this amendment is extraneous. It puts the same parameters on attorneys' fees under the ESA, the Clean Air Act, and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act that are already in place for attorneys' fees under the Equal Access to Justice Act.

The Equal Access to Justice Act already caps the hourly rate of attorneys' fees, unless the court determines an increase in the cost of living or special factors such as limited availability of qualified attorneys for the proceedings justifies a higher fee. And it requires the party to be a prevailing party.

Mr. Chairman, we don't need to add an extraneous, redundant provision to a bill that is already overburdened with harmful legislative riders, especially when I trust that the Trump administration would be very limited and very judicious in ever using this.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment. I reserve the balance of my time and my right to close.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE).

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

This amendment would block funds used by the agencies to pay legal fees under any lawsuit settlement that arises under the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, and the Endangered Species Act.

While the intent of these pieces of legislation was good, serial litigants and special interest groups have turned these laws into tools used to block access to our forests and our mineral resources.

In Montana, we have a litigation problem, as many of our forest management projects are locked up by environmental extremists filing frivolous lawsuits. Agencies spend more time behind a desk and more resources defending their actions than they do working on our lands.

These lawyers continue to get richer as Montana's landscape goes up in smoke and taxpayer funds are wasted.

This same amendment passed the House last September, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment again.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the right to close.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), who is the subcommittee chairman.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentleman's amendment. Suing the government and settling has become a lucrative business that is supported by taxpayer dollars. The Endangered Species Act, for example, has become wrapped around the axle of the judicial system by excessive litigation.

We are essentially paying people to sue the Federal Government. This needs to stop.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an "aye" vote on the amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, the sue-and-settle practice cuts stakeholders and the public out of the regulatory process. It undermines the Article I authority we hold here in Congress.

By restricting the payment of legal fees, we take away the incentive for these environmental advocacy groups to sue the Federal Government, and we protect public input in the rulemaking process.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a "yes" vote on my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

This amendment is unnecessary and duplicative. The Equal Access to Justice Act already provides a framework for legal fees related to cases in which the Federal Government is a party. I find myself standing here as a Democrat, a person who has been resisting almost everything that President Trump has been trying to do in the environmental arena and other arenas that affect healthcare and so much more, but I find myself defending the Trump administration's right in which they are a party to participate in the Equal Access to Justice Act, just as I did for President Obama's administration.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to stop, take a minute, think about what this amendment is really doing, and agree with me that we should oppose this amendment. We should not stop the Federal Government when it is involved in cases and is a party from participating in the Equal Access to Justice Act.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. LARSON OF CONNECTICUT

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 71 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 148, line 3, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$100,000) (increased by \$100,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman

from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer an amendment to require a Federal study on the financial impact of the disaster known as crumbling foundations that is plaguing parts of the Northeast, including my home State of Connecticut, Massachusetts, and with further study, we believe, it impacts much of the northeastern region of our country.

This amendment simply asks for the Treasury to lead a joint study with our Federal regulators to assess the financial impact of this disaster and provide recommendations to help mitigate Federal and local losses, and help these suffering homeowners who, through no fault of their own, have experienced a catastrophic disaster.

There is no one who has worked harder on this in our State of Connecticut than JOE COURTNEY. JOE has been a leader in this, organizing people in both the State and local arenas, as well as our two United States Senators BLUMENTHAL and MURPHY.

JOE has led the way, and I have had the fortune, along with State Senator Tim Larson, to travel to South Windsor, East Windsor, and Manchester, Connecticut, and witness the devastation and the heartache that these homeowners go through.

I know, looking out and seeing Mr. YOUNG, he will remember what happened in the South with the famous, or infamous, China drywall. It is similar to that experience, where homeowners and individuals, through no fault of their own, experienced catastrophic loss.

We have been working tirelessly on this effort and feel that this study, in fact, will reveal the impact that it will have on homeowners, many of whose loans and homes have been backed by GSEs Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, and even as we project out into the future, having Federal bases there where this concrete may have been used that has impacted the people there in a dramatic fashion.

As I indicated, nobody knows more about this issue and has studied it more thoroughly than Congressman JOE COURTNEY from the Second Congressional District.

Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) to explain further the issue of crumbling foundations.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. LARSON for yielding and, again, for offering this amendment, which has been part of a number of initiatives that we have worked on jointly together to deal with this issue.

Again, for the record, just to clarify what is going on here, a concrete quarry up in north central Connecticut,

which had been mining aggregate for foundations in homes, it turned out there was a material called pyrrhotite, which is an iron sulfide material that, over time, when it is exposed to moisture, rusts and cracks in a sickening fashion and results in the total collapse of home foundations.

The estimate is as high as 19,000 homes have had foundations using material from this quarry. As the gentleman pointed out, this has also occurred in western Massachusetts. It goes as far north, actually, as Three Rivers, Quebec, because it is a strain of pyrrhotite that runs from Canada down through New England.

This picture shows vividly the damage caused to a home in Coventry, Connecticut, where the repairs require you to lift the house, clean out the old foundation, pour a new foundation, and, again, lower the house back. It costs roughly about \$200,000.

We were able to secure a tax ruling from the Treasury Department that allows individuals like this homeowner in the picture to basically deduct those losses, which, again, is some relief.

Frankly, there is more that we need to bring to the table. The gentleman's amendment would allow the Federal regulators that set up the rules for lending banks and institutions to get some flexibility for loan-to-value ratio rules that occur when there are natural disasters.

□ 2000

Again, in Federal natural disasters in places like Florida and Texas, there is some flexibility to allow homeowners to get a loan perhaps above the loan-to-value ratios so they can, again, basically conduct repairs to make their houses habitable again. This amendment will set up that process.

Secretary Mnuchin, as the gentleman and I know we have met with personally, would be the Department that would organize this task force that the amendment contemplates.

Again, it is something which the banking industry in Connecticut and Massachusetts has expressed a strong interest in basically allowing some relief for homeowners who, again, have poured their heart and soul into their homes to be able to recover their losses.

I thank the gentleman for offering this amendment. We had a similar amendment last night that was adopted by Mr. CALVERT. Again, I want to thank the majority for their understanding on this issue.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Chair, I would also like to thank Secretary Mnuchin again for his outstanding work, his understanding and empathy, and the prompt manner in which they have taken up what, as you can imagine for these homeowners, is just catastrophic in nature. We want to commend him and also the Tax Advocate as well for their testimony before the Ways and Means Committee on this very important issue.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. LARSON). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 72 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 72 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 156, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 157, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 221, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Page 224, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment No. 72 to provide additional funding for the Native American CDFI Assistance Program.

This program supports critical economic development in Native communities, which face significant barriers to accessing basic financial services and capital. For example, almost all Alaska Native villages in my State do not have banks and are not connected to the road system.

The Native program provides financial assistance and technical assistance awards on a competitive basis to Native CDFIs, allowing them to effectively build wealth and further economic self-determines in Native communities.

These mission-driven Native organizations are working to finance businesses, create jobs, expand and improve affordable housing options, and much more.

The Native program accounts for a small portion of the fund's overall budget but has a significant positive impact, which includes empowering Alaska Natives to improve their economic well-being in my home State.

Without my amendment, a cut to the Native program in FY 2019 would be especially devastating to our Nation's impoverished and underserved Native communities.

I urge my colleagues to support this noncontroversial bipartisan amendment to restore funding for the Native program.

My amendment, when considered with Representative STEVEN PALAZZO's CDFI amendment, would restore the program to the current enacted level of \$16 million so the Native organizations may continue growing small busi-

nesses, create jobs, and promote vital economic development in Native communities.

I would like to thank the Native CDFI Network and the amendment's cosponsors, Representative GWEN MOORE, COLLEEN HANABUSA, and TULSI GABBARD.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD).

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague for introducing this amendment of which I am a proud cosponsor.

This amendment provides additional funding for the Native American CDFI Assistance Program, also known as NACA, which supports critical economic development in Native communities like mine in Hawaii, those in Alaska, and communities all across the country which already face significant barriers to accessing financial mainstream services and capital.

NACA accounts for a small portion of the CDFIs, but it provides significant support to Native CDFIs, including Native Hawaii organizations in my home State of Hawaii.

Of the \$22.7 million in CDFI awards made to Hawaii since the fund was launched, 41 percent of total dollars awarded came from this NACA Program. It has funded organizations like the Council for Native Hawaiian Advancement, which supports Native Hawaiian communities with homeownership counseling and mortgage loans, small business access to capital, and loans to farmers and ranchers.

While the NACA Program is unable to meet the demand by qualified Native CDFIs at its current funding level, a cut to NACA in FY 2019 would be especially devastating to our Nation's impoverished and underserved Native communities.

I urge my colleagues to join my colleague from Hawaii, Representative COLLEEN HANABUSA, and me to support this noncontroversial, bipartisan amendment to restore funding to NACA.

The amendment, when considered with Representative PALAZZO's CDFI amendment, would restore NACA to the current enacted level of \$16 million so that Native CDFIs may continue growing small businesses, creating jobs, and promoting vital economic opportunity and development in Native communities.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments. This is a good amendment to this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 73 OFFERED BY MS. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 73 printed in House Report 115-830.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 156, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 221, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

Page 224, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$5,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, my amendment increases funding for community development financial institutions, CDFIs.

CDFIs are critical to New Mexican communities because they provide financial products like loans, investments, and tax credits to underserved communities, including poor, rural, and Tribal areas.

This helps New Mexican entrepreneurs obtain capital to start and grow small businesses. It enables pueblos to build housing, and it provides access to economic development opportunities for rural communities throughout my State.

There are currently 19 CDFIs in New Mexico, which have received \$48 million in Federal grants since 1996. In total, CDFIs have provided 14,700 loans worth more than \$830 million for New Mexico communities, organizations, and individuals. On average, every dollar in CDFI funding can be leveraged for 12 times that amount.

It should come as no surprise just how critical this funding is for the economic development of my State, which is still struggling to recover from the recession.

For example, when no other lenders would give them a loan, the Clinica la Esperanza in the South Valley received a \$31,000 loan from the Accion CDFI to provide much-needed primary care to residents in the South Valley. A few years later, the clinic received an additional \$76,000 from Accion to move to a larger location in order to serve a larger client base of 3,800 patients.

Another example of CDFI lending is Tiwa Lending Services, which provides loans and financial education to the Pueblo of Isleta and other surrounding Native American communities.

And just last month, Clearinghouse CDFI received a \$3.2 million grant to build affordable housing in several States, including New Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, the evidence is clear. CDFIs have proven to be successful drivers of economic growth and development in underserved areas. They create jobs, provide American opportunity, and stimulate growth.

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to increase funding for CDFIs to help spur economic development in communities throughout the country.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MR. PALAZZO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 74 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 156, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$17,000,000)”.

Page 157, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)”.

Page 158, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$4,000,000)”.

Page 158, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$3,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is very simple.

During committee markup of this bill, we were successful in adding a restoration of \$25 million to the CDFI fund. Because of the way the amendment was drafted in committee, this secondary amendment is necessary to designate the individual funds within the CDFI account.

The CDFI banks that this amendment seeks to assist provide essential financial products to underserved populations, often the poorest of the poor. Additionally, financial literacy education provided by CDFI banks is an invaluable service to our most at-risk and disadvantaged communities across the Nation.

Again, this amendment is purely clerical in nature and ensures that the \$25 million added at committee markup is equitably distributed between the separate CDFI funds so it can do the most good for our most needy.

Mr. Chair, I ask the House to pass this amendment to ensure these reach their intended recipients, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition, although I do not oppose the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment.

I was disappointed that this bill originally cut CDFI by \$59 million and was very supportive of the full committee amendment that Mr. PALAZZO offered to add \$25 million to the program, which passed with bipartisan support. This amendment simply allocates that increase among the various worthy programs in CDFI.

I am particularly pleased to note that the Bank Enterprise Award Program and Healthy Food Financing Initiative received some of the funding, although I would like to point out that this increase alone does not bring any of the individual programs to their enacted levels and still leaves CDFI \$34 million, or 14 percent, below the current level.

I urge support of the amendment and hope that we will be able to work towards getting the CDFI the additional increases it needs in conference.

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

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his remarks.

Seeing no other speakers, I would like to thank the chairman and ranking member for their support in committee for restoring the funds.

Mr. Chairman, I urge an “aye” vote on my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. PALAZZO). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 75 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 160, line 3, insert “(increased by \$1,000,000)” before “shall”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chair, my amendment would increase funding for the Tax Counseling for the Elderly Program by \$1 million.

For this amendment, we are not taking the \$1 million from any other account. Rather, there is a \$2.4 billion account for taxpayer services, and this simply adds to the carveout from that total for Tax Counseling for the Elderly.

□ 2015

This amendment is identical to an amendment I offered last year that passed this body by a voice vote, and I urge my colleagues to support this amendment again this year.

The Tax Counseling for the Elderly program offers free tax help for individuals who are aged 60 or older. Cooperative grant agreements are entered into between the IRS and eligible organizations to provide tax assistance to elderly taxpayers. These funds provided by the IRS are used by organizations to reimburse volunteers for their out-of-pocket expenses, including transportation, meals, and other expenses incurred by them in providing tax counseling assistance at locations convenient to the taxpayer.

This amendment will restore funding to this program at the level that passed both the House last year and the Congress in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2018.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment; I thank the chairman for his support; and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 76 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 160, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$500,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. SOTO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Chair, my amendment would increase funding for the IRS's identity theft and refund fraud casework by \$500,000. For this amendment, we are not taking the \$500,000 from any account. Rather, there is a \$2.4 billion account for Taxpayer Services, and this simply adds to the carveout from that total for the Taxpayer Advocate Services identity theft and refund fraud casework.

This amendment will restore funding to this program at the level that passed the Congress in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2018.

Last year, there were 597,000 tax returns with confirmed identity theft, resulting in \$6 billion in taxpayer refunds being affected.

Identity theft can be frustrating and confusing to victims. While identity thieves steal information from sources outside the tax system, the IRS is often the first to inform a victim that their identity has been stolen. The IRS is working hard to resolve identity theft cases as quickly as possible and has made considerable progress at closing backlogs; however, more work remains.

Fighting identity theft is an ongoing battle, as identity thieves continue to create new ways of stealing personal information and using it for their gain. Identity theft cases are among the most complex handled by the IRS. The IRS is continually reviewing processes and policies to minimize instances of identity theft and to help those who find themselves victimized.

We, as a Congress, should be giving the IRS the resources necessary to close backlogs and help our constituents as expeditiously as possible.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment; I thank the chairman for his support; and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 77 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Strike section 125 of title I of division B.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, this week President Trump's Treasury Secretary, Steven Mnuchin, decided that the agency will no longer collect information on donations to political nonprofits.

This administration will no longer require 501(c)(4) organizations to disclose their donors, including groups like the National Rifle Association, the NRA, that operates as a nonprofit, but also spends millions of dollars each year on lobbying and advertising to influence our elections.

This announcement comes the same week that the Department of Justice arrested and charged a known Russian foreign agent who had infiltrated the NRA, an organization that has received thousands of dollars from Russian nationals since 2015. The Treasury Secretary's decision this week only thickens the swamp by unleashing a new opportunity for dark money and money from foreign powers to continue to flood our upcoming midterm elections.

I believe that we need more transparency in our elections, not less. While super PACs are currently required to disclose donors, now 501(c)(4)s are not. If you were a donor looking to influence elections and wanted to hide your identity, the underlying bill is currently making 501(c)(4) organizations an even more attractive way to conceal contributions.

There is a provision in today's appropriations package that prohibits the IRS—from issuing guidance on whether an organization is operating exclusively for the promotion of social welfare purposes, as written in the IRS code for 501(c)(4) nonprofits, to ensure that no one is abusing our Tax Code to influence our elections.

My amendment simply strikes out that provision so that the IRS may issue guidance differentiating which groups are truly social welfare organizations with a charitable mission from political organizations abusing our nonprofit tax laws to hide their political donors from the public.

More and more, our elections are being driven by organizations that are

receiving hundreds of millions of dollars in unreported, secret donations. Dark money is strangling our democracy and silencing the will of the American people.

In the 2012 presidential election, dark-money groups such as these spent over a quarter of a billion dollars on partisan political advertising and other campaign activities. In 2014, we saw the greatest wave of secret, special-interest money ever raised in a congressional election.

Moreover, in 2016, dark-money groups spent nearly 10 times what they did the previous cycle, totaling over \$1.1 billion, and that pattern of undisclosed political spending continues to grow this year. These political nonprofit organizations are receiving tax-exempt treatment and are being allowed to corrupt Federal tax law meant to help social welfare organizations like volunteer firefighters, rotary clubs, and other community service groups.

Our current election laws make it impossible to know where this money is coming from or if it is coming from foreign adversaries, like we saw recently with the NRA. This amendment is not partisan and will only continue to allow the IRS to identify nonprofits that are spending significant amounts of their money to influence our elections, regardless of their party affiliation.

Mr. Chairman, at this pivotal moment in our democracy, I urge my colleagues who are serious about draining the swamp to take this small step towards increased transparency in our political process.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from California. We have carried this provision the past 3 years in this very same bill. In fact, it has been signed into law, not only by President Trump, but also by President Barack Obama. It has been bipartisan in nature.

Retaining section 125 continues the current state of affairs as we know it today on this very, very sensitive issue. The IRS has limited resources at this time, but a lot of demands on them. Taking this section away and impacting this regulation that clearly everyone hates—we should have the IRS use their resources for the things that it should be intended for: resources to improve customer service, to implement tax reform law that we recently passed, reducing tax fraud, and moving ahead in this new tax season.

Mr. Chairman, reluctantly, I have to rise in opposition and ask that we continue the current law as it stands today.

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the feedback from my colleague.

Mr. Chair, this will not detour or take away from the efficiency of the focus of work and spending of resources by the IRS. This only does a fundamental thing, and that is provide for more disclosure and transparency to ensure that the American public has sunshine on who is spending what resources through which organizations. This amendment merely provides that transparency.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I'll close with this. I appreciate the gentleman's sentiments towards how the IRS should use their resources.

Being a member of the Appropriations Committee and a member of this subcommittee my entire time on the full committee, I can assure you that the IRS is operating at a level that was not last seen since about 2011. Their resources are tremendously limited at this time, and we would prefer that they focus on customer service and implementing the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act that we recently passed.

Mr. Chair, I'll continue to oppose the gentleman's amendment, ask the House to do the same, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 78 OFFERED BY MR. KUSTOFF
OF TENNESSEE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 78 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 185, line 8, after the dollar amount insert "(increase by \$5,000,000)".

Page 221, line 13, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

Page 224, line 19, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$5,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment to increase funding for the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Areas program by \$5 million.

I have had numerous conversations with law enforcement throughout my district, and it is crystal clear that the opioid epidemic continues to be one of their primary concerns. Our drug task forces in the Eighth Congressional District desperately need these resources, as we have seen a spike in narcotics trafficking along Interstate 40 in Tennessee.

Mr. Chairman, I know that many of my colleagues are having similar discussions in their district, so they understand just how serious this issue is becoming for the safety and the security of the American people. It is no secret that the spread of illegal drugs throughout west Tennessee and across the Nation leads to higher crime rates, which ultimately increases the financial strain on our local, State, and Federal law enforcement.

We must do more to support law enforcement in this fight. This amendment will provide necessary funds for additional equipment and man-hours to conduct and carry out lengthy investigations to arrest these drug traffickers. The brave men and women in uniform are working tirelessly on the front lines to combat the opioid epidemic, and we can't afford to simply sit back and watch.

We also must think of the resources needed to battle the drug addiction epidemic, such as the opioid crisis. The extra funding will take major steps to target these high-risk areas in a front-end approach to preventing the spread of the opioid crisis in our communities. We must be proactive now, because prevention is the best long-term solution.

I am a former United States attorney, and I have seen firsthand how much these funds can make a huge difference in forward progress. I believe that funding the High Intensity Drug Trafficking Area program is a good first step to supporting our law enforcement and combating rampant opioid epidemics.

Law enforcement at the local, State, and Federal level have expressed support for this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to do the same today.

I also want to thank my colleagues, Mrs. COMSTOCK and Mr. MCKINLEY, for their hard work and support of this amendment.

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

□ 2030

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. KUSTOFF). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MRS. MURPHY
OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 79 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 246, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in support of this bipartisan amendment, which I am proud to colead with the Congressman from California (Mr. KNIGHT), the Congressman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK), and the Congressman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON).

This amendment would provide additional support for two important and successful initiatives overseen by the U.S. Small Business Administration.

First, it would increase funding for SBA Women's Business Centers by \$600,000. This amendment builds on a successful floor amendment I offered to last year's bill, which boosted funding for WBCs by \$1 million.

If our amendment is adopted, the House would provide a total of \$19 million for WBCs, a substantial funding level that I will work to retain when the House and the Senate meet to reconcile their respective bills.

There are more than 100 Women's Business Centers located across the country, each operated by a local non-profit organization that receives financial support from SBA and others. These WBCs provide business training, counseling, and mentoring geared to women, especially those who are socially and economically disadvantaged.

Every WBC tailors its services to the specific needs of the community in which it is located, but all provide training in finance, management, and marketing. They also help clients utilize SBA's suite of capital, counseling, and contracting programs.

My central Florida district is home to many talented entrepreneurs, and, yet, it currently lacks a WBC. If this amendment is adopted, it will increase the number of WBCs that can be established nationwide and increase the chances that a WBC will be established in the Orlando area. This would help many of my constituents start or grow their small businesses and, in doing so, further strengthen our local economy.

In addition, our amendment would increase funding for SBA's Veterans Outreach programs by \$400,000, from \$12.3 million to \$12.7 million.

Each year, SBA uses these resources to serve more than 200,000 veterans and their families, including service-disabled veterans. SBA provides veterans with business training and mentorship, and helps them obtain loans, apply for Federal contracts, and cultivate connections with commercial supply chains.

My support for these investments in our veterans is rooted in the belief that servicemembers have fought for our Nation, and, we, as a Nation, must fight for them, both while they are in the military and once they transition to civilian life.

Our amendment does not increase the total amount of funding appropriated by Congress in the bill, and it enhances support for WBCs and veterans programs without reducing support for any other priorities.

I thank the Rules Committee for allowing the House to consider this bipartisan amendment. I respectfully ask my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY). The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 80 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 248, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,000,000) (increased by \$1,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment. Employee-owned businesses are uniquely structured where the employer and the shareholders and the executives benefit, as well as the workers.

There are different forms of making sure that employees can participate in the success and capital growth of a company. Those include co-ops, cooperatives; ESOPs, which stands for employee stock ownership plans; stock options; profit sharing. There are a number of ways to do it.

But some of the key findings are that, over time, employees at employee-owned businesses, whether they are partially or entirely owned by employees, have greater success. The companies do better and the workers do better: higher wages; more savings for retirement; more sustainability; and more profitability as an enterprise, because it improves retention rates and employee morale.

I think that employee-owned businesses are an important market-oriented mechanism to reduce the wage gap between executives, shareholders, and workers. But it can be difficult for a business to transition to an employee-ownership model or a business structure that allows for accessing financing and capital markets to make that transition happen.

That is why I am sponsoring this amendment today to encourage the Small Business Administration to provide technical assistance, as well as education and outreach about existing programs, one of which is called the loan guarantee program, which is available to employee-owned businesses.

SBA loans are a critical resource for many small businesses, and the employee-owned loan guarantee program

is underutilized because a lot of lenders don't understand the unique nature of employee-owned businesses, especially smaller banks.

ESOPs can be a very compelling model, as can the other models of employee ownership. There are a number of successful employee-owned companies in the district I am honored to represent in northern Colorado, including New Belgium Brewing.

SBA loans are actually a critical part of helping companies make that transition to employee ownership, especially for small and midsize enterprises.

I encourage the adoption of my amendment to help employee-owned businesses access financing options that will help small businesses grow, and help our communities retain community, local employee ownership of small businesses. I encourage my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment to highlight the role that SBA can play in making employee ownership options a real-life occurrence for more companies and people across our country.

Mr. Chairman, of course, there are a number of pieces of legislation, many of them bipartisan, under the jurisdiction of different committees with regard to how we can remove barriers to employee ownership in our economy. But this simple one before us today would simply encourage the SBA to provide technical assistance under current authorized, funded programs, to help make sure that there is a greater awareness about the opportunities of employee ownership, both for economic productivity as well as for reducing the equity and wage gap in our country.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 81 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee for the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. CAPUANO), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 264, strike lines 13 through 18.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment strikes section 628 of the underlying bill prohibiting the Securities and Exchange Commission, SEC, from issuing rules on disclosures for corporations spending money to influence our elections, primarily through paid advertising.

The Supreme Court's 2010 Citizens United decision means that corporations, even foreign-controlled corporations, are now allowed to spend unlimited amounts of money to influence American elections.

Publicly traded corporations can buy millions of dollars' worth of TV, social media, and radio ads without disclosing their political expenditures to their shareholders. This outside spending in our elections has created a greater need for Members to raise more money for their campaigns and less time legislating.

This has eroded the public's faith in our institutions and is damaging to our democracy. Families in my district and across the country are concerned about paying their children's tuition or medical bills, not spending thousands of dollars to influence Federal elections. Their voices shouldn't be drowned out by millions of dollars of secret special-interest advertising from corporations.

A corporation's main goal is to make a profit, not to improve the quality of life for all Americans. They shouldn't have a say in our elections without their shareholders and the public knowing about it.

That is why we cannot muzzle the SEC's ability to issue rules regarding disclosures for publicly traded corporations on all their political expenditures. Stockholders and voters have been clear: They want to know the details of the political donations of the companies they own and give their business to. In fact, more than 1.2 million comments have been submitted to the SEC requesting that they require political disclosure by publicly traded companies. That is the largest number of comments on a rule in the history of the agency.

Congress should stop standing in the way of the SEC's mission, which is to provide transparency to the markets and the public. This amendment does not infringe on a corporation's right to spend money on political activity. It would just allow the SEC to disclose what money is being spent.

This is yet another opportunity for my Republican colleagues to prevent special interests from gaining even more pull in Washington and begin draining that swamp. This should not be a Democrat or a Republican issue, and it goes to the heart of our democracy and maintaining a government that is of, by, and for the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to adopt this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, since the courts have weighed in, Democrats have been attempting to use the securities laws to mandate the disclosure of

companies' political spending activities in order to name and shame companies from engaging in such free speech activity.

Time and time again, when the issue of political disclosure has come up as a shareholder proposal at every company's annual proxy meeting where it has been proposed, it has been shot down. It has been defeated.

In fact, according to Proxy Monitor, the average percentage vote in favor of a political disclosure shareholder proposal in 2016 was just 23 percent support. Shareholders have repeatedly weighed in against requiring disclosure of this information and do not believe it is important in making their own investment decisions regarding that company.

Our securities laws and disclosure requirements have always centered on the concept of materiality, as determined by the Supreme Court, whether an omitted fact is material by looking at "whether there is a substantial likelihood that a reasonable shareholder would consider it important in deciding how to vote."

In fact, under the Obama administration, former SEC Chair Mary Jo White declined to advance a political disclosure rule, stating it was "not one of the priorities we are advancing."

Additionally, former Chair White was vocal about ensuring that disclosures were not causing informational overload for investors. As a member of the Financial Services Committee, we heard repeated—repeated—testimony on that fact.

This provision to prevent the SEC from issuing a political disclosure rule has continually been part of appropriations packages that have been signed into law by Presidents of both parties and should continue to stay as part of this package.

□ 2045

Now, earlier you heard that the mission of the SEC is to provide transparency. Let me read exactly what the mission of the Securities and Exchange Commission is:

"The mission of the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission is to protect investors; maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets; and facilitate capital formation."

This simply does not fit into that tripartite mission of the Securities and Exchange Commission.

Now, with that being said, nothing—and let me repeat that, nothing—prevents companies from voluntarily reporting this information if they believe that it is important for them to make such disclosures or for their shareholders to also vote that way.

So all companies, private and public, should remain free to do just that: make that decision as they decide is the best course for that particular company.

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, this is not about shaming anyone. This does

not restrict free speech or the ability of corporations to engage in political activity. It only allows the SEC to require disclosure of corporate political spending, a little bit of transparency providing disclosure to the public, so that they clearly know the companies that they are investing their money in.

Moreover, more than 150 large companies, including more than half of the companies in the S&P 100, are disclosing their political spending already. Investors have filed over 300 shareholder proposals since 2011 asking companies to disclose political spending. This is all about transparency and protecting our democracy. We should not be scared of giving the public more information.

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Mr. Chairman, I will repeat a couple of things very briefly.

All of these proxy proposals have garnered 23 percent, average, support, so there is not widespread support among the investors.

And again, I will repeat that three-pronged mission that the Securities and Exchange Commission has: "protect investors; maintain fair, orderly, and efficient markets; and facilitate capital formation." This particular effort does none of those things, advances none of those things, and that is why I oppose the amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MR. ZELDIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 82 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be used to enforce section 540 of Public Law 110-329 (122 Stat. 3688) or section 538 of Public Law 112-74 (125 Stat. 976; 6 U.S.C. 190 note).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ZELDIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ZELDIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my important bi-

partisan amendment to halt the sale and marketing of Plum Island, New York, by the General Services Administration.

Situated at the gateway of the Long Island Sound, Plum Island is a treasure for our local community in both New York and Connecticut. As a critical resource for research, approximately 90 percent of the land on Plum Island has been sheltered from development, protecting the diverse ecosystem of Long Island Sound and critical habitat for migratory birds, marine mammals, and rare plants. With recorded history dating back to the 1700s, Plum Island is also an essential cultural and historical resource.

Since World War II, Plum Island has been utilized as a resource laboratory. The facility, which has been under Federal jurisdiction since 1899, has since grown to become what is known today as the Plum Island Animal Disease Center.

In 2005, the Department of Homeland Security, which currently has jurisdiction over the island, announced that the Animal Disease Center would be moved to a new Federal facility in Kansas. To offset the cost of this relocation, a law was enacted in 2008 that called for the private sale of Plum Island to the highest bidder.

The traditional interagency consultation process regarding the disposal of Federal property was bypassed, fast-tracking the potential sale of this island without consulting the local community or other Federal agencies. This statutory mandate was also based on a false assumption that a sale could offset the cost of the new facility, when the true value of the island, including cleanup costs, still are not clear.

The town of Southold, New York, has local jurisdiction over the island and has passed ordinances preventing any private development. This factor, coupled with the significant cleanup and environmental mitigation costs associated with closing this facility, gives Plum Island little to no commercial value.

Furthermore, according to a DHS report issued in April of 2016, the new site in Manhattan, Kansas, is already fully paid for through a combination of Federal appropriations and State funding.

Allowing for continued research, public access, and permanent preservation of the island is a priority shared by elected officials, conservation groups, and local residents on both sides of the sound.

The GSA must stop advancing the sale of this island and stop wasting taxpayer money on retaining expensive real estate firms in violation of the will of the people and in spite of pending litigation over this proposed sale.

This amendment allows Congress to use the power of the purse to stop the GSA from marketing or selling the island while we continue the fight for a permanent solution that will preserve the island for conservation and education.

Mr. Chairman, this amendment passed the House on a bipartisan vote in 2016 as part of Financial Services and General Government Appropriations. My similar stand-alone bill, the Plum Island Preservation Act, has also passed with unanimous support in the House now in two consecutive Congresses.

Mr. Chairman, I once again urge all of my colleagues to support this bipartisan amendment.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I thank my partners from Connecticut, ROSA DELAURO and JOE COURTNEY, for once again introducing this amendment with me. I also thank my additional cosponsors from New York, KATHLEEN RICE, TOM SUOZZI, and JOHN FASO. The broad range of bipartisan support for this effort throughout our region shows what an important gem Plum Island is for our environment and for our history.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 83 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available under title IV or title VIII of this Act may be used by the District of Columbia government to carry out the Health Insurance Requirement Amendment Act of 2018 (subtitle A of title V of the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Support Act of 2018; D.C. Bill 22-753).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would prohibit funds from being used to carry out the District of Columbia's Health Insurance Requirement Amendment Act of 2018. This is essentially the District's version of ObamaCare's individual mandate with a few important and troubling distinctions.

The mandate requires that all residents of the District of Columbia purchase government-sanctioned health insurance or pay what the District calls a "shared responsibility payment."

However, the mandate goes even further by allowing D.C. authorities to place liens on, seize, and sell the property of their residents if they are unwilling or unable to pay the tax penalty.

Let me repeat. If a D.C. resident chooses not to purchase the government-sanctioned health insurance plan or purchases health insurance that doesn't meet the District of Columbia's preferences, they will now have the authority to impose a tax penalty or seize and sell that person's assets.

But it gets worse.

Every plan available through the D.C. Health Link covers elective abortion, which means that the mandate forces individuals who don't wish to purchase this coverage to choose between violating their conscience and facing a tax penalty or, even worse, having their property seized.

I am sure you will hear objections to Congress meddling in District of Columbia affairs, but I will remind those objectors that Article I, section 8, clause 17 of the Constitution vests Congress, not the D.C. City Council, with the authority to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever regarding the District.

When the District of Columbia makes it a priority to force the residents to buy insurance coverage they neither want nor need, it is incumbent upon Congress to exercise their constitutional authority and prohibit the use of funds to carry out this policy.

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in strong opposition to this amendment interfering in the local affairs of the District of Columbia.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, you wouldn't know it from hearing the Member on the other side speak, but in 1973, Congress passed the bipartisan District of Columbia Home Rule Act, which created a locally elected government. According to the Home Rule Act, a central purpose of the act was to "relieve Congress of the burden of legislating upon essentially local District matters."

In his signing statement of the Home Rule Act, President Nixon wrote, "It will give the people of the District of Columbia the right . . . to govern themselves in local affairs. . . ."

Yet the bill before us would either repeal or block the District of Columbia from carrying out or enacting five local laws.

I filed amendments to strike all of these undemocratic riders, but the Rules Committee has blocked me from offering any of them on the floor, even though they all complied with House rules. I have gotten some of these amendments off in the past, and I intend to do so again, because this matter has to go to the Senate as well, Mr. Chairman.

Adding insult to injury, the Rules Committee allowed this and one other undemocratic amendment to be offered.

Republicans were not satisfied with sabotaging the Affordable Care Act by,

among other things, reducing the penalty for failure to comply with the individual responsibility requirement to \$0 in the recently enacted GOP tax scam. The ACA remains standing and popular, nevertheless, throughout the country.

Mr. PALMER has moved to sabotage, therefore, the District of Columbia's local health insurance market, too, and deny the 700,000 Federal taxpaying Americans who live in the District of Columbia access to quality, affordable health insurance coverage.

This antidemocratic healthcare amendment is offered by Mr. PALMER of Alabama, who doesn't live in and is not responsible to the people of the District of Columbia, but answers to another district. I doubt that Representative PALMER's constituents want him taking time from their business to meddle in the business of another Member's district.

This amendment would prohibit the District from spending its own local funds, consisting solely of local taxes and fees, to carry out a local District of Columbia bill that requires individuals to maintain health coverage or to pay a penalty for failure to do so.

I remind the House that three States have adopted this same approach.

In response to Republican efforts to sabotage the ACA, the District of Columbia, like States across the country, decided to do what they could and, in our case, convened a working group that consisted of businesses, providers, consumers, and insurers on how to preserve quality, affordable coverage locally.

In February, the working group unanimously recommended creating a local individual responsibility requirement—and I thought the other side was all about localism—and the District of Columbia Health Benefit Exchange Authority Executive Board unanimously supported the recommendation.

□ 2100

The District of Columbia Mayor then included an individual responsibility of requirement in her budget, and the D.C. Council debated and unanimously passed the Health Insurance Requirement Amendment Act of 2018, as required by Congress. Thus, D.C. will join three States in requiring residents to maintain health insurance coverage, and more States are considering doing the very same thing.

I urge Members to vote "no" on this undemocratic, offensive, and harmful amendment that would reduce enrollment in the D.C. individual insurance market by 15 percent, and increase premiums. I ask the gentleman to stay out of the business of my district.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Alabama has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chair, I want to applaud my good friend from Alabama, Mr. PALMER, and my colleague from North Carolina, Mr. WALKER, for their work on this particular amendment.

I couldn't disagree more with the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia. This is not about individual liberties. In fact, this amendment supports individual liberties. It keeps liens from being placed on property.

Quite frankly, Congress, overwhelmingly has supported repealing the individual mandate. And for some city to say that they are wanting to implement an individual mandate, it has nothing to do with healthcare. It has more to do with political statements.

And I can tell you that to have the particular initiative here in Washington, D.C., limit short-term health plans and, certainly, association health plans, it, again, is not about healthcare.

So I would encourage an adoption of the amendment and stand for liberty.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the other distinguished gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER).

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of this amendment.

In December, Congress passed historic tax reform that frees people from ObamaCare's erroneous individual mandate which punished lower and middle income families for not buying health insurance they don't want or cannot afford.

Well, how does D.C. respond? The City Council has now decreed that all residents must buy health insurance, no matter the cost or need. And listen, if you refuse, not only will you be financially penalized, but the D.C. government can seize your personal property. What?

The idea that a local government can force you to buy a private product just because of your zip code is unjust and un-American.

Congress, which has direct oversight of D.C., cannot allow the District to ignore Federal law and use politics to punish their residents.

I urge my colleagues to support the measure.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, how much time is remaining?

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CURTIS). The gentleman from Alabama has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlemen from North Carolina, Mr. MEADOWS and Mr. WALKER, for their support of this amendment. And I would just like to point out, as Mr. MEADOWS was pointing out, this is really about defending rights.

This amendment prohibits the District of Columbia Council from imposing on individual property rights. It denies people the option to buy less expensive health insurance and insurance that they want and need.

I would like to also point out that in ObamaCare, even there, there was no force imposed on people to buy health

insurance. They could pay the penalty, or they could apply for a waiver with the IRS and, literally, millions did that. At no time did ObamaCare pose a threat to people's property rights, as this amendment does.

So, Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to stand up for the rights of the citizens of the District of Columbia to protect their property rights and support this amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. MEADOWS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 84 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out section 1334 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chair, before I get into my amendment, I want to thank the chairman of the subcommittee and the entire staff for not only a very thoughtful bill that really requires very few amendments, but really working with Members of all different ideological stripes in our conference. And I look forward to being able to support this when it comes up for a vote tomorrow.

My amendment prohibits funds from being used by the Office of Personnel Management, better known as OPM, to administer the ObamaCare's multistate program.

ObamaCare required OPM to contract with health insurers to make multistate plans available to consumers in all the States, and D.C., by 2017.

Now, there is only one problem with that. There is only one State participating. And yet, here we continue to fund it.

The multistate plan program has failed to meet its statutory requirements. It has failed to generate competition in the healthcare marketplace. And it has failed to lower health insurance premiums.

According to OPM, the government has spent \$53 million on administrative costs for this failed program. The evidence is clear: This program doesn't work and it is a waste of taxpayer dollars.

In fact, the Congressional Budget Office and the Joint Committee on Taxation said eliminating funding for this plan will not affect the levels of competition or premiums in the insurance markets, nor would it affect any ObamaCare subsidies.

So my amendment does not take funds away from OPM. It leaves more money for OPM to continue its other mission-critical programs without having to waste the time and resources on a poorly-functioning multistate plan program.

I have got letters from the OPM, Office of Personnel Management, who administers the plan, supporting the elimination of this program. I also have a letter from the National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association, better known as NARFE, who represent the interests of more than 5 million Federal employees and retirees and their survivors, supporting the elimination of this program.

So finally, this program is widely viewed by analysts on the both the left and the right as either a de facto public option or a plausible foundation for a future public option.

The House should vote overwhelmingly to do away with this, and I urge my colleagues, both Democrats and Republicans, to do so.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. This amendment is another in a long line of attacks on the Affordable Care Act. It is, unfortunately, an example of Republicans turning to the appropriations process, instead of working through the appropriate channels via the authorization committees.

Weighing down bills with partisan riders does nothing but make it more difficult to enact these spending bills, especially in a timely manner.

Turning to the substance of the amendment, our constituents would be better served if we focused our efforts on extending quality, affordable coverage to more individuals, not eliminating plans.

Healthcare is an essential right, and a healthy America is a more productive, safer, and better place to call home. I suggest my colleagues vote "no" on the Meadows amendment.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have left?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from North Carolina has 2½ minutes remaining.

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman opposite with his articulation of opposition; but I find it

interesting because the last time I checked, he is not from Arkansas, which is the only State that actually is benefiting from this. And yet, his State, my State, and every other State is paying for this for the benefit. And I would use that word very liberally, because it is not really benefiting them. They just keep it there. It is not lowering premiums in Arkansas.

So at what time do we look at a failed Federal program and say enough is enough? I think that that day is today, and I urge all my colleagues to support this amendment.

I want to thank the gentleman for his leadership. I urge a vote in support of this particular amendment.

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

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

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 85 printed in House Report 115-830.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available under title IV or title VIII of this Act may be used by the District of Columbia government to carry out section 47-4471, D.C. Official Code, with respect to the liability of a taxpayer under section 47-5108, D.C. Official Code (as added by subtitle A of title V of the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Support Act of 2018; D.C. Bill 22-753).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of this amendment, a narrow amendment which simply prohibits any funds from going toward the District of Columbia from seizing property of citizens not in compliance with the District's individual healthcare mandate. It is a narrower amendment than the one we just debated.

My amendment does not take away the mandate. It simply says one of the remedies cannot be the seizure of property if an individual does not comply with the mandate to buy health insurance.

The individual mandate is, of course, controversial. Even Barack Obama opposed it when he was running in 2008.

In one of the debates in the 2008 primary, then Senator and Presidential candidate Obama said: "A mandate means that in some fashion, everybody will be forced to buy health insurance. . . . But I believe," then candidate Obama said, "the problem is not that folks are trying to avoid getting healthcare. The problem is they can't afford it."

He separately said:

If the mandate was the solution, we could try to solve homelessness by mandating that everyone buy a house. The reason why they don't have the house is they don't have the money. So our focus has been on reducing costs and making it available.

Regardless of what anyone on either side of the aisle thinks about a requirement to buy health insurance, it seems ill-advised and unjust to take away property from people that cannot even afford insurance.

I have to imagine that this was an oversight in writing the law, because surely no legislators could have intended such a harsh result.

I would note, Mr. Chairman, that in 2015, 6,902 residents of the District of Columbia were forced to pay the mandate penalty. Seventy-five percent of them made less than \$50,000.

I hope that my colleagues on both sides of the aisle will join me in supporting this commonsense measure, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chairman, I claim time in strong opposition to yet another amendment that interferes with another Member's district, indicating that there is more than one Member in this body that does not have enough to do at home.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from the District of Columbia is recognized for 5 minutes.

□ 2115

Ms. NORTON. A few minutes ago, we debated an amendment offered by Representative GARY PALMER of Alabama that would prohibit the District from spending its own local funds, consisting solely of taxes and fees, to carry out a local D.C. bill, the Health Insurance Requirement Amendment Act of 2018, that requires individuals to maintain health insurance coverage or pay a tax penalty for failure to do so.

This amendment before us now offered by this Member, Mr. ROTHFUS of Pennsylvania, seeks to weaken the coverage requirement by prohibiting D.C. from spending its local funds to carry out a method of tax collection in existing D.C. law to enforce the penalty.

Mr. ROTHFUS has plenty to do representing his own district, but is now venturing far afield into a district represented by another Member of the House of Representatives.

In particular, D.C. would be prohibited from using its local funds to collect the tax penalty by distraint, or the seizure of property to obtain payment, for failure to pay.

The District is not unique in authorizing distraint, and it is seldom used. I

can't think of when it has been used. The seizure of property to settle tax debt is standard practice for the Federal Government, States, and cities across the country, including, would you believe, Representative ROTHFUS' State of Pennsylvania.

Under title 53 of the Pennsylvania Consolidated Statutes, section 16031, Pennsylvania jurisdictions are allowed to collect taxes by distraint. I wonder if the sponsor has asked his own legislature to repeal that statute. Let him start at home before he tries to repeal something passed unanimously by the council of the District of Columbia.

It is true that the Affordable Care Act prohibited the Internal Revenue Service from seizing property to collect the individual responsibility requirement tax penalty, although it did authorize the IRS to withhold the penalty amount from future tax refunds, which amounts to the very same thing. However, each State and the District is free to authorize distraint to collect the local individual responsibility requirement tax penalty.

However, it is important to note, and I emphasize, that the District rarely seizes property to collect taxes owed. When it does, it does so only as a last resort. I can't think of when this has even happened. If a payment plan or settlement could not be established with a taxpayer, the District would first turn to remedies like withholding tax refunds or garnishing wages, not seizing a house or a car.

I am sure that is what happens in Mr. ROTHFUS' State of Pennsylvania as well.

I will not tolerate Republicans, this Member or any other, using the District of Columbia to score points with opponents of the ACA. They haven't been able to beat the ACA.

This amendment is one of several that constitute the most significant abuse of Federal power over the District of Columbia since Republicans took control in 2011.

So the ACA remains popular throughout the United States. They just can't bear that. So Mr. ROTHFUS moves on to the District, to see if he can do to the District what his side has not been able to do in the country for the ACA.

We found greater respect for democratic self-rule in the Senate in getting such riders removed. We intend to do so again.

Mr. Chair, I say to the gentleman, mind your own business.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this abuse of power, and I urge a "no" vote.

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, I would hope that the gentlewoman would realize that this amendment scores points for the 75 percent of the people who were subject to the penalty who made less than \$50,000 a year. That is what happens when we have the mandate.

And it is Federal policy now, Federal policy, that holds that people should not be punished if they can't afford to purchase health insurance. They certainly shouldn't be punished by having their property seized.

And if it is only a few people, as the gentlewoman says, I would wonder why she is opposed to this amendment.

This is the Federal city. It is Federal policy that people should not be so punished.

President Obama, when he was running for President in 2008, was pretty clear. He knew what would happen. He observed what was going on with the Massachusetts mandate. He said:

Now, Massachusetts has a mandate right now. They have exempted 20 percent of the uninsured because they've concluded that that 20 percent can't afford it. In some cases, there are people who are paying fines and still can't afford it. So now they are worse off than they were. They don't have health insurance and they're paying a fine. And in order for you to force people to get health insurance, you have to have a very harsh, stiff penalty.

President Obama understood that. He understood, as a candidate, that it would be wrong to seize property.

Again, when you look at the people who were being levied the penalty in 2015, when the ACA had a penalty, 75 percent of the people who paid the penalty in the District of Columbia made less than \$50,000 a year.

Again, President Obama as a candidate:

I think it is important to recognize that, if you are going to mandate the purchase of insurance and it is not affordable, then there is going to have to be some enforcement mechanism that the government uses. It may charge people who don't already have healthcare fines or have to take it out of their paychecks.

And candidate Obama said:

And that, I don't think, is helping people without health insurance.

Again, he liked to keep on going and talking about Massachusetts. What is happening in Massachusetts, then-candidate Obama said:

There are articles being written about it which are that folks are paying fines that don't have healthcare. They would rather go ahead and take the fine, because they cannot afford coverage.

Mr. Chairman, this is for the folks who may not be able to afford it, people making less than \$50,000 a year. They shouldn't have their property seized.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to accept this commonsense, narrow amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

ceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 86 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. MCHENRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 87 printed in House Report 115-830.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the United States Postal Service to—

(1) implement any approach in the report of the Office of Inspector General of the Postal Service on May 21, 2015, entitled "The Road Ahead for Postal Financial Services"; or

(2) carry out any pilot project pursuant to the report.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 996, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MCHENRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very simple. It would bar the United States Postal Service from expanding on its current offerings of financial services and banking products.

I think it is important that the Postal Service focus on its core business of delivering the mail. While the idea of postal banking is nothing new, it is still a terrible idea.

In 2015, the inspector general for the Postal Service took the highly unusual step in proposing that the Postal Service should expand its banking services in areas like prepaid cards, savings products, and money orders. Since then, postal banking advocates have used the report to argue that the Postal Service has the authority to offer more banking products, all without congressional oversight or consent. Recent reports indicate that these efforts include using a pilot program to implement this awful idea. That is the reason why I am offering my amendment.

To make things even worse, rather than proposing the idea legislatively, the current strategy of those advocating for postal banking is to institute the program via behind-the-scenes negotiation between government bureaucrats and liberal special interest groups.

This amendment draws a clear, bright line that says that no taxpayer money shall be used to subsidize these quiet attempts at making postal banking a reality.

Proponents of postal banking argue that it would help the under-banked in this country, but the simple fact is that socialized banking is not the answer.

Instead, we have to focus on working together in a bipartisan way around fi-

nancial innovation as the pathway toward financial inclusion.

Postal banking is a giant step backward. The Postal Service, as I said, should focus on its core mission of delivering our mail.

Postal banking would simply create yet another government program that fails to solve the underlying problem.

Further, if Congress does not step in and stop this now, we endanger our small community banks and credit unions that are already in trouble, while at the same time putting an additional burden on the American taxpayer, who will be stuck footing the bill for this horrible idea.

This amendment protects the American taxpayers from being forced to finance a terrible idea called postal banking. Its passage would also maintain the role of Congress in determining the fate of the Postal Service and postal banking, not government bureaucrats and interest groups.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, sadly, the provisions contained in this amendment would block the Postal Service from running a pilot program designed to improve operations and save taxpayers money, like allowing travelers to submit passport applications at post offices across the country. It would severely limit the potential of one of our most essential, constitutionally mandated government agencies, and hurt our communities and our citizens in the process.

I represent not only countless letter carriers, but thousands of Ohioans who rely on the Postal Service for timely delivery of their Social Security checks, electric bills, and birthday cards from loved ones.

Expanding the services provided at our Nation's post offices would achieve two ends: supporting a great Federal job provider, and helping our communities and citizens at the same time.

At a time when banks and other institutions are abandoning inner cities and rural communities, in my district alone, post offices present a perfect medium to collocate, including with traditional banks or credit unions.

For example, in my home State, 18.6 percent of Cleveland households have no checking or savings account, and 24.1 percent of households are under-banked, forced to use costly payday and auto title firms or currency exchange stores to cash paychecks or make consumer loans. More than 35 percent of Cleveland's 389,000 residents live below the Federal poverty line.

Many post offices are located in bank deserts. Fifty-nine percent of post offices are in ZIP Codes with either zero banks or only one bank branch.

By giving the Postal Service the opportunity to serve our communities in

a more expansive capacity, we could also put the Postal Service back on the right track financially, bring back hundreds of American jobs, and, in so doing, restore faith in one of our most fundamental government services.

The Postal Service is already providing an impressive, expansive, and affordable service to all the American people—and by the American people, by the way. I am fighting in Congress to support the hardworking employees of the Postal Service and our citizens, especially in underserved communities across not just my district, but our country.

It is really horrendous to go into communities that have no financial services, where people are being ripped off every day.

Mr. Chair, I hope my colleagues will join me in this effort and oppose this misguided amendment.

Mr. Chair, I yield my remaining time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a very able and intelligent Congressman.

□ 2130

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time we have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Ohio has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment which would limit the Postal Service's ability to offer products and services on a pilot basis that could help the Postal Service find its way to financial stability.

At a time when the Postal Service is bleeding red ink, this bill takes away existing revenue and potential revenue. In fiscal year 2017, the Postal Service reported a loss of \$2.7 billion, marking the 11th straight year in the red.

And just coincidentally, it got in the red because Congress, in 2006, restricted what the Postal Service could do. Well, it really worked well: 11 years of red ink, putting the Postal Service in insolvency, technically. To address the Postal Service's financial situation, the Postal Service needs financial relief, not further restrictions.

H.R. 6076, the Postal Reform Act of 2018, which I introduced with the gentleman from North Carolina, Congressman MARK MEADOWS, on a bipartisan basis, passed the authorizing committee unanimously, and we are hoping to take it to the floor, and that is where it belongs, in an authorization bill, not as a rider on the appropriations bill.

This bill even addresses issues raised by the gentleman from North Carolina's amendment. Under the Postal Reform Act, the Postal Service would have to limit any new nonpostal products and services to only those provided to State, local, and Tribal governments and Federal agencies. The bill would preserve existing nonpostal products and services.

However, this amendment is much more restrictive than that. This

amendment includes a blanket prohibition that would prevent the Postal Service from implementing any other recommendations from a May 2015 Postal Service Inspector General Report, including improving its existing range of financial services, such as money orders.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Ranking Member LOWEY, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chair, this amendment, as I said, includes blanket prohibitions that would prevent the Postal Service from implementing the reports and recommendations of the 2015 Postal Service Inspector General Report, including improving its existing range of financial services, such as money orders.

I might add, the assertions that have been made that there has been no congressional oversight, that is not true. My committee, the Oversight and Government Reform Committee, has had numerous hearings on the Postal Service, numerous briefings with the Postmaster General and her predecessor and his predecessor.

We have marked up numerous bills. We finally got one we could agree on, and it is pending. That is how this should be done—not piecemeal, not in a way that further constrains and circumscribes the Postal Service that can only lead to more red ink.

We are trying to save the Postal Service, which is mandated in the Constitution. It has a requirement for universal service that private sector firms do not. And we have allowed some pilot programs to see if they can work. They are not a threat to financial institutions.

So we are fixing a problem here that does not really exist, and we are going to do real harm to a Postal Service we have already harmed with the 2006 legislation Congress passed in a lame-duck session in the name of reform, and it backfired. It blew up, and it has done incalculable damage which we are now trying to repair to the Postal Service.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this unwarranted intrusion into the prerogatives of the authorizing committee that is doing its job and has a bipartisan bill that passed our committee unanimously, which is a remarkable statement for the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

We ought not to be legislating on an appropriations bill in this way with respect to the Postal Service. It deserves better, our consumers deserve better, Postal Service customers deserve better, and we can do better.

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

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from the American Bankers Association, the

Credit Union National Association, the Independent Community Bankers of America, and the National Association of Federally Insured Credit Unions in support of this amendment.

JULY 18, 2018.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN PATRICK MCHENRY: On behalf of our organizations and the Americans we represent, we write to express support of your Amendment to Division B, within the Financial Services and General Government section of H.R. 6147. This amendment would prohibit the use of any taxpayer funds for postal banking and financial services and prohibit the creation of any new pilot program that would expand this business practice through collective bargaining.

While the USPS serves an important role in delivering mail and packages, we are concerned about expanding the Postal Service's primary role and allowing the government to compete with the private sector. This would include lower fees, subsidized services and even competing based on real estate and office location.

Consideration of expanding postal operations to engage in banking and financial services is not a new concept. It has been touted as a solution to help stabilize the US Postal Service's financial practices. The cost alone to hire additional workers and retrain existing employees to offer banking products would further undermine the Postal Service's budgetary issues.

Additionally, we have reservations about the ability of the Postal Service to safeguard customers' identities and information such as bank accounts and passwords. Regardless of the federal agency, the government has shown it can be slow to react to cyber threats, allowing bad actors to access citizens' private records.

It is clear the US Postal Service's financial health is troubling. Expanding USPS's operations to compete with private sector banks and credit unions is not the answer. We, the undersigned organizations, support your amendment to H.R. 6147 and encourage its inclusion in the final appropriations legislation.

Sincerely,

Grover G. Norquist, President, Americans for Tax Reform; Tim Chapman, Executive Director, Heritage Action; Tom Schatz, President, Council for Citizens Against Government Waste; Adam Brandon, President, FreedomWorks; Brandon Arnold, Executive Vice President, National Taxpayers Union; Kevin Kosar, Vice President of Policy, R Street Institute; Andrew F. Quinlan, President, Center for Freedom and Prosperity; Iain Murray, Vice President for Strategy and Sr. Fellow, Competitive Enterprise Institute.

WHO SUPPORTS THE AMENDMENT?

American Bankers Association, Americans for Tax Reform, Center for Freedom and Prosperity, Citizens Against Government Waste, Competitive Enterprise Institute, Credit Union National Association, Freedom Works, Heritage Action, Independent Community Bankers of America, National Association of Federally Insured Credit Unions, National Taxpayers Union, R Street Institute.

Mr. MCHENRY. Mr. Chair, I also include in the RECORD a letter on behalf of Americans for Tax Reform, Heritage Action for America, Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, FreedomWorks, National Taxpayer Union, R Street, and the Center for Freedom and Prosperity, along with the Competitive Enterprise Institute in support of this amendment.

JULY 17, 2018.

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

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: On behalf of the members of the American Bankers Association, the Credit Union National Association, the Independent Community Bankers of America, and the National Association of Federally Insured Credit Unions, I write to urge the adoption of Congressman Patrick McHenry's amendment to the Financial Services and General Government (FSGG) appropriations bill to prohibit the U.S. Postal Service from providing banking services.

Financial institutions are strongly supportive of the Postal Service, as one of the largest mailers of any industry group in America. Physical mail remains an important communications channel for banks and credit unions. Financial institutions of all sizes use the mail to communicate with current and potential customers, to send statements and receive payments, and to market new products and services to their customers. Financial companies are also a vital revenue source for the Postal Service, generating billions of dollars of annual revenue that supports postal infrastructure. For these reasons, our members are committed to identifying long-term solutions to ensure an efficient, self-sustaining, and affordable U.S. postal system.

Postal banking is not one of those solutions. Although there have been a number of proposals over the past few years to turn the U.S. Postal Service into the world's largest shadow banking system, we are very concerned that allowing the U.S. Postal Service to provide banking services will be beyond the Postal Service's core competencies, will raise a number of serious regulatory and consumer protection questions, and will present significant competitive issues for private sector entities. Congress should encourage the Postal Service to focus on its core business of physical mail delivery, and not be distracted by expanding the mission to businesses outside of the Postal Service's area of expertise.

Most significantly, postal banking does not address the Postal Service's financial challenges, and may well make them worse. The U.S. Postal Service agrees. The Postal Service has strongly argued against authority to provide banking services, noting that providing these products would almost certainly cause it to lose money:

"The Postal Service's mission is to provide the American public with trusted, affordable, universal mail service. Our core function is delivery, not banking . . . Profit margins on these financial services businesses across the industry are very low . . . so even if we achieved \$1 billion in revenue and executed well, our cash position would only increase by an estimated \$100-200 million, which will not materially change our financial condition—we need to focus on the core delivery business."

The Postal Service went on to note that to the extent that more affordable pricing of financial services is a primary goal of postal banking efforts, "[m]ore affordable appears to mean at a lower price level than the free market provides today . . . Since established financial services firms make a slim margin on revenue . . . it seems unlikely that there is any significant room to lower prices without incurring a loss, and at a minimum, a lower profit margin."

No doubt, postal reform is a serious topic that Congress must confront. We encourage Congress to enact legislation that would re-

duce costs and increase efficiencies to put the U.S. Postal Service on a sound and sustainable financial path over the long run, but the provision of banking services is not an acceptable solution. We look forward to continuing to work with you on postal reform efforts in the coming months, but urge you to support Congressman McHenry's amendment to the FSGG appropriations bill to ban the Postal Service from providing banking services when it is on the House Floor this week.

Sincerely,

American Bankers Association, Credit Union National Association, Independent Community Bankers of America, National Association of Federally Insured Credit Unions.

Mr. McHENRY. Mr. Chairman, I submit to you that the Postal Service, as my colleagues across the aisle say, is a constitutional function. It is really important that the Postal Service do its mission of delivering the mail.

What we don't think we should do is give a government bureau, through a nonlegislative means, the right to expand into nonessential services for a part of the government that is bleeding money. An institution that cannot balance its own books should not be getting into the offering of credit or the movement of money and funds.

While I am in favor of postal reform, and while I support my letter carriers, I do not favor postal banking. I think it is important for this Congress to put a note down that we are in opposition to that, and that is why I urge my colleagues to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Ranking Member LOWEY, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I would just like to respond to the gentleman. The offer of this amendment should never be on an appropriation bill. This is one of these extraneous riders that belongs in other bills, and it is very damaging to the future of communities across this country, thousands of which lack banking services and financial services of any kind.

What we are talking about here is something simple. It is something very simple: a pilot program. We are not saying this is going to happen all over the United States. This gentleman wants to deny the ability of communities to have any kind of normal financial service where they have been redlined by the very letters that the gentleman just asked to be placed in the RECORD. Those very institutions abandoned the communities that we are seeking to serve.

I am really disappointed that the gentleman would want people to be subjected to usurious interest rates or to a lack of any kind of financial service, even paying your electric bill, for heaven's sake.

So, for two reasons, I ask my colleagues to vote against the gentleman's amendment: number one, it doesn't belong in this bill; and number

two, it does a great disservice to the people of this country. They have a right to better service.

The Postal Service is coast to coast. It is audited, it is properly staffed, and it is universal. Whether you are poor or whether you are rich in this country, you have a right. You have a right to be treated fairly by the institutions that this Nation manages.

Mr. Chair, I want to congratulate those who work for our great Postal Service. I ask that the gentleman's amendment be defeated, and let us support what is in the Constitution of the United States, which is respect for the Postal Service, coast to coast to every citizen.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman.

The Acting CHAIR. For what purpose does the gentlewoman from Ohio seek recognition?

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Chairman, you know, if they would operate these microphones for the Democrats as well as they operate them for the Republicans, maybe we could be heard on this floor, and especially for the women Democrats, I might add.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman's request for a recorded vote has been postponed.

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Chair, before we can conclude our debate, I wanted to thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member BETTY MCCOLLUM of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee for their work; and also the Financial Services and General Government Subcommittee Chairman TOM GRAVES and Ranking Member MIKE QUIGLEY for the great job they did; and for the men and women behind them that make up the professional and personal staff of the Appropriations Committee.

As of today, all 12 appropriations bills have been released. With the passage of this legislation, the full House will have halfway done all of our bills on the floor.

Mr. Chairman, we continue our momentum by passing H.R. 6147. I guess that will be tomorrow, and I urge support of the bill.

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115-830 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 43 by Mr. MULLIN of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 44 by Mr. MULLIN of Oklahoma.

Amendment No. 46 by Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS of Washington.

Amendment No. 48 by Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado.

Amendment No. 49 by Mr. LAMBORN of Colorado.

Amendment No. 50 by Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia.

Amendment No. 51 by Mr. GALLEGO of Arizona.

Amendment No. 60 by Mr. PEARCE of New Mexico.

Amendment No. 62 by Mr. PEARCE of New Mexico.

Amendment No. 63 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 69 by Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 70 by Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

Amendment No. 81 by Mr. CARBAJAL of California.

Amendment No. 83 by Mr. PALMER of Alabama.

Amendment No. 84 by Mr. MEADOWS of North Carolina.

Amendment No. 85 by Mr. ROTHFUS of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 87 by Mr. MCHENRY of North Carolina.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 215, noes 194, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 346]

AYES—215

Abraham	Biggs	Buchson
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Budd
Allen	Bishop (GA)	Burgess
Amash	Bishop (MI)	Byrne
Amodei	Bishop (UT)	Calvert
Arrington	Blum	Carter (GA)
Babin	Bost	Carter (TX)
Bacon	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Banks (IN)	Brat	Cheney
Barletta	Brooks (AL)	Cloud
Barr	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Barton	Buchanan	Collins (GA)
Bergman	Buck	Collins (NY)

Comer	Jenkins (WV)	Reed
Comstock	Johnson (LA)	Renacci
Conaway	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)
Cook	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Cramer	Jones	Roe (TN)
Crawford	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Cuellar	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Culberson	Kelly (MS)	Rohrabacher
Curtis	Kelly (PA)	Rokita
Davidson	King (IA)	Rooney, Thomas
Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	J.
Denham	Kinzinger	Ross
DesJarlais	Knight	Rothfus
Diaz-Balart	Kustoff (TN)	Rouzer
Donovan	Labrador	Royce (CA)
Duffy	LaHood	Russell
Duncan (SC)	LaMalfa	Rutherford
Duncan (TN)	Lamborn	Scalise
Dunn	Latta	Schweikert
Emmer	Lesko	Scott, Austin
Estes (KS)	Lewis (MN)	Sensenbrenner
Ferguson	LoBiondo	Sessions
Fleischmann	Long	Shimkus
Flores	Loudermilk	Simpson
Fortenberry	Love	Smith (MO)
Foxx	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Frelinghuysen	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Gallagher	MacArthur	Smucker
Garrett	Marchant	Stewart
Gianforte	Marino	Stivers
Gibbs	Marshall	Taylor
Gohmert	Massie	Tenney
Goodlatte	McCarthy	Thompson (PA)
Gosar	McCaul	Thornberry
Gowdy	McClintock	Tipton
Granger	McHenry	Trott
Graves (GA)	McKinley	Turner
Graves (LA)	McMorris	Valadao
Graves (MO)	Rodgers	Wagner
Griffith	McSally	Walberg
Grothman	Meadows	Walden
Guthrie	Messer	Walker
Handel	Mitchell	Walorski
Harper	Moolenaar	Walters, Mimi
Harris	Mooney (WV)	Weber (TX)
Hartzler	Mullin	Webster (FL)
Hensarling	Newhouse	Wenstrup
Herrera Beutler	Noem	Westerman
Hice, Jody B.	Norman	Williams
Higgins (LA)	Nunes	Wilson (SC)
Hill	Olson	Wittman
Holding	Palazzo	Womack
Hollingsworth	Palmer	Woodall
Hudson	Pearce	Yoder
Huizenga	Perry	Yoho
Hultgren	Pittenger	Young (AK)
Hunter	Poe (TX)	Young (IA)
Hurd	Poliquin	Zeldin
Issa	Posey	
Jenkins (KS)	Ratcliffe	

NOES—194

Adams	Crowley	Gutiérrez
Barragán	Cummings	Hastings
Beatty	Curbelo (FL)	Heck
Bera	Davis (CA)	Higgins (NY)
Beyer	Davis, Danny	Himes
Blumenauer	DeFazio	Huffman
Blunt Rochester	DeGette	Jackson Lee
Bonamici	Delaney	Jayapal
Boyle, Brendan	DeLauro	Jeffries
F.	DelBene	Johnson (GA)
Brady (PA)	Demings	Johnson, E. B.
Brown (MD)	DeSaunier	Kaptur
Brownley (CA)	Deutch	Katko
Bustos	Dingell	Keating
Butterfield	Doggett	Kelly (IL)
Capuano	Doyle, Michael	Kennedy
Carbajal	F.	Khanna
Carson (IN)	Ellison	Kihuen
Cartwright	Engel	Kildee
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Kilmer
Castro (TX)	Espallat	Kind
Chu, Judy	Esty (CT)	Krishnamoorthi
Cicilline	Evans	Kuster (NH)
Clark (MA)	Faso	Lamb
Clarke (NY)	Fitzpatrick	Lance
Clay	Foster	Langevin
Cleaver	Frankel (FL)	Larsen (WA)
Clyburn	Fudge	Larson (CT)
Coffman	Gabbard	Lawrence
Cohen	Galleo	Lawson (FL)
Connolly	Garamendi	Lee
Cooper	Gomez	Levin
Correa	Gonzalez (TX)	Lewis (GA)
Costa	Gotthelmer	Lieu, Ted
Costello (PA)	Green, Al	Lipinski
Courtney	Green, Gene	Loeb
Crist	Grijalva	Lofgren

Lowenthal	Payne	Sherman
Lowe	Pelosi	Sires
Lujan Grisham,	Perlmutter	Smith (NJ)
M.	Pingree	Smith (WA)
Lujan, Ben Ray	Pocan	Soto
Lynch	Polis	Stefanik
Maloney,	Price (NC)	Suozi
Carolyn B.	Quigley	Swalwell (CA)
Maloney, Sean	Raskin	Takano
Mast	Reichert	Thompson (CA)
Matsui	Rooney, Francis	Thompson (MS)
McCollum	Ros-Lehtinen	Titus
McEachin	Rosen	Tonko
McGovern	Roskam	Torres
McNerney	Roybal-Allard	Tsongas
Meeks	Ruiz	Upton
Meng	Ruppersberger	Vargas
Moore	Rush	Veasey
Moulton	Ryan (OH)	Vela
Murphy (FL)	Sánchez	Velázquez
Nadler	Sanford	Visclosky
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Wasserman
Neal	Schakowsky	Schultz
Nolan	Schiff	Waters, Maxine
Norcross	Schneider	Watson Coleman
O'Halleran	Schrader	Welch
O'Rourke	Scott (VA)	Wilson (FL)
Pallone	Scott, David	Yarmuth
Panetta	Serrano	
Pascrell	Sewell (AL)	

NOT VOTING—19

Aguilar	Hanabusa	Shea-Porter
Bass	Hoyer	Shuster
Black	Paulsen	Sinema
Blackburn	Peters	Speier
Cárdenas	Peterson	Walz
DeSantis	Rice (NY)	
Gaetz	Richmond	

□ 2203

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

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 346.

Stated against:

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 346.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 346.

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 346.

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “nay” on rollcall No. 346.

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. MULLIN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 215, noes 199, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 347]

AYES—215

Abraham Granger
 Aderholt Graves (GA)
 Allen Graves (LA)
 Amash Graves (MO)
 Arrington Griffith
 Babin Grothman
 Bacon Guthrie
 Banks (IN) Handel
 Barletta Harper
 Barr Harris
 Barton Hartzler
 Biggs Hensarling
 Bilirakis Herrera Beutler
 Bishop (GA) Hice, Jody B.
 Bishop (MI) Higgins (LA)
 Bishop (UT) Hill
 Blum Holding
 Bost Hollingsworth
 Brady (TX) Hudson
 Brat Huizenga
 Brooks (AL) Hultgren
 Brooks (IN) Hunter
 Buchanan Hurd
 Buck Issa
 Bucshon Jenkins (KS)
 Budd Jenkins (WV)
 Budzinski Johnson (LA)
 Burgess Johnson (OH)
 Byrne Johnson (OH)
 Calvert Johnson, Sam
 Carter (GA) Jones
 Carter (TX) Jordan
 Chabot Kelly (MS)
 Cheney Kelly (PA)
 Cloud King (IA)
 Coffman King (NY)
 Cole Kinzinger
 Collins (GA) Knight
 Collins (NY) Kustoff (TN)
 Comer Labrador
 Comstock LaHood
 Conaway LaMalfa
 Cook Lamborn
 Cramer Latta
 Crawford Lesko
 Cuellar Lewis (MN)
 Culberson LoBiondo
 Curtis Long
 Davidson Loudermilk
 Davis, Rodney Love
 Denham Lucas
 DesJarlais Luetkemeyer
 Donovan MacArthur
 Duffy Marchant
 Duncan (SC) Marino
 Duncan (TN) Marshall
 Dunn Massie
 Emmer Mast
 Estes (KS) McCarthy
 Ferguson McCaul
 Fleischmann McClintock
 Flores McKinley
 Fortenberry McMorris
 Foxx Rodgers
 Frelinghuysen McSally
 Gallagher Meadows
 Garrett Messer
 Gianforte Mitchell
 Gibbs Moolenaar
 Gohmert Mooney (WV)
 Goodlatte Mullin
 Gosar Newhouse
 Gowdy Noem
 Norman

NOES—199

Adams Cartwright
 Aguilar Castor (FL)
 Amodei Castro (TX)
 Barragán Chu, Judy
 Beatty Cicilline
 Bera Clark (MA)
 Bergman DelBene
 Beyer Clarke (NY)
 Blumenauer Clay
 Blunt Rochester Cleaver
 Bonamici Clyburn
 Boyle, Brendan Cohen
 F. Connolly
 Brady (PA) Cooper
 Brown (MD) Correa
 Brownley (CA) Costa
 Bustos Costello (PA)
 Butterfield Courtney
 Capuano Crist
 Carbajal Crowley
 Carson (IN) Cummings
 Curbelo (FL) Faso

Fitzpatrick
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Garamendi
 Gomez
 Gonzalez (TX)
 Gottheimer
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hastings
 Heck
 Higgins (NY)
 Himes
 Roby
 Jackson Lee
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kihuen
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Lamb
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lieu, Ted

NOT VOTING—14

Bass
 Black
 Blackburn
 Cárdenas
 DeSantis
 Gaetz
 Hanabusa
 Hoyer
 Joyce (OH)
 Peterson
 Richmond
 Shuster
 Speier
 Walz

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

□ 2207

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

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MS. MCMORRIS
 RODGERS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentlewoman from Washington (Ms.
 MCMORRIS RODGERS) on which further
 proceedings were postponed and on
 which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.
 The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
 The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 227, noes 185,
 not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 348]

AYES—227

Abraham Allen
 Aderholt Amodei
 Arrington
 Babin

Bacon
 Banks (IN)
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Bergman
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blum
 Bost
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Brooks (AL)
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Cloud
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comer
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Cuellar
 Culberson
 Curtis
 Davidson
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Donovan
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Dunn
 Emmer
 Estes (KS)
 Ferguson
 Fleischmann
 Flores
 Fortenberry
 Foxx
 Frelinghuysen
 Gallagher
 Garrett
 Gianforte
 Gibbs
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy

NOES—185

Adams
 Aguilar
 Amash
 Barragán
 Beatty
 Bera
 Beyer
 Bishop (GA)
 Blumenauer
 Blunt Rochester
 Bonamici
 Boyle, Brendan
 F.
 Brady (PA)
 Brown (MD)
 Brownley (CA)
 Bustos
 Butterfield
 Capuano
 Carbajal
 Carson (IN)
 Cartwright
 Castor (FL)
 Castro (TX)
 Chu, Judy
 Cicilline
 Clark (MA)
 Clarke (NY)
 Clay
 Cleaver
 Clyburn
 Cohen
 Cole
 Connolly
 Cooper
 Correa
 Costa
 Courtney
 Crist
 Crowley
 Cummings
 Davis (CA)
 Davis, Danny
 DeFazio
 DeGette
 Delaney
 DeLauro
 DelBene
 Demings
 DeSaulnier
 Deutch
 Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Espallat
 Esty (CT)
 Evans
 Fitzpatrick
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard

Gallego	Loeb	Roybal-Allard	Carter (GA)	Hunter	Ratcliffe	Kuster (NH)	Nadler	Schneider
Garamendi	Lofgren	Ruiz	Carter (TX)	Hurd	Reed	Lamb	Napolitano	Schrader
Gomez	Lowenthal	Ruppersberger	Chabot	Issa	Renacci	Lance	Neal	Scott (VA)
Gonzalez (TX)	Lowe	Rush	Cheney	Jenkins (KS)	Rice (SC)	Langevin	Nolan	Scott, David
Gottheimer	Lujan Grisham,	Ryan (OH)	Cloud	Jenkins (WV)	Roby	Norcross	Norcross	Serrano
Green, Al	M.	Sánchez	Coffman	Johnson (LA)	Roe (TN)	Larson (CT)	O'Halleran	Sewell (AL)
Green, Gene	Luján, Ben Ray	Sanford	Cole	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)	Lawrence	O'Rourke	Shea-Porter
Hastings	Lynch	Sarbanes	Collins (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Rogers (KY)	Lawson (FL)	Pallone	Sherman
Heck	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky	Collins (NY)	Jones	Rohrabacher	Lee	Panetta	Sinema
Higgins (NY)	Matsui	Schiff	Comer	Jordan	Rokita	Levin	Pascrell	Sires
Himes	McColum	Schneider	Comstock	Joyce (OH)	Rooney, Francis	Lewis (GA)	Paulsen	Smith (NJ)
Huffman	McEachin	Scott (VA)	Conaway	Katko	Rooney, Thomas	Lieu, Ted	Payne	Smith (WA)
Jackson Lee	McGovern	Serrano	Cook	Kelly (MS)	J.	Lipinski	Pelosi	Soto
Jayapal	McNerney	Sewell (AL)	Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Roskam	LoBiondo	Perlmutter	Suozi
Jeffries	Meeks	Shea-Porter	Crawford	King (IA)	Ross	Loeb	Peters	Swalwell (CA)
Johnson (GA)	Meng	Sherman	Culberson	Kinzinger	Rothfus	Lofgren	Pingree	Takano
Johnson, E. B.	Moore	Sinema	Curtis	Knight	Rouzer	Lowenthal	Pocan	Thompson (CA)
Kaptur	Moulton	Sires	Davidson	Kustoff (TN)	Royce (CA)	Lowey	Polis	Thompson (MS)
Keating	Murphy (FL)	Smith (NJ)	Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Russell	Lujan Grisham,	Price (NC)	Titus
Kelly (IL)	Nadler	Smith (WA)	Denham	LaHood	Rutherford	M.	Quigley	Tonko
Kennedy	Napolitano	Soto	DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Scalise	Luján, Ben Ray	Raskin	Torres
Khanna	Neal	Suozi	Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Schweikert	Lynch	Reichert	Tsongas
Kihuen	Nolan	Swalwell (CA)	Duffy	Latta	Scott, Austin	Maloney,	Rice (NY)	Upton
Kildee	Norcross	Takano	Duncan (SC)	Lesko	Sensenbrenner	Carolyn B.	Ros-Lehtinen	Vargas
Kilmer	O'Halleran	Thompson (CA)	Duncan (TN)	Lewis (MN)	Sessions	Maloney, Sean	Rosen	Veasey
Kind	O'Rourke	Thompson (MS)	Dunn	Long	Shimkus	Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Vela
Krishnamoorthi	Pallone	Titus	Emmer	Loudermilk	Simpson	McColum	Ruiz	Velázquez
Kuster (NH)	Panetta	Tonko	Estes (KS)	Love	Smith (MO)	McEachin	Ruppersberger	Visclosky
Lamb	Pascrell	Torres	Faso	Lucas	Smith (NE)	Rush	McGovern	Wasserman
Lance	Payne	Tsongas	Ferguson	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)	McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Schultz
Langevin	Pelosi	Vargas	Fleischmann	MacArthur	Smucker	Meeks	Sánchez	Waters, Maxine
Larsen (WA)	Perlmutter	Veasey	Flores	Marchant	Stefanik	Meng	Sanford	Watson Coleman
Larson (CT)	Peters	Vela	Fox	Marino	Stewart	Moore	Sarbanes	Welch
Lawrence	Pingree	Velázquez	Frelinghuysen	Marshall	Stivers	Moulton	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)
Lawson (FL)	Pocan	Visclosky	Gallagher	Massie	Taylor	Murphy (FL)	Schiff	Yarmuth
Lee	Polis	Wasserman	Garrett	Mast	Tenney			
Levin	Price (NC)	Schultz	Gianforte	McCarthy	Thompson (PA)			
Lewis (GA)	Quigley	Watson Coleman	Gibbs	McCaul	Thornberry	Bass	Gaetz	Shuster
Lieu, Ted	Raskin	Welch	Gohmert	McClintock	Tipton	Black	Hanabusa	Speier
Lipinski	Rice (NY)	Wilson (FL)	Goodlatte	McHenry	Trott	Blackburn	Hoyer	Walz
LoBiondo	Rosen	Yarmuth	Gosar	McKinley	Turner	Cárdenas	Peterson	
			Gowdy	McMorris	Valadao	DeSantis	Richmond	
			Granger	Rodgers	Wagner			
			Graves (GA)	McSally	Walberg			
			Graves (LA)	Meadows	Walden			
			Graves (MO)	Messer	Walker			
			Griffith	Mitchell	Walorski			
			Grothman	Moolenaar	Weber (TX)			
			Guthrie	Mooney (WV)	Webster (FL)			
			Handel	Mullin	Wenstrup			
			Harper	Newhouse	Westerman			
			Harris	Noem	Williams			
			Hartzler	Norman	Wilson (SC)			
			Hensarling	Nunes	Wittman			
			Herrera Beutler	Olson	Womack			
			Hice, Jody B.	Palazzo	Woodall			
			Higgins (LA)	Palmer	Yoder			
			Hill	Pearce	Yoho			
			Holding	Perry	Young (AK)			
			Hollingsworth	Pittenger	Young (IA)			
			Hudson	Poe (TX)	Zeldin			
			Huizenga	Poliquin				
			Hultgren	Posey				

NOT VOTING—16

Bass	Grijalva	Scott, David
Black	Gutiérrez	Shuster
Blackburn	Hanabusa	Speier
Cárdenas	Hoyer	Walz
DeSantis	Peterson	
Gaetz	Richmond	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2210

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

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 202, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 349]

AYES—213

Abraham	Barr	Brady (TX)
Aderholt	Barton	Brat
Allen	Bergman	Brooks (IN)
Amodei	Biggs	Buck
Arrington	Bilirakis	Bucshon
Babin	Bishop (MI)	Budd
Bacon	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Banks (IN)	Blum	Byrne
Barletta	Boat	Calvert

Adams	Connolly
Aguilar	Cooper
Amash	Correa
Barragán	Costa
Beatty	Costello (PA)
Bera	Courtney
Beyer	Crist
Bishop (GA)	Crowley
Blumenauer	Cuellar
Blunt Rochester	Cummings
Bonamici	Curbelo (FL)
Boyle, Brendan	Davis (CA)
F.	Davis, Danny
Brady (PA)	DeFazio
Brooks (AL)	DeGette
Brown (MD)	Delaney
Brownley (CA)	DeLauro
Buchanan	DelBene
Bustos	Demings
Butterfield	DeSaulnier
Capuano	Deutch
Carbajal	Dingell
Carson (IN)	Doggett
Cartwright	Donovan
Castor (FL)	Doyle, Michael
Castro (TX)	F.
Chu, Judy	Ellison
Ciulline	Engel
	Eshoo
	Españillat
	Esty (CT)
	Evans
	Fitzpatrick
	Fortenberry

NOES—202

Foster	Johnson (GA)
Frankel (FL)	Johnson, E. B.
Fudge	Kaptur
Gabbard	Keating
Gallego	Kelly (IL)
Garamendi	Kennedy
Gomez	Khanna
Gonzalez (TX)	Kihuen
Gottheimer	Kildee
Green, Al	Kilmer
Green, Gene	Kind
Grijalva	King (NY)
Gutiérrez	Krishnamoorthi
Hastings	
Heck	
Higgins (NY)	
Himes	
Huffman	
Jackson Lee	
Jayapal	
Jeffries	
Johnson (GA)	
Johnson, E. B.	
Kaptur	
Keating	
Kelly (IL)	
Kennedy	
Khanna	
Kihuen	
Kildee	
Kilmer	
Kind	
King (NY)	
Krishnamoorthi	

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

□ 2213

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California changed her vote from “aye” to “no.” So the amendment was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 213, noes 201, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 350]

AYES—213

Abraham	Biggs	Byrne
Aderholt	Bilirakis	Calvert
Allen	Bishop (MI)	Carter (GA)
Amash	Bishop (UT)	Carter (TX)
Amodei	Blum	Chabot
Arrington	Boat	Cheney
Babin	Brady (TX)	Cloud
Bacon	Brat	Coffman
Banks (IN)	Brooks (IN)	Cole
Barletta	Buck	Collins (GA)
Barr	Bucshon	Collins (NY)
Barton	Budd	Comer
Bergman	Burgess	Comstock

Conaway Johnson (OH)
 Cook Johnson, Sam
 Costa Jones
 Cramer Jordan
 Crawford Joyce (OH)
 Cuellar Kelly (MS)
 Culberson Kelly (PA)
 Curtis King (IA)
 Davidson Kinzinger
 Davis, Rodney Knight
 Denham Kustoff (TN)
 DesJarlais Labrador
 Diaz-Balart LaHood
 Duffy LaMalfa
 Duncan (SC) Lamborn
 Duncan (TN) Latta
 Dunn Lesko
 Emmer Lewis (MN)
 Estes (KS) Long
 Ferguson Loudermilk
 Fleischmann Love
 Flores Lucas
 Foxx Luetkemeyer
 Frelinghuysen MacArthur
 Gallagher Marchant
 Garrett Marino
 Gianforte Marshall
 Gibbs Massie
 Gohmert McCarthy
 Goodlatte McCaul
 Gosar McClintock
 Gowdy McHenry
 Granger McKinley
 Graves (GA) McMorris
 Graves (LA) Rodgers
 Graves (MO) McCally
 Griffith Meadows
 Grothman Messer
 Guthrie Mitchell
 Handel Moolenaar
 Harper Mooney (WV)
 Harris Mullin
 Hartzler Newhouse
 Hensarling Noem
 Herrera Beutler Norman
 Hice, Jody B. Nunes
 Higgins (LA) Olson
 Hill Palmer
 Holding Pearce
 Hollingsworth Perry
 Hudson Pittenger
 Huizenga Poe (TX)
 Hultgren Poliquin
 Hunter Posey
 Hurd Ratcliffe
 Issa Reed
 Jenkins (KS) Renacci
 Jenkins (WV) Rice (SC)
 Johnson (LA) Roby

NOES—201

Adams Crist
 Aguilar Crowley
 Barragán Cummings
 Beatty Curbelo (FL)
 Bera Davis (CA)
 Beyer Davis, Danny
 Bishop (GA) DeFazio
 Blumenauer DeGette
 Blunt Rochester Delaney
 Bonamici DeLauro
 Boyle, Brendan DelBene
 F. Demings
 Brady (PA) DeSaulnier
 Brooks (AL) Deutch
 Brown (MD) Dingell
 Brownley (CA) Doggett
 Buchanan Donovan
 Bustos Doyle, Michael
 Butterfield F.
 Capuano Ellison
 Carbajal Engel
 Carson (IN) Eshoo
 Cartwright Espallat
 Castor (FL) Esty (CT)
 Castro (TX) Evans
 Chu, Judy Faso
 Cicilline Fitzpatrick
 Clark (MA) Fortenberry
 Clarke (NY) Foster
 Clay Frankel (FL)
 Cleaver Fudge
 Clyburn Gabbard
 Cohen Gallego
 Connolly Garamendi
 Cooper Gomez
 Correa Gonzalez (TX)
 Costello (PA) Gottheimer
 Courtney Green, Al

LoBiondo Panetta
 Loeb sack Pascarell
 Lofgren Paulsen
 Lowenthal Payne
 Lowey Pelosi
 Lujan Grisham, Perlmutter
 M. M. Peters
 Luján, Ben Ray Pingree
 Lynch Pocan
 Maloney, Polis
 Carolyn B. Price (NC)
 Maloney, Sean Quigley
 Mast Raskin
 Matsui Reichert
 McCollum Rice (NY)
 McEachin Ros-Lehtinen
 McGovern Rosen
 McNeerney Roybal-Allard
 Meeks Ruiz
 Meng Ruppertsberger
 Moore Rush
 Moulton Ryan (OH)
 Murphy (FL) Sánchez
 Nadler Sarbanes
 Napolitano Schakowsky
 Neal Schiff
 Nolan Schneider
 Norcross Scott (VA)
 O'Halleran Scott, David
 O'Rourke Serrano
 Pallone Sewell (AL)

NOT VOTING—14

Bass Gaetz
 Black Hanabusa
 Blackburn Hoyer
 Cárdenas Palazzo
 DeSantis Peterson

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2216

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

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD-
 LATTE) on which further proceedings
 were postponed and on which the ayes
 prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 213, noes 202,
 not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 351]

AYES—213

Abraham Brat
 Aderholt Brooks (IN)
 Allen Buchanan
 Amash Buck
 Amodei Bucshon
 Arrington Budd
 Babin Burgess
 Bacon Byrne
 Banks (IN) Calvert
 Barletta Carter (GA)
 Barr Carter (TX)
 Barton Chabot
 Bergman Cheney
 Biggs Cloud
 Bilirakis Cole
 Bishop (MI) Collins (GA)
 Bishop (UT) Collins (NY)
 Blum Comer
 Bost Conaway
 Brady (TX) Cook

Flores LaMalfa
 Fortenberry Lamborn
 Foxx Latta
 Frelinghuysen Lesko
 Gallagher Lewis (MN)
 Garrett Long
 Gianforte Loudermilk
 Gibbs Love
 Gohmert Lucas
 Goodlatte Luetkemeyer
 Gosar Marchant
 Gowdy Marino
 Granger Marshall
 Graves (GA) Massie
 Graves (LA) Mast
 Graves (MO) McCarthy
 Griffith McCaul
 Grothman McClintock
 Guthrie McHenry
 Handel McKinley
 Harper McMorris
 Hartzler Rodgers
 Hensarling McSally
 Herrera Beutler Meadows
 Hice, Jody B. Messer
 Higgins (LA) Mitchell
 Hill Moolenaar
 Holding Mooney (WV)
 Hollingsworth Mullin
 Hudson Newhouse
 Huizenga Noem
 Hultgren Norman
 Hunter Nunes
 Hurd Olson
 Issa Palazzo
 Jenkins (KS) Palmer
 Jenkins (WV) Pearce
 Johnson (LA) Perry
 Johnson (OH) Pittenger
 Johnson, Sam Poe (TX)
 Jones Poliquin
 Jordan Posey
 Katko Ratcliffe
 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

NOES—202

Adams Kaptur
 Aguilar DeGette
 Barragán Delaney
 Beatty DeLauro
 Bera DelBene
 Beyer Demings
 Bishop (GA) DeSaulnier
 Blumenauer Deutch
 Blunt Rochester Dingell
 Bonamici Doggett
 Boyle, Brendan Doyle, Michael
 F. F.
 Brady (PA) Ellison
 Brooks (AL) Engel
 Brown (MD) Eshoo
 Brownley (CA) Espallat
 Bustos Esty (CT)
 Butterfield Evans
 Capuano Faso
 Carbajal Fitzpatrick
 Carson (IN) Foster
 Cartwright Frankel (FL)
 Castor (FL) Fudge
 Castro (TX) Gabbard
 Chu, Judy Gallego
 Cicilline Garamendi
 Clark (MA) Gomez
 Clarke (NY) Gonzalez (TX)
 Clay Gottheimer
 Cleaver Green, Al
 Clyburn Green, Gene
 Coffman Grijalva
 Cohen Gutierrez
 Comstock Harris
 Connolly Hastings
 Cooper Heck
 Correa Higgins (NY)
 Costa Himes
 Courtney Huffman
 Crist Jackson Lee
 Connolly Jayapal
 Cooper Jeffries
 Cummings Johnson (GA)
 Curbelo (FL) Johnson (E. B.)
 Davis (CA) Johnson, E. B.
 Davis, Danny Joyce (OH)

Rooney, Francis
 Rooney, Thomas
 J.
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Royce (CA)
 Russell
 Rutherford
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schrader
 Massie
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (TX)
 Smucker
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Taylor
 Tenney
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Olson
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Zeldin

Murphy (FL) Ros-Lehtinen Suozzi Heck
 Nadler Rosen Swalwell (CA) Higgins (NY)
 Napolitano Roybal-Allard Takano Himes
 Neal Ruiz Taylor Huffman
 Nolan Ruppertsberger Jackson Lee
 Norcross Rush Thompson (MS) Jayapal
 O'Halleran Ryan (OH) Titus Jeffries
 O'Rourke Sánchez Tonko Johnson (GA)
 Pallone Sarbanes Torres Johnson, E. B.
 Panetta Schakowsky Tsongas Jones
 Pascrell Schiff Upton Kaptur
 Paulsen Schneider Vargas Katko
 Payne Scott (VA) Veasey Keating
 Pelosi Scott, David Vela Kelly (IL)
 Perlmutter Serrano Velázquez Kennedy
 Peters Sewell (AL) Visclosky Khanna
 Pingree Shea-Porter Wasserman Kihuen
 Pocan Sherman Schultz Kildee
 Polis Sinema Waters, Maxine Kilmer
 Price (NC) Sires Watson Coleman Kind
 Quigley Smith (NJ) Welch Krishnamoorthi
 Raskin Smith (WA) Wilson (FL) Kuster (NH)
 Reed Soto Wittman Lamb
 Rice (NY) Stefanik Yarmuth Lance

NOT VOTING—13

Bass Gaetz Shuster
 Black Hanabusa Speier
 Blackburn Hoyer Walz
 Cárdenas Peterson
 DeSantis Richmond

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2219

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

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. GALLEGO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on the amendment offered by the
 gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO)
 on which further proceedings were
 postponed and on which the noes pre-
 vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 203, noes 212,
 not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 352]

AYES—203

Adams Dingell
 Aguilar Clay
 Amash Cleaver
 Beatty Clyburn
 Bera Coffman
 Beyer Cohen
 Bishop (GA) Connolly
 Blumener Cooper
 Blunt Rochester Correa
 Bonamici Costa
 Boyle, Brendan Costello (PA)
 F. Courtney
 Brady (PA) Crist
 Brooks (AL) Crowley
 Brown (MD) Frankel (FL)
 Brownley (CA) Cuellar
 Bustos Cummings
 Butterfield Curbelo (FL)
 Capuano Davis (CA)
 Carbajal Davis, Danny
 Carson (IN) DeFazio
 DeGette
 Cartwright Delaney
 Castor (FL) DeLauro
 Castro (TX) DelBene
 Chu, Judy Demings
 Cicilline DeSaulnier
 Clark (MA) Deutch

Dingell
 Doggett
 Doyle, Michael
 F.
 Ellison
 Engel
 Eshoo
 Españat
 Esty (CT)
 Evans
 Faso
 Fitzpatrick
 Fortenberry
 Foster
 Frankel (FL)
 Fudge
 Gabbard
 Davis (CA)
 Garamendi
 Gomez
 Gonzalez (TX)
 Gottheimer
 Green, Al
 Green, Gene
 Grijalva
 Gutiérrez
 Hastings

Heck
 Higgins (NY)
 Himes
 Huffman
 Ruppertsberger
 Jayapal
 Jeffries
 Johnson (GA)
 Johnson, E. B.
 Jones
 Kaptur
 Katko
 Keating
 Kelly (IL)
 Kennedy
 Khanna
 Kihuen
 Kildee
 Kilmer
 Kind
 Krishnamoorthi
 Kuster (NH)
 Lamb
 Lance
 Langevin
 Larsen (WA)
 Larson (CT)
 Lawrence
 Lawson (FL)
 Lee
 Levin
 Lewis (GA)
 Lieu, Ted
 Lipinski
 LoBiondo
 Loebach
 Lofgren
 Lowenthal
 Lowey
 Lujan Grisham,
 M.
 Luján, Ben Ray
 Lynch

NOES—212

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amodei
 Arrington
 Babin
 Bacon
 Banks (IN)
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barraçan
 Barton
 Bergman
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blum
 Bost
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Brooks (IN)
 Buchanan
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Cloud
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comer
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Culberson
 Gabbard
 Gallego
 Davidson
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Donovan
 Davidson
 Joyce (OH)
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (IA)
 King (NY)
 Duffy
 Knight
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)

Maloney,
 Carolyn B.
 Maloney, Sean
 Matsui
 McCollum
 McEachin
 McGovern
 McNeerney
 Meeks
 Meng
 Moore
 Moulton
 Murphy (FL)
 Nadler
 Napolitano
 Neal
 Nolan
 Norcross
 O'Halleran
 O'Rourke
 Pallone
 Panetta
 Pascrell
 Paulsen
 Payne
 Pelosi
 Perlmutter
 Peters
 Pingree
 Pocan
 Polis
 Price (NC)
 Quigley
 Raskin
 Rice (NY)
 Rohrabacher
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Rosen
 Roskam
 Roybal-Allard
 Ruiz
 Ruppertsberger
 Rush

Ryan (OH)
 Sánchez
 Sanford
 Sarbanes
 Schakowsky
 Schiff
 Schneider
 Schrader
 Scott (VA)
 Scott, David
 Serrano
 Sewell (AL)
 Shea-Porter
 Sherman
 Sinema
 Sires
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (WA)
 Soto
 Stefanik
 Suozzi
 Swalwell (CA)
 Takano
 Thompson (CA)
 Thompson (MS)
 Titus
 Tonko
 Torres
 Tsongas
 Vargas
 Veasey
 Vela
 Velázquez
 Visclosky
 Wasserman
 Schultz
 Waters, Maxine
 Watson Coleman
 Welch
 Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bass
 Black
 Blackburn
 Cárdenas
 DeSantis
 Gaetz
 Hanabusa
 Hoyer
 Peterson
 Richmond

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2222

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

AMENDMENT NO. 60 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

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

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
 minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 206, noes 209,
 not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 353]

AYES—206

Abraham
 Aderholt
 Allen
 Amodei
 Arrington
 Babin
 Bacon
 Banks (IN)
 Barletta
 Barr
 Barton
 Bergman
 Biggs
 Bilirakis
 Bishop (MI)
 Bishop (UT)
 Blum
 Bost
 Brady (TX)
 Brat
 Brooks (IN)
 Buck
 Bucshon
 Budd
 Burgess
 Byrne
 Calvert
 Carter (GA)
 Carter (TX)
 Chabot
 Cheney
 Cloud
 Coffman
 Cole
 Collins (GA)
 Collins (NY)
 Comer
 Comstock
 Conaway
 Cook
 Cramer
 Crawford
 Culberson
 Curtis
 Davidson
 Davis, Rodney
 Denham
 DesJarlais
 Diaz-Balart
 Duffy
 Duncan (SC)
 Duncan (TN)
 Dunn
 Emmer
 Estes (KS)
 Fergusson
 Fleischmann
 Flores
 Foxx
 Gallagher
 Gianforte
 Gibbs
 Gohmert
 Goodlatte
 Gosar
 Gowdy

Granger
 Graves (GA)
 Graves (LA)
 Graves (MO)
 Grothman
 Guthrie
 Handel
 Harper
 Harris
 Hartzler
 Hensarling
 Herrera Beutler
 Hice, Jody B.
 Higgins (LA)
 Hill
 Holding
 Hollingsworth
 Hudson
 Huizenga
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd
 Jenkins (KS)
 Jenkins (WV)
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jones
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)

King (IA)	Norman	Simpson	Scott (VA)	Suozzi	Vela	Long	Pittenger	Smith (NE)
Kinzinger	Nunes	Smith (MO)	Scott, David	Swalwell (CA)	Velázquez	Loudermilk	Poe (TX)	Smith (TX)
Knight	Olson	Smith (NE)	Serrano	Takano	Visclosky	Love	Poliquin	Smucker
Kustoff (TN)	Palazzo	Smith (TX)	Sewell (AL)	Thompson (CA)	Wasserman	Lucas	Posey	Stewart
Labrador	Palmer	Smucker	Shea-Porter	Thompson (MS)	Schultz	Luetkemeyer	Ratcliffe	Stivers
LaHood	Pearce	Stewart	Sherman	Titus	Waters, Maxine	MacArthur	Reed	Taylor
LaMalfa	Perry	Stivers	Sinema	Tonko	Watson Coleman	Marchant	Reichert	Tenney
Lamborn	Pittenger	Taylor	Sires	Torres	Welch	Marino	Renacci	Thompson (PA)
Latta	Poe (TX)	Tenney	Smith (NJ)	Tsongas	Wilson (FL)	Marshall	Rice (SC)	Thornberry
Lesko	Poliquin	Thompson (PA)	Smith (WA)	Upton	Yarmuth	Massie	Roby	Tipton
Lewis (MN)	Posey	Thornberry	Soto	Vargas		McCarthy	Roe (TN)	Trott
Long	Ratcliffe	Tipton	Stefanik	Veasey		McCaul	Rogers (AL)	Turner
Loudermilk	Reed	Trott				McClintock	Rogers (KY)	Valadao
Love	Renacci	Turner				McHenry	Rohrabacher	Wagner
Lucas	Rice (SC)	Valadao	Bass	Gaetz	Shuster	McKinley	Rokita	Walberg
Luetkemeyer	Roby	Walden	Black	Hanabusa	Speier	McMorris	Rooney, Francis	Walden
MacArthur	Roe (TN)	Walber	Blackburn	Hoyer	Walz	Rogers	Rooney, Thomas	Walker
Marchant	Rogers (AL)	Walker	Cárdenas	Peterson		McSally	J.	Walorski
Marino	Rogers (KY)	Walorski	DeSantis	Richmond		Meadows	Ros-Lehtinen	Walters, Mimi
Marshall	Rohrabacher	Walters, Mimi				Messer	Roskam	Weber (TX)
Massie	Rokita	Weber (TX)				Mitchell	Ross	Webster (FL)
McCarthy	Rooney, Francis	Webster (FL)				Moolenaar	Rothfus	Westerman
McCaul	Rooney, Thomas	Westerman				Mooney (WV)	Rouzer	Williams
McClintock	J.	Williams				Mullin	Royce (CA)	Wilson (SC)
McHenry	Roskam	Wilson (SC)				Newhouse	Russell	Wittman
McKinley	Ross	Wittman				Noem	Rutherford	Womack
McMorris	Rothfus	Womack				Norman	Scalise	Woodall
Rodgers	Rouzer	Woodall				Nunes	Schweikert	Yoder
McSally	Royce (CA)	Yoder				Olson	Scott, Austin	Yoho
Meadows	Russell	Yoho				Palazzo	Sensenbrenner	Young (AK)
Messer	Rutherford	Young (AK)				Palmer	Sessions	Young (IA)
Mitchell	Scalise	Young (IA)				Paulsen	Shimkus	Zeldin
Moolenaar	Schweikert	Zeldin				Pearce	Simpson	
Mooney (WV)	Scott, Austin					Perry	Smith (MO)	
Mullin	Sensenbrenner							
Newhouse	Sessions							
Noem	Shimkus							

NOES—209

Adams	Ellison	LoBiondo
Aguilar	Engel	Loebsack
Amash	Eshoo	Lofgren
Barragán	Españillat	Lowenthal
Beatty	Esty (CT)	Lowe
Bera	Evans	Lujan Grisham,
Beyer	Faso	M.
Bishop (GA)	Fitzpatrick	Luján, Ben Ray
Blumenauer	Fortenberry	Lynch
Blunt Rochester	Foster	Maloney,
Bonamici	Frankel (FL)	Carolyn B.
Boyle, Brendan	Frelinghuysen	Maloney, Sean
F.	Fudge	Mast
Brady (PA)	Gabbard	Matsui
Brooks (AL)	Gallego	McCollum
Brown (MD)	Garamendi	McEachin
Brownley (CA)	Garrett	McGovern
Buchanan	Gomez	McNerney
Bustos	Gonzalez (TX)	Meeks
Butterfield	Gottheimer	Meng
Capuano	Green, Al	Moore
Carbajal	Green, Gene	Moulton
Carson (IN)	Griffith	Murphy (FL)
Cartwright	Grijalva	Nadler
Castor (FL)	Gutiérrez	Napolitano
Castro (TX)	Hastings	Neal
Chu, Judy	Heck	Nolan
Cicilline	Higgins (NY)	Norcross
Clark (MA)	Himes	O'Halleran
Clarke (NY)	Huffman	O'Rourke
Clay	Issa	Pallone
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Panetta
Clyburn	Jayapal	Pascrell
Cohen	Jeffries	Pascrell
Connolly	Johnson (GA)	Paulsen
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Payne
Correa	Kaptur	Pelosi
Costa	Keating	Perlmutter
Costello (PA)	Kelly (IL)	Peters
Courtney	Kennedy	Pingree
Crist	Khanna	Pocan
Crowley	Kihuen	Polis
Cuellar	Kildee	Price (NC)
Cummings	Kilmer	Quigley
Curbelo (FL)	Kind	Raskin
Davis (CA)	King (NY)	Reichert
Davis, Danny	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)
DeFazio	Kuster (NH)	Ros-Lehtinen
DeGette	Lamb	Rosen
Delaney	Lance	Roybal-Allard
DeLauro	Langevin	Ruiz
DelBene	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
Demings	Larson (CT)	Rush
DeSaulnier	Lawrence	Ryan (OH)
Deutch	Lawson (FL)	Sánchez
Dingell	Lee	Sanford
Doggett	Levin	Sarbanes
Donovan	Lewis (GA)	Schakowsky
Doyle, Michael	Lieu, Ted	Schiff
F.	Lipinski	Schneider
		Schrader

NOT VOTING—13

Bass
Black
Wagner
Walberg
Cárdenas
DeSantis

Gaetz
Hanabusa
Hoyer
Peterson
Richmond

Shuster
Speier
Walz

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

□ 2225

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

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from New Mexico (Mr.
PEARCE) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the ayes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.
The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 216, noes 199,
not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 354]

AYES—216

Abraham	Conaway	Handel	Adams	Fitzpatrick	Matsui
Aderholt	Cook	Harper	Aguilar	Fortenberry	McCollum
Allen	Costello (PA)	Harris	Barragán	Foster	McEachin
Amash	Cramer	Hartzler	Beatty	Frankel (FL)	McGovern
Amodei	Crawford	Hensarling	Bera	Fudge	McNerney
Arrington	Cuellar	Hice, Jody B.	Beyer	Gabbard	Meeks
Babin	Culberson	Higgins (LA)	Bishop (GA)	Gallego	Meng
Bacon	Curbelo (FL)	Hill	Blumenauer	Garamendi	Moore
Banks (IN)	Curtis	Holding	Garamendi	Gomez	Moulton
Barletta	Davidson	Hollingsworth	Gomez	Gonzalez (TX)	Murphy (FL)
Barr	Davis, Rodney	Hudson	Gonzalez (TX)	Gottheimer	Nadler
Barton	Denham	Huizenga	Green, Al	Green, Gene	Napolitano
Bergman	DesJarlais	Hultgren	Grijalva	Grihalva	Nolan
Biggs	Diaz-Balart	Hunter	Grothman	Grothman	Norcross
Bilirakis	Duffy	Hurd	Gutiérrez	Gutiérrez	O'Halleran
Bishop (MI)	Duncan (SC)	Issa	Hastings	Hastings	O'Rourke
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (TN)	Jenkins (KS)	Heck	Heck	Pallone
Blum	Dunn	Jenkins (WV)	Herrera Beutler	Herrera Beutler	Panetta
Bost	Emmer	Johnson (LA)	Higgins (NY)	Higgins (NY)	Pascrell
Bradley (TX)	Estes (KS)	Johnson (OH)	Himes	Himes	Payne
Brat	Ferguson	Johnson, Sam	Huffman	Huffman	Pelosi
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	Jones	Huffman	Huffman	Perlmutter
Buck	Flores	Jordan	Jackson Lee	Jackson Lee	Peters
Bucshon	Foxx	Joyce (OH)	Jayapal	Jayapal	Pingree
Budd	Frelinghuysen	Katko	Jeffries	Jeffries	Pocan
Burgess	Gallagher	Kelly (MS)	Johnson (GA)	Johnson (GA)	Polis
Byrne	Garrett	Kelly (PA)	Johnson, E. B.	Johnson, E. B.	Price (NC)
Calvert	Gianforte	King (IA)	Kaptur	Kaptur	Quigley
Carter (GA)	Gibbs	Kinzinger	Keating	Keating	Raskin
Carter (TX)	Gohmert	Knight	Kelly (IL)	Kelly (IL)	Rice (NY)
Chabot	Goodlatte	Kustoff (TN)	Kennedy	Kennedy	Rosen
Cheney	Gosar	Labrador	Khanna	Khanna	Roybal-Allard
Cloud	Gowdy	LaHood	Kihuen	Kihuen	Ruiz
Coffman	Granger	LaMalfa	Kildee	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Cole	Graves (GA)	Lamborn	Kilmer	Kilmer	Rush
Collins (GA)	Graves (LA)	Latta	Kind	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Collins (NY)	Graves (MO)	Lesko	King (NY)	King (NY)	Sánchez
Comer	Griffith	Lewis (MN)	Krishnamoorthi	Krishnamoorthi	Sanford
Comstock	Guthrie	LoBiondo	Kuster (NH)	Kuster (NH)	Sarbanes
			Kyburz	Kyburz	Schakowsky
			Lamb	Lamb	Schiff
			Lance	Lance	Schneider
			Langevin	Langevin	Scott (VA)
			Larsen (WA)	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
			Larson (CT)	Larson (CT)	Serrano
			Lawrence	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
			Lawson (FL)	Lawson (FL)	Shea-Porter
			Lee	Lee	Sherman
			Levin	Levin	Sinema
			Lewis (GA)	Lewis (GA)	Sires
			Lieu, Ted	Lieu, Ted	Smith (NJ)
			Lipinski	Lipinski	Smith (WA)
					Soto
					Stefanik
					Suozzi
					Swalwell (CA)
					Takano
					Thompson (CA)
					Thompson (MS)
					Titus
					Tonko

NOES—199

Adams	Fitzpatrick	Matsui
Aguilar	Fortenberry	McCollum
Barragán	Foster	McEachin
Beatty	Frankel (FL)	McGovern
Bera	Fudge	McNerney
Beyer	Gabbard	Meeks
Bishop (GA)	Gallego	Meng
Blumenauer	Garamendi	Moore
Blunt Rochester	Gomez	Moulton
Bonamici	Gonzalez (TX)	Murphy (FL)
Boyle, Brendan	Gottheimer	Nadler
F.	Green, Al	Napolitano
Brady (PA)	Green, Gene	Neal
Brooks (AL)	Grijalva	Nolan
Brown (MD)	Grothman	Norcross
Brownley (CA)	Gutiérrez	O'Halleran
Buchanan	Hastings	O'Rourke
Bustos	Heck	Pallone
Butterfield	Herrera Beutler	Panetta
Capuano	Higgins (NY)	Pascrell
Carbajal	Himes	Payne
Carson (IN)	Huffman	Pelosi
Cartwright	Jackson Lee	Perlmutter
Castor (FL)	Jayapal	Peters
Castro (TX)	Jeffries	Pingree
Chu, Judy	Johnson (GA)	Pocan
Cicilline	Johnson, E. B.	Polis
Clark (MA)	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Clarke (NY)	Keating	Quigley
Clay	Kelly (IL)	Raskin
Cleaver	Kennedy	Rice (NY)
Clyburn	Khanna	Rosen
Cohen	Kihuen	Roybal-Allard
Connolly	Kildee	Ruiz
Cooper	Kilmer	Ruppersberger
Correa	Kind	Rush
Costa	King (NY)	Ryan (OH)
Costello (PA)	Krishnamoorthi	Sánchez
Courtney	Kuster (NH)	Sanford
Crist	Lamb	Sarbanes
Crowley	Lance	Schakowsky
Cummings	Langevin	Schiff
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Schneider
Davis, Danny	Larson (CT)	Schrader
DeFazio	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
DeGette	Lawson (FL)	Scott, David
Delaney	Lee	Serrano
DeLauro	Levin	Sewell (AL)
DelBene	Lewis (GA)	Shea-Porter
Demings	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
DeSaulnier	Lipinski	Sinema
Deutch	Loeb sack	Sires
Dingell	Lofgren	Smith (NJ)
Doggett	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
Donovan	Lowe	Soto
Doyle, Michael	Lujan Grisham,	Stefanik
F.	M.	Suozzi
Ellison	Luján, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Engel	Lynch	Takano
Eshoo	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
Españillat	Esty (CT)	Thompson (MS)
Evans	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Faso	Mast	Tonko

Torres Vela Waters, Maxine
Tsongas Velázquez Watson Coleman
Upton Visclosky Welch
Vargas Wasserman Wilson (FL)
Veasey Schultz Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bass Gaetz Shuster
Black Hanabusa Speier
Blackburn Hoyer Walz
Cárdenas Peterson
DeSantis Richmond

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2227

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

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 193, noes 220,
not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 355]

AYES—193

Abraham Diaz-Balart Jordan
Aderholt Duffy Kelly (MS)
Allen Duncan (SC) Kelly (PA)
Amash Duncan (TN) King (IA)
Amodei Dunn Kinzinger
Arrington Emmer Kustoff (TN)
Babin Estes (KS) Labrador
Bacon Ferguson LaHood
Banks (IN) Fleischmann LaMalfa
Barletta Flores Lamborn
Barr Foxx Latta
Barton Gallagher Lesko
Bergman Garrett Lewis (MN)
Biggs Gianforte Long
Bishop (MI) Gibbs Loudermilk
Bishop (UT) Gohmert Love
Blum Goodlatte Lucas
Bost Gosar Luetkemeyer
Brady (TX) Gowdy MacArthur
Brat Granger Marchant
Brooks (AL) Graves (GA) Marino
Brooks (IN) Graves (LA) Marshall
Buck Graves (MO) Massie
Bucshon Griffith Mast
Budd Grothman McCarthy
Burgess Guthrie McCaul
Byrne Handel McClintock
Calvert Harper McKinley
Carter (GA) Harris McMorris
Carter (TX) Hartzler Rodgers
Chabot Hensarling Meadows
Cheney Hice, Jody B. Messer
Cloud Higgins (LA) Mitchell
Cole Hill Moolenaar
Collins (GA) Holding Mooney (WV)
Collins (NY) Hollingsworth Mullin
Comer Hudson Newhouse
Conaway Huizenga Noem
Cook Hultgren Norman
Cramer Hunter Nunes
Culberson Issa Olson
Curtis Jenkins (KS) Palazzo
Davidson Jenkins (WV) Palmer
Davis, Rodney Johnson (LA) Pearce
Denham Johnson (OH) Perry
DesJarlais Johnson, Sam Pittenger

Poe (TX) Russell
Posey Rutherford
Ratcliffe Sanford
Reed Scalise
Renacci Schweikert
Rice (SC) Scott, Austin
Roby Sensenbrenner
Roe (TN) Sessions
Rogers (AL) Shimkus
Rogers (KY) Smith (MO)
Rohrabacher Smith (NE)
Rokita Smith (TX)
Rooney, Francis Smucker
Rooney, Thomas Stewart
J. Tenney
Ross Thompson (PA)
Rothfus Thornberry
Rouzer Valadao
Royce (CA) Wagner

NOES—220

Adams Gallego Neal
Aguilar Garamendi Nolan
Barragán Gomez Norcross
Beatty Gonzalez (TX) O'Halleran
Bera Gottheimer O'Rourke
Beyer Green, Al Pallone
Bilirakis Green, Gene Panetta
Bishop (GA) Grijalva Pascarell
Blumenauer Gutiérrez Paulsen
Blunt Rochester Hastings Payne
Bonamici Heck Pelosi
Boyle, Brendan Herrera Beutler Perlmutter
F. Higgins (NY)
Brady (PA) Himes Pingree
Brown (MD) Huffman Pocan
Brownley (CA) Hurd Poliquin
Buchanan Jackson Lee Polis
Bustos Jayapal Price (NC)
Butterfield Jeffries Quigley
Capuano Johnson (GA) Raskin
Carbajal Johnson, E. B. Reichert
Carson (IN) Jones Rice (NY)
Cartwright Joyce (OH) Ros-Lehtinen
Castor (FL) Kaptur Rosen
Castro (TX) Katko Roskam
Chu, Judy Keating Roybal-Allard
Cicilline Kelly (IL) Ruiz
Clark (MA) Kennedy Ruppertsberger
Clarke (NY) Khanna Rush
Clay Kihuen Ryan (OH)
Cleaver Kildee Sánchez
Clyburn Kilmer Sarbanes
Coffman Kind Schakowsky
Cohen King (NY) Schiff
Comstock Knight Schneider
Connolly Krishnamoorthi Schrader
Cooper Kuster (NH) Scott (VA)
Correa Lamb Scott, David
Costa Lance Serrano
Costello (PA) Langevin Sewell (AL)
Courtney Larsen (WA) Shea-Porter
Crist Larson (CT) Sherman
Crowley Lawrence Simpson
Cuellar Lawson (FL) Sinema
Cummings Lee Sires
Curbelo (FL) Levin Smith (NJ)
Davis (CA) Lewis (GA) Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny Lieu, Ted Soto
DeFazio Lipinski Stefanik
DeGette LoBiondo Stivers
Delaney Loeb sack Suozzi
DeLauro Lofgren Swalwell (CA)
DelBene Lowenthal Takano
Demings Lowey Taylor
DeSaulnier Lujan Grisham, Thompson (CA)
Deutch M. Thompson (MS)
Dingell Luján, Ben Ray Titus
Doggett Lynch Tonko
Donovan Maloney, Torres
Doyle, Michael Carolyn B. Trott
F. Maloney, Sean Tsongas
Ellison Matsui Turner
Engel McCollum Upton
Eshoo McEachin Vargas
Españall McGovern Veasey
Esty (CT) McHenry Vela
Evans McNerney Velázquez
Faso McSally Visclosky
Fitzpatrick Meeks Wasserman
Fortenberry Meng Schultz
Foster Moore Waters, Maxine
Frankel (FL) Moulton Watson Coleman
Frelinghuysen Murphy (FL) Welch
Nadler Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth Napolitano

NOT VOTING—15

Bass DeSantis Richmond
Black Gaetz Shuster
Blackburn Hanabusa Speier
Cárdenas Hoyer Tipton
Crawford Peterson Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2231

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

AMENDMENT NO. 69 OFFERED BY MR. JODY B. HICE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B.
HICE) on which further proceedings
were postponed and on which the noes
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 174, noes 240,
not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 356]

AYES—174

Abraham Fortenberry Loudermilk
Aderholt Gallagher Love
Allen Garrett Luetkemeyer
Amash Gianforte Marchant
Arrington Gibbs Marino
Babin Gohmert Marshall
Banks (IN) Gonzalez (TX) Massie
Barletta Goodlatte Mast
Barr Gosar McCarthy
Barton Gowdy McCaul
Bergman Granger McClintock
Biggs Graves (GA) McHenry
Bilirakis Graves (LA) McMorris
Bishop (MI) Graves (MO) Rodgers
Bishop (UT) Griffith Meadows
Blum Grothman Messer
Bost Guthrie Mitchell
Brady (TX) Handel Mooney (WV)
Brat Harper Mullin
Brooks (AL) Harris Newhouse
Brooks (IN) Hartzler Noem
Buck Hensarling Norman
Budd Hice, Jody B. Olson
Burgess Higgins (LA) Palazzo
Byrne Hill Palmer
Carter (GA) Holding Pearce
Carter (TX) Hudson Perry
Chabot Huizenga Pittenger
Cheney Hultgren Poe (TX)
Cloud Hunter Poliquin
Collins (GA) Issa Posey
Comer Jenkins (KS) Ratcliffe
Comstock Johnson (LA) Renacci
Conaway Johnson (OH) Rice (SC)
Cook Johnson, Sam Roe (TN)
Cramer Jones Rogers (AL)
Crawford Jordan Rohrabacher
Culberson Kelly (MS) Rokita
Curtis Kelly (PA) Rooney, Francis
Davidson King (IA) Rooney, Thomas
DesJarlais Kinzinger J.
Duffy Kustoff (TN) Ross
Duncan (SC) Labrador Rothfus
Duncan (TN) LaHood Rouzer
Dunn LaMalfa Russell
Emmer Lamborn Sanford
Estes (KS) Latta Scalise
Ferguson Johnson (LA) Lesko Schweikert
Fleischmann Lewis (MN) Scott, Austin
Flores Long Sensenbrenner

Sessions
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stewart
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Wagner

Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Nolan
Peterson

Richmond
Shuster

Speier
Walz

Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas
J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Simpson

Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden

Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)

NOES—240

Adams
Aguilar
Amodei
Bacon
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Bustos
Butterfield
Calvert
Capuano
Carbal
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole
Collins (NY)
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard

Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hollingsworth
Huffman
Hurd
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Joyce (OH)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lucas
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
McSally
Meeks
Meng
Moolenaar
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran

O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Roby
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Kaptur
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Stefanik
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walden
Wasserman
Schultz
Walters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Womack
Yarmuth

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Blum
Bost
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cloud
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer

Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Fox
Frelinghuysen
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador

LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbal
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael
F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Españillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Schiff
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham,
M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)

Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Stefanik
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Walters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—14

Bass
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Cárdenas

DeSantis
Gaetz
Hanabusa
Hoyer
Peterson

Richmond
Shuster
Speier
Walz

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

□ 2233

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

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. SMITH OF
MISSOURI

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on the amendment offered by the
gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH)
on which further proceedings were
postponed and on which the ayes pre-
vailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-
minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 215, noes 199,
not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 357]

AYES—215

NOES—199

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

2236

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 190, noes 224, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 358]

AYES—190

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

Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine

Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)

NOES—224

Abraham	Graves (LA)
Aderholt	Graves (MO)
Allen	Griffith
Amash	Grothman
Amodei	Guthrie
Arrington	Handel
Babin	Harper
Banks (IN)	Hartzler
Barletta	Hensarling
Barr	Herrera Beutler
Barton	Hice, Jody B.
Bergman	Higgins (LA)
Biggs	Hill
Bilirakis	Holding
Bishop (MI)	Hollingsworth
Bishop (UT)	Hudson
Blum	Huizenga
Bost	Hultgren
Brat	Hunter
Brooks (AL)	Hurd
Brooks (IN)	Issa
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)
Buck	Jenkins (WV)
Bucshon	Johnson (LA)
Budd	Johnson (OH)
Burgess	Johnson, Sam
Byrne	Jordan
Calvert	Joyce (OH)
Carter (GA)	Katko
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)
Chabot	Kelly (PA)
Cheney	King (IA)
Cloud	King (NY)
Coffman	Kinzinger
Cole	Knight
Collins (GA)	Kustoff (TN)
Collins (NY)	Labrador
Comstock	LaHood
Conaway	LaMalfa
Cook	Lamborn
Costello (PA)	Lance
Cramer	Latta
Crawford	Lesko
Culberson	Lewis (MN)
Curbelo (FL)	LoBiondo
Curtis	Long
Davidson	Loudermilk
Havis, Rodney	Love
Denham	Lucas
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer
Diaz-Balart	MacArthur
Donovan	Marchant
Duffy	Marino
Duncan (SC)	Marshall
Duncan (TN)	Masie
Dunn	Mast
Emmer	McCarthy
Estes (KS)	McCaul
Faso	McClintock
Ferguson	McHenry
Fitzpatrick	McKinley
Fleischmann	McMorris
Flores	Rodgers
Fortenberry	McNerney
Fox	McSally
Frelinghuysen	Meadows
Gallagher	Messer
Garrett	Mitchell
Gianforte	Moolenaar
Gibbs	Mooney (WV)
Gohmert	Mullin
Goodlatte	Newhouse
Gosar	Noem
Gowdy	Norman
Granger	Nunes
Graves (GA)	Olson

NOT VOTING—14

Bass	DeSantis	Richmond
Black	Gaetz	Shuster
Blackburn	Hanabusa	Speier
Brady (TX)	Hoyer	Walz
Cárdenas	Peterson	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

2239

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

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 226, noes 189, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 359]

AYES—226

Palazzo	Abraham	Gianforte	McHenry
Palmer	Aderholt	Gibbs	McKinley
Paulsen	Allen	Gohmert	McMorris
Pearce	Amash	Goodlatte	Rodgers
Perry	Amodei	Gosar	McSally
Pittenger	Arrington	Gowdy	Meadows
Poe (TX)	Babin	Granger	Messer
Posey	Bacon	Graves (GA)	Mitchell
Ratcliffe	Banks (IN)	Graves (LA)	Moolenaar
Reed	Barletta	Graves (MO)	Mooney (WV)
Reichert	Barr	Griffith	Mullin
Renacci	Barton	Grothman	Mullin
Rice (SC)	Bergman	Guthrie	Noem
Roby	Biggs	Handel	Norman
Roe (TN)	Bilirakis	Harper	Nunes
Rogers (AL)	Bishop (MI)	Harris	Olson
Rogers (KY)	Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Palazzo
Rohrabacher	Blum	Hensarling	Palmer
Rokita	Bost	Herrera Beutler	Paulsen
Rooney, Francis	Brady (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Pearce
Rooney, Thomas J.	Brat	Higgins (LA)	Perry
Ros-Lehtinen	Brooks (AL)	Hill	Pittenger
Roskam	Brooks (IN)	Holding	Poe (TX)
Ross	Buchanan	Hollingsworth	Poliquin
Rothfus	Buck	Hudson	Posey
Rouzer	Bucshon	Huizenga	Ratcliffe
Royce (CA)	Budd	Hultgren	Reed
Russell	Burgess	Hunter	Reichert
Rutherford	Byrne	Hurd	Renacci
Rutherford	Calvert	Issa	Rice (SC)
Russell	Carter (GA)	Jenkins (KS)	Roby
Rutherford	Carter (TX)	Jenkins (WV)	Roe (TN)
Sanford	Chabot	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Scalise	Cheney	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (KY)
Schweikert	Cloud	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Sensenbrenner	Coffman	Jones	Rokita
Sessions	Cole	Jordan	Rooney, Francis
Shimkus	Collins (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Rooney, Thomas J.
Simpson	Collins (NY)	Katko	Roskam
Smith (MO)	Comer	Kelly (MS)	Ross
Smith (NE)	Comstock	Kelly (PA)	Rothfus
Smith (NJ)	Conaway	King (IA)	Rouzer
Smith (TX)	Cook	King (NY)	Royce (CA)
Smucker	Costello (PA)	Kinzinger	Russell
Stefanik	Cramer	Knight	Rutherford
Stewart	Crawford	Kustoff (TN)	Sanford
Stivers	Culberson	Labrador	Scalise
Taylor	Curbelo (FL)	LaHood	Schweikert
Tenney	Curtis	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Thompson (PA)	Davidson	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Thornberry	Davis, Rodney	Lance	Sessions
Tipton	Denham	Latta	Shimkus
Trott	DesJarlais	Lesko	Simpson
Turner	Diaz-Balart	Lewis (MN)	Smith (MO)
Upton	Donovan	LoBiondo	Smith (NE)
Valadao	Duffy	Long	Smith (NJ)
Walberg	Duncan (SC)	Loudermilk	Smith (TX)
Walder	Duncan (TN)	Love	Smucker
Walker	Dunn	Lucas	Stefanik
Walorski	Emmer	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Walters, Mimi	Estes (KS)	MacArthur	Stivers
Webster (FL)	Ferguson	Marchant	Taylor
Webster (FL)	Fleischmann	Marino	Tenney
Webster (FL)	Flores	Marshall	Thompson (PA)
Wenstrup	Fortenberry	Thornberry	Thornberry
Westerman	Fox	Mast	Tipton
Williams	Frelinghuysen	McCarthy	Trott
Williams	Gallagher	McCaul	Turner
Wilson (SC)	Garrett	McClintock	Upton
Wittman			
Womack			
Woodall			
Yoder			
Yoho			
Young (AK)			
Young (IA)			
Zeldin			

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 231, noes 184, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 361]

AYES—231

Abraham	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Aderholt	Graves (LA)	Palmer
Allen	Graves (MO)	Paulsen
Amash	Griffith	Pearce
Amodei	Grothman	Perry
Arrington	Guthrie	Pittenger
Babin	Handel	Poe (TX)
Bacon	Harper	Poliquin
Banks (IN)	Harris	Posey
Barletta	Hartzler	Ratcliffe
Barr	Hensarling	Reed
Barton	Herrera Beutler	Reichert
Bergman	Hice, Jody B.	Renacci
Biggs	Higgins (LA)	Rice (SC)
Bilirakis	Hill	Roby
Bishop (MI)	Holding	Roe (TN)
Bishop (UT)	Hollingsworth	Rogers (AL)
Blum	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Bost	Huizenga	Rohrabacher
Brady (TX)	Hultgren	Rokita
Brat	Hunter	Rooney, Francis
Brooks (AL)	Hurd	Rooney, Thomas J.
Brooks (IN)	Issa	Ros-Lehtinen
Buchanan	Jenkins (KS)	Roskam
Buck	Jenkins (WV)	Ross
Bucshon	Johnson (LA)	Rothfus
Budd	Johnson (OH)	Rouzer
Burgess	Johnson, Sam	Royce (CA)
Byrne	Jones	Russell
Calvert	Jordan	Rutherford
Carter (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Sanford
Carter (TX)	Katko	Scalise
Chabot	Kelly (MS)	Schrader
Cheney	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert
Cloud	King (IA)	Scott, Austin
Coffman	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Kinzinger	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Knight	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Simpson
Comer	Labrador	Smith (MO)
Comstock	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Conaway	LaMalfa	Smith (NJ)
Cook	Lamborn	Smith (TX)
Costello (PA)	Lance	Smucker
Cramer	Latta	Stefanik
Crawford	Lesko	Stewart
Culberson	Lewis (MN)	Stivers
Curbelo (FL)	LoBiondo	Taylor
Curtis	Long	Tenney
Davidson	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Davis, Rodney	Love	Thornberry
Denham	Lucas	Tipton
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Trott
Diaz-Balart	MacArthur	Turner
Donovan	Marchant	Upton
Duffy	Marino	Valadao
Duncan (SC)	Marshall	Wagner
Duncan (TN)	Masnie	Walberg
Dunn	Mast	Walden
Emmer	McCarthy	Walker
Estes (KS)	McCaul	Walorski
Faso	McClintock	Walters, Mimi
Ferguson	McHenry	Weber (TX)
Fitzpatrick	McKinley	Webster (FL)
Fleischmann	McMorris	Wenstrup
Flores	Rodgers	Westerman
Fortenberry	McSally	Williams
Fox	Meadows	Wilson (SC)
Frelinghuysen	Messer	Wittman
Gallagher	Mitchell	Womack
Garrett	Moolenaar	Woodall
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	Yoder
Gibbs	Mullin	Yoho
Gohmert	Newhouse	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Noem	Young (IA)
Gosar	Norman	Zeldin
Gowdy	Nunes	
Granger	Olson	

NOES—184

Adams	Bera	Blunt Rochester
Aguilar	Beyer	Bonamici
Barragan	Bishop (GA)	Boyle, Brendan F.
Beatty	Blumenauer	

Brady (PA)	Grijalva	Norcross
Brown (MD)	Gutiérrez	O'Halleran
Brownley (CA)	Hastings	O'Rourke
Bustos	Heck	Pallone
Butterfield	Higgins (NY)	Panetta
Capuano	Himes	Pascrell
Carbajal	Huffman	Payne
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Pelosi
Cartwright	Jayapal	Perlmutter
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Peters
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Pingree
Chu, Judy	Johnson, E. B.	Pocan
Cicilline	Kaptur	Polis
Clark (MA)	Keating	Price (NC)
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Quigley
Clay	Kennedy	Raskin
Cleaver	Khanna	Rice (NY)
Clyburn	Kihuen	Rosen
Cohen	Kildee	Roybal-Allard
Connolly	Kilmer	Ruiz
Cooper	Kind	Ruppersberger
Correa	Krishnamoorthi	Rush
Costa	Kuster (NH)	Ryan (OH)
Courtney	Lamb	Sanchez
Crist	Langevin	Sarbanes
Crowley	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
Cuellar	Larson (CT)	Schiff
Cummings	Lawrence	Schneider
Davis (CA)	Lawson (FL)	Scott (VA)
Davis, Danny	Lee	Scott, David
DeFazio	Levin	Serrano
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Sewell (AL)
Delaney	Lieu, Ted	Shea-Porter
DeLauro	Lipinski	Sherman
DeLbene	Loeb sack	Sinema
Demings	Lofgren	Sires
DeSaulnier	Lowenthal	Smith (WA)
Deutsch	Lowe	Soto
Dingell	Lujan Grisham, M.	Suo zzi
Doggett	Lujan, Ben Ray	Swalwell (CA)
Doyle, Michael F.	Lynch	Takano
Ellison	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Thompson (CA)
Engel	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Espallat	Matsui	Tonko
Esty (CT)	McCollum	Torres
Evans	McCollum	Tsongas
Foster	McEachin	Vargas
Frankel (FL)	McGovern	Veasey
Fudge	McNerney	Vela
Gabbard	Meeks	Velázquez
Gallego	Meng	Viscosky
Garamendi	Moore	Wasserman
Gomez	Moulton	Schultz
Gonzalez (TX)	Murphy (FL)	Waters, Maxine
Gottheimer	Nadler	Watson Coleman
Green, Al	Napolitano	Welch
Green, Gene	Neal	Wilson (FL)
	Nolan	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Bass	Gaetz	Shuster
Black	Hanabusa	Speier
Blackburn	Hoyer	Walz
Cardenas	Peterson	
DeSantis	Richmond	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2248

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. MCHENRY

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 201, noes 212, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 362]

AYES—201

Abraham	Graves (LA)	Paulsen
Aderholt	Graves (MO)	Pearce
Allen	Griffith	Pittenger
Amash	Grothman	Poe (TX)
Amodei	Guthrie	Poliquin
Arrington	Handel	Posey
Babin	Harper	Ratcliffe
Bacon	Harris	Reed
Banks (IN)	Hartzler	Reichert
Barletta	Hensarling	Renacci
Barr	Herrera Beutler	Rice (SC)
Barton	Hice, Jody B.	Roby
Bergman	Higgins (LA)	Roe (TN)
Biggs	Hill	Rogers (AL)
Bilirakis	Holding	Rogers (KY)
Bishop (MI)	Hollingsworth	Rohrabacher
Bishop (UT)	Hudson	Rokita
Blum	Brady (TX)	Rooney, Francis
Bost	Brat	Rooney, Thomas J.
Brady (TX)	Brooks (AL)	Roskam
Brat	Brooks (IN)	Ross
Brooks (AL)	Buchanan	Rothfus
Brooks (IN)	Buck	Rouzer
Buchanan	Bucshon	Royce (CA)
Buck	Budd	Russell
Bucshon	Burgess	Rutherford
Budd	Burns	Sanford
Burgess	Byrne	Scalise
Byrne	Calvert	Schweikert
Calvert	Carter (GA)	Scott, Austin
Carter (GA)	Carter (TX)	Sensenbrenner
Carter (TX)	Chabot	Sessions
Chabot	Cheney	Shimkus
Cheney	Cloud	Simpson
Cheney	Coffman	Lamborn
Cloud	Cole	Latta
Coffman	Cole	Smith (MO)
Cole	Collins (GA)	Smith (NE)
Collins (GA)	Collins (NY)	Smith (TX)
Collins (NY)	Comer	Smith (TX)
Comer	Comstock	Smucker
Comstock	Conaway	Stewart
Conaway	Cramer	Stivers
Cook	Crawford	Stivers
Costello (PA)	Culberson	Taylor
Cramer	Curtis	Tenney
Crawford	Curtis	Tenney
Culberson	Davidson	Thompson (PA)
Curbelo (FL)	DesJarlais	Thornberry
Curtis	Diaz-Balart	Tipton
Davidson	Donovan	Trott
Davis, Rodney	Duffy	Turner
Denham	Duncan (SC)	Upton
DesJarlais	Duncan (TN)	Valadao
Diaz-Balart	Dunn	Wagner
Donovan	Emmer	Walberg
Duffy	Estes (KS)	Walden
Duncan (SC)	Faso	Walker
Duncan (TN)	Ferguson	Walorski
Dunn	Fitzpatrick	Walters, Mimi
Emmer	Fleischmann	Weber (TX)
Estes (KS)	Flores	Webster (FL)
Faso	Fortenberry	Wenstrup
Ferguson	Fox	Westerman
Fitzpatrick	Frelinghuysen	Williams
Fleischmann	Gallagher	Wilson (SC)
Flores	Garrett	Wittman
Fortenberry	Gianforte	Womack
Fox	Gibbs	Woodall
Frelinghuysen	Gohmert	Yoder
Gallagher	Goodlatte	Yoho
Garrett	Gosar	Young (IA)
Gianforte	Gowdy	Young (IA)
Gibbs	Granger	Zeldin
Gohmert		
Goodlatte		
Gosar		
Gowdy		
Granger		

NOES—212

Adams	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Aguilar	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny
Barragan	Chu, Judy	Davis, Rodney
Beatty	Cicilline	DeFazio
Bera	Clark (MA)	DeGette
Beyer	Clarke (NY)	Delaney
Bishop (GA)	Clay	DeLauro
Blumenauer	Cleaver	DeBene
Blunt Rochester	Clyburn	Demings
Bonamici	Cohen	Denham
Bost	Connolly	DeSaulnier
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cook	Deutsch
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cooper	Dingell
Boyle, Brendan F.	Correa	Doggett
Boyle, Brendan F.	Costa	Donovan
Boyle, Brendan F.	Costello (PA)	Doyle, Michael F.
Boyle, Brendan F.	Courtney	Ellison
Boyle, Brendan F.	Crist	Engel
Boyle, Brendan F.	Crowley	Eshoo
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cuellar	Espallat
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cummings	Esty (CT)
Boyle, Brendan F.	Curbelo (FL)	

Evans	Lee	Rice (NY)
Faso	Levin	Ros-Lehtinen
Fitzpatrick	Lewis (GA)	Rosen
Fortenberry	Lieu, Ted	Roybal-Allard
Foster	Lipinski	Ruiz
Frankel (FL)	LoBiondo	Ruppersberger
Fudge	Loebsock	Rush
Gabbard	Lofgren	Ryan (OH)
Gallego	Lowenthal	Sánchez
Garamendi	Lowey	Sarbanes
Gomez	Lujan Grisham,	Schakowsky
Gonzalez (TX)	M.	Schiff
Gottheimer	Luján, Ben Ray	Schneider
Green, Al	Lynch	Schrader
Green, Gene	Maloney,	Scott (VA)
Grijalva	Carolyn B.	Scott, David
Gutiérrez	Maloney, Sean	Serrano
Hastings	Mast	Sewell (AL)
Heck	Matsui	Shea-Porter
Higgins (NY)	McCollum	Sherman
Himes	McEachin	Sires
Huffman	McGovern	Smith (NJ)
Jackson Lee	McKinley	Smith (WA)
Jayapal	McNerney	Soto
Jeffries	Meadows	Stefanik
Johnson (GA)	Meeks	Suzuki
Johnson (OH)	Meng	Swalwell (CA)
Johnson, E. B.	Moore	Takano
Jones	Moulton	Thompson (CA)
Joyce (OH)	Murphy (FL)	Thompson (MS)
Kaptur	Nadler	Titus
Katko	Napolitano	Tonko
Keating	Neal	Torres
Kelly (IL)	Nolan	Tsongas
Kennedy	Norcross	Turner
Khanna	O'Halleran	Valadao
Kihuen	O'Rourke	Vargas
Kildee	Pallone	Veasey
Kilmer	Panetta	Vela
Kind	Pascrell	Velázquez
King (NY)	Payne	Visclosky
Knight	Pelosi	Wasserman
Krishnamoorthi	Perlmutter	Schultz
Kuster (NH)	Perry	Waters, Maxine
Lamb	Peters	Watson Coleman
Lance	Pingree	Welch
Langevin	Pocan	Wilson (FL)
Larsen (WA)	Polis	Yarmuth
Larson (CT)	Price (NC)	Young (AK)
Lawrence	Quigley	
Lawson (FL)	Raskin	

NOT VOTING—15

Amodei	DeSantis	Richmond
Bass	Gaetz	Shuster
Black	Hanabusa	Sinema
Blackburn	Hoyer	Speier
Cárdenas	Peterson	Walz

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2252

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated against:

Ms. SINEMA. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably
detained. Had I been present, I would have
voted "nay" on rollcall No. 362.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no
further amendments, under the rule,
the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose;
and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUR-
TIS) having assumed the chair, Mr.
COLLINS of Georgia, Acting Chair of the
Committee of the Whole House on the
state of the Union, reported that that
Committee, having had under consider-
ation the bill (H.R. 6147) making appro-
priations for the Department of the In-
terior, environment, and related agen-
cies for the fiscal year ending Sep-
tember 30, 2019, and for other purposes,
and, pursuant to House Resolution 996,
he reported the bill, as amended by
that resolution, back to the House with
sundry further amendments adopted in
the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under
the rule, the previous question is or-
dered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any
further amendment reported from the
Committee of the Whole? If not, the
Chair will put them en gros.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant
to clause 1(c) of rule XIX, further
consideration of H.R. 6147 is postponed.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there
objection to the request of the gen-
tleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr.
Speaker, I am honored to rise today to
speak to the success in Louisiana's
Fourth Congressional District that we
have seen since the implementation of
the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Every skeptic, even the early skeptics
of tax reform, saw near immediate
benefits when the IRS adjusted their
withholding tables and it resulted in
bigger paychecks for more than 90 per-
cent of Americans.

Now we are 7 months out, and after
the enactment of the Tax Cuts and
Jobs Act, the results are undeniable.
Nearly every economic indicator,
whether you are talking about the un-
employment rate or wages or job crea-
tion, is showing record growth; and
because of this tax reform, more than 1
million jobs have already been created
and more than 4 million Americans
have received increased wages or bo-
nuses.

The average tax cut in Louisiana for
a family of four was more than \$1,700.
That is not crumbs. That is real money
for the people in my district, and it
provides them with greater flexibility
to save for the future.

Real benefits for real people, that is
what tax reform delivered. I look for-
ward to many more success stories be-
cause of this historic legislation.

**HONORING COMMISSIONER ROY
CHARLES BROOKS**

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise
today to join my fellow Texans in hon-

oring Tarrant County Commissioner
Roy Charles Brooks for a tremendous
year of leadership as president of the
National Association of Counties.

For over 30 years, Commissioner
Brooks has fought for underserved
communities across Tarrant County.
As a community volunteer, a city
elected official, and county commis-
sioner, his integrity, innovation, and
fervor to help others has touched gen-
erations of Texans.

He has taken on issues such as
healthcare for the homeless, infant
mortality, obesity, criminal justice re-
form, mental health, and AIDS edu-
cation; and this past year, he worked
tirelessly to bring awareness to his
presidential initiative Serving the Un-
derserved: Counties Addressing Pov-
erty.

The project has pushed over 3,000
counties to look at the role they play
in alleviating poverty and to develop
best practices to address vital societal
needs, especially as pertain to early
childhood development.

Through his work, he has created a
community family that supports and
lifts each other up, building hope and
faith across Tarrant County. I honor
his lifetime of work and his dedication
to advocating for the toughest issues
that our communities face.

□ 2300

**CONGRATULATING THE NEVADA
COUNTY FARM BUREAU**

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise
today to commend and note Nevada
County Farm Bureau in my district in
northern California that is celebrating
this weekend their 100th anniversary of
existence in Nevada County, helping
farmers and ranchers with the very di-
verse types of crops they have, not like
in the flatlands, but nestled in the
foothills and the mountains of Nevada
County.

They have different crops: hay crops,
tree crops, even a level of forestry that
they are all involved with there. The
Farm Bureau has been a leader a long
time in helping those folks to navigate
regulations, ideas for better propaga-
tion of their crops, and just a better
way to do things in the community.

We appreciate their leadership and
all of their memberships to help make
farming strong.

Congratulations to the Nevada Coun-
ty Farm Bureau on 100 years of helping
their members in Nevada County.

**PRESIDENT TRUMP'S COMMENTS
AT HELSINKI**

(Ms. SHEA-PORTER asked and was
given permission to address the House
for 1 minute.)

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I
would like to share an editorial from