



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 12, 2019

No. 146

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

Reverend Kyle Wright II, Holy Cross Lutheran Church and School, Collinsville, Illinois, offered the following prayer:

In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost, amen.

I thank and praise You, Heavenly Father, for moving each and every one of these men and women to serve this country which You sustain in Your mercy. Watch over them this day that Your will be done in their discussions, decisions, and, most of all, their actions.

You are the God of all power and might who, out of love for Your creation, established order from chaos, peace from discord, and life from death.

For the sake of Christ Jesus our Lord, forgive us of our pride, our disobedience, and our poor stewardship of what You have placed into our care. According to Your mercy, open the eyes and hearts of Your people so they may know the depth of Your love found only in Christ Jesus.

Dear Lord, I commend to Your care our Congress, our government, and our Nation, as You judge and keep us according to Your just mercy.

In Jesus Christ our Lord, amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) come

forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. STAUBER led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING REVEREND KYLE WRIGHT II

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SHIMKUS. Madam Speaker, I rise to thank and welcome Pastor Wright. Pastor Wright serves as pastor of my home congregation, Holy Cross Lutheran Church and School in Collinsville, Illinois.

He received his undergraduate degree from Concordia University in Austin, Texas, and a master of divinity from Concordia Theological Seminary in Fort Wayne, Indiana. He is currently pursuing a master of sacred theology at Concordia Seminary in St. Louis, Missouri.

He has served as a pastor for the Lutheran Church Missouri Synod since 2006. During that time, he has also served as a resource hospital chaplain, hospice chaplain, and on multiple boards.

His wife, Keri, is the help, support, and love of his life. They have four beautiful daughters. Katie is 12; Gwen, 10; Lilli, 10; and Magie, also 10.

Yes, you heard it right, triplets.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

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

IN RECOGNITION OF THE SEPTEMBER 13, 2018, MERRIMACK VALLEY GAS EXPLOSIONS

(Mrs. TRAHAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. TRAHAN. Madam Speaker, I rise in recognition of a tragic anniversary that the residents of the Merrimack Valley will never forget.

Tomorrow marks 1 year since a cascade of explosions in Lawrence, Andover, and North Andover, Massachusetts, damaged over 130 homes and businesses, burning several to the ground.

At least 20 people were sent to the hospital. A Lawrence police officer, Ivan Soto, lost his home while aiding his community. Shakira Figueroa was seriously injured, and a young man, Leonel Rondon, lost his life.

An NTSB investigation revealed a series of failures by the gas company as it replaced pipelines in the area. Oversight allowed the full flow of high-pressure gas to enter a low-pressure distribution system.

In April, I introduced the Leonel Rondon Pipeline Safety Act to prevent this type of disaster from ever happening again. We owe it to the Sotos, the Figueras, the Rondons, and the many other families who suffered on September 13 to pass strong pipeline safety legislation this year.

THANKING THE ST. LOUIS COUNTY VOLUNTEER RESCUE SQUAD

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my gratitude for the St. Louis County Volunteer Rescue Squad, located in northern Minnesota, and their quick response to an emergency that took place in my district a little over a month ago.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H7669

At the end of July, a group of Girl Scouts traveled to northern Minnesota to experience the beauty and magnificence of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. Their trip unexpectedly hit a rough patch when severe thunderstorms rolled in and lightning struck close to their campsite. A few of the girls reported feeling something from the ground, potentially a ground current, and needing precautionary medical attention.

The Boundary Waters Canoe Area is very remote, making any rescue attempt more complex and rigorous. Nevertheless, the St. Louis County Volunteer Rescue Squad members immediately sprang into action, navigating five portages by motorboat and then canoe, escorting the girls back to safety.

Mr. Speaker, I am thankful that the Northland has such a capable and well-trained group of individuals dedicated to the safety of our neighbors and visitors. Due to their hard work over the years, many emergencies have been averted and lives have been saved.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF MARCA BRISTO

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

Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, this past weekend, we lost my dear friend, Marca Bristo, an inspiring civil rights activist from Chicago.

Marca had a diving accident when she was young that left her paralyzed from the chest down. She never allowed her disability to define her. Instead, her disability became her superpower.

Marca dedicated her life to changing laws and bringing attention to the disparities faced by people with disabilities in the most basic services. She was instrumental in bringing wheelchair ramps to Chicago public buses.

She didn't do this by just writing letters or holding meetings. Marca went as far as chaining herself to a bus to force the Chicago Transit Authority to make mass transit more accessible.

She worked with the broader civil rights communities to pass key legislation like the Americans with Disabilities Act. The organization she founded, Access Living of Metropolitan Chicago, will carry on with her legacy.

I send our heartfelt thoughts to her son and her daughter.

Rest in power, Marca Bristol.

HONORING THE SIMPSON COUNTY HISTORICAL SOCIETY

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

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Simpson County Historical Society and its long-reaching influence on Simpson County and the surrounding communities.

Since its founding in 1959, Simpson County Historical Society has been a

valuable asset to the First District of Kentucky. Through the collection and preservation of historical property and genealogical records, the society has been able to maintain an extensive archive for the benefit of future generations.

I applaud the work the society has done over the last 60 years, and I am pleased to say that, as of Thursday, September 12, they will have expanded to a newer, larger facility enabling them to increase their research capabilities and broaden their effect on local education and cultural development.

I join with the residents of Simpson County and the local community, as well as those who have benefited from the work of the Simpson County Historical Society, in honoring their incredible dedication to the preservation and promotion of history. I wish the historical society the best as they begin a new phase of their own history and express my gratitude for their service to the First District of Kentucky.

WE NEED A RESET

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, we have a crisis in housing, in homelessness, growing wealth inequality, and it is all not an accident. It is the result of deliberate discrimination and policy failure.

The Federal Government, for years, intervened in housing for White veterans, for middle-class homeowners, for developers and property owners, but shut out poor and, especially, people of color—African Americans, most notably. Trump is making it worse.

Tonight, 550,000 people will go to sleep homeless. We have a gap of 7 million affordable rental units, and income inequality grows. We need a reset.

Last week, I released this report, "Locked Out: Reversing Federal Housing Failures and Unlocking Opportunity," which details solutions for our most vexing housing policy challenges. It is available on blumenauer.house.gov website.

We must be bold, transformative, and ambitious in solving these challenges. We can't afford another generation of small-scale thinking and large-scale failure.

CELEBRATING THE 150TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE JEFFERSON COUNTY COURTHOUSE

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the 150th anniversary of the Jefferson County Courthouse in Pennsylvania's 15th Congressional District.

Since its opening in 1869, the Jefferson County Courthouse has undergone serious renovations and changes, but its impact on the community remains steadfast. County Commissioner Jack Matson said: "You really can't be a resident of Jefferson County and not have the courthouse affect your daily lives."

Tomorrow, the Jefferson County community will come together to celebrate this milestone on the courthouse grounds in Brookville. The programming will include tours of the courthouse, a performance by the Punxsutawney Area High School marching band, a reenactment of the trial of abolitionist Judge Elijah Heath, and the dedication of a World War II monument. The evening will conclude with the lighting of the bell tower and a special rig designed by students at the Jefferson County-Dubois Area Vocational-Technical School.

Jefferson County Commissioner Jeff Pisarcik said it best when he said: "It's not our building; it's everybody's building that lives in Jefferson County."

HONORING THE SERVICE OF TOM FERRARESE

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

Mr. MORELLE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor my longtime friend and Monroe County Board of Elections commissioner, Tom Ferrarese, as he begins his retirement.

For more than two decades, Tom has served our community with distinction at the Board of Elections, working tirelessly to expand access to voters, safeguard our elections, and uphold the democratic process.

Tom has been a passionate political and community activist, working diligently to advance the ideals of the Democratic Party, not just through his work at the board, but through his extensive volunteer and community advocacy on behalf of LGBTQ individuals.

It has been a true privilege to work alongside Tom, and our entire community is grateful for his many years of service. I wish him nothing but a well-deserved rest, relaxation, and best wishes in retirement.

□ 0915

RECOGNIZING U.S. SPACE COMMAND

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize our newest combatant command: U.S. Space Command, which was stood up on Monday in Colorado Springs.

President Trump's decision to stand up SPACECOM could not be more timely. In recent years, Russia and China have reorganized their militaries and

pursued capabilities to threaten our space assets. Fortunately, our Nation has no shortage of innovative and brilliant men and women in uniform.

Our newest combatant command will harness the creative dynamo of these space warfighters. Congress will give them the authorities and funding they need to triumph in this newest contest of arms. With the infrastructure, industrial base, and personnel already located at Peterson and Schriever Air Force Bases in Colorado Springs, SPACECOM can seamlessly transition into a fully functioning combatant command immediately. This is a great and exciting milestone for our Nation.

ARCTIC CULTURAL AND COASTAL PLAIN PROTECTION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 1146.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 548 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 1146.

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

□ 0916

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 1146) to amend Public Law 115-97 (commonly known as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act) to repeal the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge oil and gas program, and for other purposes, with Mr. CASTEN of Illinois in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in section 2 of House Resolution 548, and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources

The gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) and the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Today the House of Representatives will take a historic vote to roll back one provision of the Republican tax law that was rammed through the last Con-

gress on a party line vote. In addition to the tax breaks to millionaires, billionaires, and multinational corporations, there was a provision that mandated oil and gas development in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

Today we will take up bipartisan legislation to repeal this drilling mandate, protecting, not just the Arctic Refuge, but the wildlife and the indigenous people who depend on this sacred natural landscape.

I introduced H.R. 1146 earlier this year with my Republican colleague BRIAN FITZPATRICK because we believe, as do 182 other cosponsors of this bill, that there are some places that are simply too important, too special, too sacred to be spoiled by oil and gas development. This is the same basic proposition that we were presented with yesterday when the House passed bipartisan legislation to protect our coasts from offshore drilling. Because the north coast of California is too special to have its fisheries and coastal economy put at risk for the profit of big oil. Because places like the Lowcountry of South Carolina are too special to be spoiled by oil spills. Today we are here to show that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, the largest wildlife refuge in the United States is also too special.

The refuge is home to more than 200 different wildlife species, and that includes the Porcupine caribou herd that is a vital source of subsistence for the indigenous Gwich'in people. The refuge is a special place where veterans recovering from PTSD find themselves again. We have heard these voices and many others during Natural Resource Committee deliberations on this bill in a hearing earlier this year. And I thank all of those who testified and have spoken out to help us bring this bill to the floor today.

The question before us is: Will the Federal Government protect this special place and the communities that depend on it or will our Federal Government be responsible for its destruction by auctioning it off to big oil? During this debate, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are going to ask us and ask the American people to trust this administration to do the right thing.

They are going to say that drilling can be done responsibly. They will ask us to trust a Secretary of the Interior who the GAO has determined violated Federal spending laws during the Trump government shutdown. A secretary who violated his ethics pledge by meeting with his former clients at the U.S. Oil and Gas Association as they were pushing for more drilling on American public lands. And a secretary who continues to shill for his former lobbying clients at every turn.

They will ask us to trust this administration where the leading Department of the Interior official pushing for drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge just left public service days ago to start a new job at an oil

and gas company with interests, believe it or not, in Arctic oil and gas development in Alaska. You can't make this stuff up. They will ask us to trust a President, who, armed with a Sharpie, overrules scientists and threatens the jobs of scientists when they speak out.

We need to reject this agenda of big oil and protect America's Arctic from oil and gas drilling. It is time to pass H.R. 1146 and repeal the Trump administration tax laws drilling mandate.

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

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

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

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I listened to the presentation of the author of this bill. I have been in this House 48 years. We have been arguing about this ANWR for 40 of those years. We have passed it out of the house 14 times. And by the way, it was established by a Democrat President and a Democrat House to allow the 1002 areas to be explored if Congress said so. And that is what we have done.

Now we have a sponsor from California who doesn't know beans about this business talking about big oil and about Trump. This has been a policy of this Nation to allow drilling there if the Congress spoke, and we did so. Under the tax bill, yes, but 13 times before that this House passed the legislation to have the 1002 explored.

Just keep in mind, we are talking about an area of a 19-million-acre refuge and areas left inside, the 1002 area—the map behind me, if anybody can see that little tiny red dot, 2,000 acres, less than the size of Dulles Airport, less than the size of the Capitol grounds. And yet, we are trying to say, no, no development. We are trying to say that is not right, this is the last pristine area. May I say again, it is not the last pristine area.

We have had approximately 30 years of development in Prudhoe Bay, the same type of terrain, same species of animals, same amount of caribou. In fact, we have more now than we had before after we started drilling. So this bill is a sham. And I listened to this with great interest. I always understand what they are trying to do, and it is also a sham to this Congress. This Congress spoke. It is a sham to this Nation. We are taking time away from what should be done in this Nation. We have sat, frankly, 2 years in this House and have done nothing.

Unfortunately, we have heard also this is a cultural bill, and the Gwich'in supposedly is all this gentleman listens to, doesn't listen to the Inupiat. That to me is important. The people that live there want the drilling. The people at least 150 miles away don't want the drilling, but that is who they are listening to.

So, again, my colleagues, this bill is the wrong step forward for this Nation.

It is not about big oil. It is about the State of Alaska. It is about my constituents, not California; they have enough problems of their own. Just read the papers. So I am suggesting, with respect, this bill should not go anywhere. It may pass today, because there are a lot of people on that side who don't believe in oil. I understand that. But it is wrong to undo what Congress has done. And now I will suggest, respectfully, it is dead. You are wasting our time. It will not go anywhere, that is why I am not going to get really excited and go over there and—never mind.

I would suggest, respectfully, I am going to see the death of this bill a long time before this gentleman is ever in this House again.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for his restraint. One of the arguments my friend from Alaska invariably makes when we talk about this issue is the proposed drilling area is just a tiny little piece of a great big refuge in a great big State. And it is typically characterized as just a little 2,000-acre postage stamp.

We need to dispel this very inaccurate and disingenuous characterization. It may be 2,000 acres of hard footprint, but it is not 2,000 acres of development all in one place. It is spread out across the coastal plain, which is the beating heart of America's largest wildlife refuge. And if you want to see what this footprint really looks like, it is not so tiny, folks. When you look at the hundreds of miles of roads and the gravel mining and the gravel pads and the oil rigs and other infrastructure that have to go in, it looks a lot differently than what has been characterized.

So this picture depicts what the true footprint of this little postage stamp development in the Arctic refuge looks like. And I think by any fair measure, it would absolutely despoil the beating heart of America's largest wildlife refuge.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), my friend and great champion of our public lands and of the Arctic refuge.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentleman yielding and allowing me to speak on this.

I was on the Ways and Means Committee that passed the grotesque Republican tax cut. This provision was never debated on a bill that never had a hearing wedged in. The math doesn't work out. It portends that we are going to have hundreds of millions, a billion or more in savings. It is not going to happen. We are talking about a relatively small amount of money, which I am convinced, despite my good friend from Alaska's assertion, this is going to move forward.

The American public opposed it. It is the wrong thing to do. We need to be moving in the other direction in terms of keeping the oil up there in the

ground for climate, but also, for the environment there. I had a chance to visit that area with Governor Inslee and other colleagues and am really impressed with the nature of that. I saw that caribou herd.

This is a treasure. It is much more fragile than one would think, and we are bound and determined to work to support the environmental values, the desire of the American people, our challenges for climate, and to unwind this egregious provision in the Republican tax bill, which, mark my words, will, in fact, be substantially adjusted, if not in this Congress in a subsequent Congress.

I appreciate my friend's forthright approach here. I appreciate the fact that we are focusing the American public on the outrageous provision, that we are fighting to protect the Arctic Wildlife Refuge and dismissing this egregious provision in the Republican tax scam.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Alaska for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle proclaim that they are concerned about the environment, but that does not mean that I am not concerned about the environment or that my colleagues on this side of the aisle are not concerned about the environment.

One of our earliest and most recognized conservationists, Gifford Pinchot, stated that when conflicting interests must be resolved that we should strive to do the greatest good for the greatest number for the long run. Pinchot also wrote that conservation is the application of common sense to the common problems for the common good.

Mr. Chairman, this bill today lacks common sense. I have been to the North Slope of Alaska. We can develop clean, safe, low-cost energy in the world and conserve our public lands and the environment. I would argue that because of our technology and innovation and using clean fuels like natural gas that has allowed the United States to decrease our global greenhouse gas emissions more than any other country in the world.

As we look at this bill today, and we look at the history of what has happened, in 1980 a Democratic-held Congress passed the Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act, and President Carter signed it into law. That act set aside more than 1.5 million acres for responsible oil and gas development in ANWR itself, nearly 20 million acres in total.

Such a large commitment less than a decade after the Arab oil embargo made logical sense at the time.

□ 0930

However, it took until 2018 for Congress to uphold its word, finally ap-

proving a limited exploration project on 2,000 acres in ANWR. This constitutes less than one ten-thousandth of the total acreage and one one-hundredth of the initial exploration.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chair, in the face of increasing belligerence from Russia and China and an unstable Middle East, Members of this House have a choice. We can choose dirtier foreign energy over responsibly developing a tiny parcel of land already set aside for production.

That inaction, Mr. Chair, is one that demands common sense. It is in the common interest to protect domestic energy. Realistically, 2,000 acres is a small price to pay for our security.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote for the greatest good for the greatest number and to vote for the long run. I urge my colleagues to vote for common sense and vote "no" on H.R. 1146.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND), the chair of the National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands Subcommittee of the Natural Resources Committee.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chair, as a 35th-generation American, I rise in support of H.R. 1146.

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge was set aside to protect its unique wildlife, wilderness, and resources. It sustains the Gwich'in Tribe and has for centuries. It is why they call it "the sacred place where life begins."

Oil and gas drilling puts at risk the Porcupine caribou herd, which has sustained tribes for centuries and centuries. It also threatens wolves, polar bears, and migratory birds that live in the refuge. It will release carbon dioxide into the atmosphere, exacerbating the effects of global warming, which have affected Alaska far more than any State in this country.

Republicans slipped this drilling provision into their tax cut bill last Congress. I might add that no tribes had an opportunity to voice their opinions on any of that. Now, this administration is rushing ahead without adequate environmental review or Tribal consultation.

Americans want a smart approach to sustainable energy development, not a careless rush to sell off one of our most iconic and sacred places for shortsighted, destructive fossil fuel production.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to stand with the Gwich'in, speak up for the animals that live in the refuge, and support this important legislation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN).

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague from Alaska for yielding.

Mr. Chair, how long must we rely on foreign adversaries for fuel? Utilizing

our domestic resources is essential to a strong economy. Energy dominance on the world stage is our end goal. We will never get there if we continue to cut off access to our own resources.

The truth is, oil and gas production in ANWR benefits our country as a whole, but it is also a key industry for the people of Alaska.

The community of Kaktovik sees the energy sector as a significant source of employment, revenue, and reliable energy. The people, including the local Tribe of Alaska Natives, are incredibly supportive of the continuation of oil and gas production in their community. These people were never consulted by my colleagues at any point in the development of this bill.

Neither was our colleague DON YOUNG, who has represented the needs of the people of Alaska for more than 40 years, who has more experience than everyone who wrote this bill combined. DON YOUNG, the dean of the House, the longest serving Member in Congress, should have been the first person consulted about this legislation was never sought out. Instead, they consulted a Tribe 350 miles away that has nothing to do with oil and gas in ANWR.

To put this in perspective, I live in Tulsa, Oklahoma. Omaha, Nebraska, is about 380 miles away. Can anybody tell me what my opinion would matter in Omaha, Nebraska? I don't spend time there. I don't know what the people there want.

The only assumption we can make as to why a Tribe over 350 miles away was consulted instead of the local community is that my colleagues knew they wouldn't find support in Kaktovik.

This should be an easy decision. There is no reason to vote "yes" on this bill.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to think about the future of our country and vote "no" today on H.R. 1146.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I know the gentleman does not mean to disrespect or trivialize the interests of an indigenous tribe that for hundreds and hundreds of years has depended on the Porcupine caribou herd, where its calving grounds and the heart of its migratory road is right in the refuge we are talking about. I know the gentleman doesn't mean to disrespect them by suggesting that their voices don't matter, but we believe that the Gwich'in people's voice does matter. Mr. Chair, you are going to hear us stand up for their interests consistently on this issue.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of California. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of H.R. 1146, the Arctic Cultural and Coastal Plain Protection Act.

After almost 40 years of protection, the Trump administration and the fossil fuel lobbyists that have taken up residence at the Department of the Interior opened up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas development. The timing of this decision could not be more irresponsible.

The last thing we should be doing is expanding fossil fuel development in the Arctic, where temperatures are rising twice as fast as the rest of the United States. But we know that this administration isn't concerned about protecting our environment or addressing the climate crisis, so it is not surprising that it is willing to sacrifice the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge's diverse habitat in an attempt to help its Big Oil friends turn an even bigger profit.

The American people disagree. The vast majority of Americans oppose drilling in this iconic landscape, and I am proud to stand with them.

We should be reducing our dependence on fossil fuels, embracing renewable energy, and leading the world in combating climate change, not going backward.

Mr. Chair, I strongly support the Arctic Cultural and Coastal Plain Protection Act, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, environmentally responsible development of ANWR will increase America's energy security and independence, create jobs, and provide affordable, reliable energy for consumers while providing much-needed revenue to both the State of Alaska and the Federal Government.

While congressional authorization is required by law for any leasing in ANWR, I, along with my Republican colleagues on the Natural Resources Committee, believe that Alaska Natives should be able to exercise their right to develop minerals on their lands if they so choose.

As the gentleman from Alaska has pointed out, Native Alaskans who actually live within ANWR fully support responsible development of their local energy resources.

Who do we listen to? The people who actually live there or extreme environmental activists here in Washington?

The oil and gas sector has historically served as a significant source of employment, revenue, and reliable energy for Alaska and Alaska Natives, and supports over 110,000 direct and indirect jobs.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to oppose this legislation, which, fortunately, will never become law.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chair, listen to "the people who actually live there." I wish we had seen that same concern yesterday when we had a chance to vote on banning offshore drilling in places where Governors, mayors, and overwhelming majorities of actual residents don't want to see their pristine coastlines and their coastal economies despoiled by oil and gas development.

I am afraid that my friends sometimes have a selective sense of hearing, but the one consistent voice that always seems to be heard is that of Big Oil.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL), my friend and the chair of the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, I thank Representative HUFFMAN for his leadership on this very, very important bill.

I would like to discuss briefly one idea, and that is the idea that you hear around that if we are going to protect ANWR, that somehow is going to hurt our ability to become energy independent, that we cannot be energy independent unless we open up ANWR, and that right now, we have to really worry because we are going to become, by not opening ANWR, more beholden to the Russians, to Saudi Arabia.

This is all going to be whether we open up ANWR or not? This is absolute nonsense.

Republicans and this administration no longer care about energy independence. Let's be clear. They do not care about energy independence, and they haven't for years, ever since they voted to lift the oil export ban.

For so many years, we said that we care about energy independence, and we are not going to export our oil and gas. If energy independence was the goal, we wouldn't be letting companies send American-produced oil all over the world, particularly when we are still importing from other countries, yet that is exactly what is happening today.

We export over 3 million barrels a day. Yet at the same time, we are importing 7 million barrels a day.

If oil development, what we are hearing today, is really about making America energy independent, instead of exporting those 3 million barrels, we could keep them here at home.

If Republicans want to put the export ban back in place, then we should have a real discussion. I would love to have that discussion, but they know that their friends in the oil and gas industry would never let them have that discussion because this is all about profits.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chair, this is all about profits. It is not about energy independence.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN).

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Chair, I stand in opposition to this legislation, as it hamstring U.S. energy production and goes against the will of the people.

Tax reform not only delivered on the tax cuts for the country and propelled our record-breaking economy, but it paved the way to further energy dominance by authorizing the development of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. Specifically, there is an area in the NPR that has reserves designated in 1980 by a Democratic Congress to be opened up for gas and oil lease sales.

Before tax reform and the opening of ANWR, 92 percent of the 19.5 million

acres could not even be legally touched. This area was set aside by the 1980 Congress and was limited to 2,000 Federal acres. That is just 0.0001 percent of ANWR.

I heard an analogy the other day. It is like the size of a football on a football field. It is a very, very small spot. I heard another analogy, the size of a postage stamp on a wall.

This was set aside for energy production. It has the resources, and it is time for us to develop those resources because the failure to develop the resources we have in this country to meet the energy needs of our Nation means that we continue to be dependent on other nations.

We think about the Middle East when we think about that, but as I told a story yesterday, the New England States get natural gas from Russia. An LNG tanker that showed up at Boston Harbor provides natural gas to an American State.

That means they are relying on Russia. That is hard for me to fathom when we have an abundance of natural gas in this country, when we have an abundance of oil in this country both offshore and onshore.

These are American resources that should be developed, with a very minimal impact on the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. It is time for America to develop the resources God gave us when He blessed this great Nation, develop these resources in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. It is the law of the land right now. It is time to develop.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Chair, we have addressed this postage stamp canard that we often hear. This is the postage stamp. It is spread out throughout the coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge. It is the world's biggest postage stamp, if it is a postage stamp, and it would certainly despoil the beating heart of America's largest wildlife refuge.

□ 0945

Let me just briefly address this other canard, the idea that Congress set aside the 1002 area of the refuge for oil and gas development. If we actually read the law, it was set aside for a study by the Department of the Interior that would determine if it makes sense to open up the beating heart of America's largest wildlife refuge to oil and gas development.

And here is an inconvenient fact: The Department of the Interior actually found that this is a uniquely vital natural resource that could be dramatically harmed. That is why, for over 40 years, Congress has declined to take the step that that law envisioned of opening it up to oil and gas development. That is, until the last Congress, when it was slipped in on a party-line vote against the wishes, frankly, of even many of my friends across the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. BARRAGÁN).

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H.R. 1146 and protecting one of our Nation's greatest treasures from becoming the spoils of an industry that recklessly puts profits ahead of risks to the environment.

After nearly four decades of protection, earned by virtue of its diverse wildlife habitats and scenic wonders, the Trump administration wants to sell off the heartbeat of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to the highest bidders. Buried in the small print of a tax giveaway, the President removed critical habitat protections with the stroke of a pen, leaving more than 250 wildlife species, like the polar bear, exposed to potential disaster at the hands of the oil industry.

This action is not only a complete failure of the government's stewardship of these natural habitats, but completely unnecessary, considering the United States is already the world's largest producer of petroleum. Why threaten a fragile ecosystem that is already under terrible threat from climate change?

We owe it to the planet, to future generations of Americans, and to the two-thirds of American people who are opposed to drilling in this iconic landscape to pass this protection act.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, as painful as it is to listen to all of that nonsense on the other side, I am glad to have logical people speak on this side.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, it is great to be out here with my friends on both sides of the aisle. As many know, I have announced I am not going to run for reelection. One of the successes is because of what Chairman YOUNG was able to do in the last Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I have been to the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I don't want to debunk the view. Alaska is bigger than the whole continental United States. The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge is a small area where no one is at. I have been there. I hope you get there. It is a flat coastal plain. This would be like putting a drilling rig that is the size of a football field on the State of South Carolina. We can't debunk those arguments.

My father-in-law worked on the pipeline. He was a communications microwave guy. There are thousands of jobs.

Also, an insidious part of this plan is we know that the pipeline has to have oil in it to flow. We know that we need to continue to have exploration up there so that there is enough oil to keep that pipeline operating.

My friends in the environmental left organizations want to shut down the pipeline. This will make sure it doesn't get shut down.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), the chair of the House Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chairman of

the Water, Oceans, and Wildlife Subcommittee for the time and for his longstanding leadership on this issue. And also, I thank the 182 Members of Congress who support H.R. 1146.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to strongly support this legislation, H.R. 1146, a bill to protect the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge from the irreversible impacts of oil and gas drilling.

This bill would undo a particular terrible provision that was slipped into the 2017 Republican tax bill with no debate in this Chamber, no amendments in this Chamber, and no votes in this Chamber.

The Republican Party was not content with merely giving trillions of dollars of tax cuts to the wealthiest companies and individuals in this country, tax cuts that have driven us deeper into debt without any of the positives the bill sponsors promised; at the same time they were handing out trillions of dollars to their friends and donors, they threw in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge for their oil and gas buddies. They promised that this would be done right, as if destroying a pristine wilderness and threatening the survival of an entire Tribe's way of life can ever be done right.

But then the Trump administration took over. Since then, we have had rushed environmental reviews so they could try to get a lease sale done in 1 year, 2 years quicker than the schedule laid out in the tax bill.

We have seen evidence of the concerns of career scientists being ignored or overridden, and we have seen the Assistant Secretary in charge of making this lease sale happen jump ship and, after a long 3-day cooling off weekend, start at an oil company that has leases right next to the refuge.

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge should never have been opened, and even those who want to see it develop should recoil at the idea that this is now in the hands of Donald Trump and his buddies.

The Arctic National Wildlife Refuge has nothing to do with national security, has nothing to do with gas prices, and has nothing to do with energy independence. It has to do with greed, plain and simple.

This administration simply can't stand the idea that there are some places that the oil and gas industry shouldn't be allowed to destroy. They can't believe that there are some places that deserve to be protected. They can't imagine there being anything more important than profits.

I don't agree. At some point, we have to say: Stop. You have enough.

We are the number one producer of oil and gas in the world, and production is going up.

The administration is repealing regulations left and right and reduced land or wildlife protections on over 150 million acres of public land. The oil and gas industry has enough. They shouldn't get the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge as well.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote for this legislation.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman YOUNG for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this Democratic messaging bill, H.R. 1146, a harmful attempt to undermine responsible energy development.

Throughout the history of our country, we have observed a pattern of politicians in Washington and the East and West Coasts legislating based on what they think is best for the folks in the rest of the country. As we have listened to debate today, we can clearly see that this Washingtonian habit is alive and well.

My good friends on the other side of this issue think they know better than the Alaska Natives living within ANWR; they think they know better than those who would benefit from job growth; they think they know better than the unions; and they think they know better than the people closest to the project.

I urge my colleagues to take a step back and look at the unsettling trend that is occurring throughout this country of outsiders with a tenuous grip on the truth imposing their will on the people really impacted by these local projects.

For instance, in my home State of Minnesota, the same thing is happening with the replacement of Line 3. People from the Twin Cities who are unimpacted by this project are launching efforts right here in this Chamber to stop the replacement and stop the job growth and economic development that would accompany it. Instead of putting our laborers, operating engineers, teamsters, and construction workers to work, they support legislation that is undermining these jobs.

These projects are meant to develop our natural resources to ensure our energy independence and not reduce our reliance on foreign and hostile nations to this country. We responsibly develop our energy with the strongest environmental standards and labor standards in the world.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill. Let's listen to those affected directly by these projects and do what is right.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague, the gentleman from California, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise in strong support of this bill as someone who has had the privilege of spending 2 weeks in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge 15 years ago. It was a life-changing trip.

ANWR's beauty and majesty are almost beyond description. Paddling down the Kongakut River and along the shore of the Beaufort Sea, my companions and I experienced an astound-

ing wealth of plants and animals in a mix unique to the region, a truly iconic corner of our Earth.

Anyone who says it is an empty place or that there is nothing there is committing a sacrilege as far as I am concerned. It is a sacred place to me, and it is no wonder that it is a sacred place to the Gwich'in people.

The Arctic is warming twice as fast as the rest of the United States. Drilling in ANWR would exacerbate that regional effect as well as hastening catastrophic warming, generally.

In short, we must prevent this administration's reckless effort to open up ANWR to oil and gas development to prevent dangerous biological, cultural, and climate impacts. We simply cannot allow this to happen on our watch.

I would point out that, when I paddled down the Kongakut River, I visited these places that are planned for drilling. We were literally hiking along the plain and we came upon these drill pads. It would be outrageous to drill in these places where there are nesting grounds for birds and homes to other animals that just don't exist anywhere else.

I invite any of my colleagues who have the ability to travel on their own power paddling and hiking to join me in going back to ANWR. I don't think they would want to drill there if they did.

Mr. Chairman, I thank Congressman HUFFMAN for his leadership on this, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, it is an honor now to yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY).

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague from Alaska for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this legislation.

I wish I could say that I am surprised by the bills that are being brought before us this week, but I am not. The Democratic war on our economy, on America's families, and on fossil fuels continues.

Mr. Chairman, energy independence is crucial for our economy and our security. I stand in strong solidarity with my friend and colleague from Alaska, someone who is a mentor not just to me, but to all on our side of the aisle.

Partly, I stand in solidarity with him because I, like Mr. YOUNG, represent my entire State. Like Alaska, Wyoming is no stranger to outsiders thinking they know what is best for us.

The legislation we have before us today echoes the majority's goal of making the Green New Deal a reality, fundamentally changing our way of life by making us increasingly dependent on foreign sources of energy.

Yesterday, Mr. Chairman, I joined my colleagues, Whip SCALISE and the House Committee on Natural Resources ranking member, Mr. BISHOP, to introduce the American Energy First Act.

Our bill would end unnecessary overreach from Washington bureaucrats and enable States to manage energy production on lands within our borders. Our all-of-the-above pro-energy legislation would help put our families to work, further our energy independence, and put our national security at the forefront.

Wyoming prides itself on our fossil fuels. We know that our economy and that our security depends on these. We consider our fossil fuels to be national treasures, and, Mr. Chairman, we thank God for our fossil fuels.

Mr. Chairman, I stand here today to oppose this misguided anti-energy independence and anti-national security agenda that the Democratic majority has continued to put before us, and I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

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

Mr. Chairman, this is not about energy independence. If my friends across the aisle were concerned about energy independence, they certainly wouldn't have lifted the crude oil export ban in the previous Congress. And if they wanted to talk about putting that crude oil export ban back in place, we would have something to work together on and we could actually take a step towards energy independence.

But the truth is we are awash in oil right now. We are exporting millions of barrels of oil a day while we continue to import all that big bad imported oil that sometimes my friends across the aisle are concerned about.

□ 1000

What this is really about, is money and profits for Big Oil. They make a lot more money when they can export that oil on the world market. That is why, when we talk about developing the coastal plain of the Arctic refuge, no one should be confused by these claims that that oil would go to American consumption. It won't.

It will find top dollar on the global export market because that is where Big Oil can make the most money, and that is what the agenda we have heard about is really all about.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the Representative from Alaska for yielding me the time.

I want to say it again. I want to thank the gentleman from Alaska, the sole Member representing all Alaskans in the House of Representatives, who joins with his Senators, the entire Alaska delegation, in opposing this bill.

I heard Mr. STAUBER come down earlier and talk about how we don't need people from other States, from California coming in and imposing their beliefs on Alaska. We have a Constitution. We have a structure here where

Members from the State of Alaska, residents from the State of Alaska, they elect their Representatives. And their Representatives are unanimously supporting the development in the ANWR. They unanimously support it.

Why do we have this structure where other people come in? It is fascinating to me that we can be here and have folks from California sit there and all the time ask for exemptions, ask for exceptions, ask for their own conditions or rules in California, and then they now come in and they know better, and they need to tell Alaskans what needs to be done.

I just heard allegations that this was about oil company profits and other things. This is about what the citizens of Alaska want, what their elected Representatives are doing to represent their own constituents.

Now, to give you an idea of how much of a farce this whole thing is, do you realize that this is the third bill that is using the same funding stream to pay for everything? We have taken \$1 and we paid \$3 with it. How do you do that? This entire thing is a farce.

To take it a step further to let you know what a farce this is, when this bill came up in the Natural Resources Committee, I offered an amendment that said that if this bill results in greater greenhouse gas emissions, then this bill doesn't take place. It is not enacted.

Do you know that my Democrat friends voted against it, meaning they want greater emissions and greenhouse gases, my environmentalist friends? This whole thing is a farce. This is going to result in greater dependence upon foreign oil imports.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I thank Mr. YOUNG for yielding me more time.

This is going to result in greater dependence on imports of energy. We have seen it over and over again. We had career officials sit right in front of us in the Natural Resources Committee and testify that when you stop domestic production, that you become more dependent.

Look upon my friend's own State of California that has become increasingly dependent upon oil from Saudi Arabia, increasing their imports of oil from Saudi Arabia. Look at our friends up in the northeast that had to import natural gas from Vladimir Putin's Russia and burn heavy heating oil to help to warm the homes in the northeast because they similarly cut off their energy supplies.

This makes no sense whatsoever. We are doing it under the auspices of an environment that this very bill threatens.

Mr. Chair, I urge rejection of this legislation, and rejection of this entire farce process.

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

We just heard some pretty high sanctimony about the need to listen to the people who actually live there. That might be convincing but for the fact that just yesterday, my friends voted to override the wishes of the people who actually live on the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts, the wishes of their Governors, their mayors, overwhelming majorities of their populations, who don't want to wreck their pristine coastlines and put their coastal economies at risk because of oil development.

So, again, let's not pretend that this is about listening to local voices. This is about listening to one voice, and that is the voice of Big Oil.

Let's take it back to Alaska. Even in the hotbed of oil development, as my friends would tell it, in the village of Kaktovik, a 2016 poll in that community indicated that that community itself is divided on the question of whether oil and gas development should proceed.

So, again, let's not be selective or hypocritical about the voices we claim to care about. Certainly, the voice of Big Oil is well-represented here today in this debate.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON).

Mr. UPTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the bill. I served as the former chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee and now serve as the top Republican on the Energy Subcommittee.

In those years, I helped develop, promote, and implement a North American energy independent plan, and it includes all of the above—yes, renewable energy as well.

I can remember the gas lines. I can remember paying higher prices for natural gas. I can remember \$4 and \$5 per gallon gas prices. And I can remember sending \$1 billion every day to the Middle East.

I smiled this last weekend when I filled up for \$2.25. I smile now when I know that we can export rather than import oil from places that may not be so friendly to the United States.

So if this bill passed, as well as the other two that passed yesterday and somehow became enacted into law, we have this thing called supply and demand. And guess what? Our consumers will pay much higher gas prices and we will lose out. So I would urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA).

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chairman, I wish to thank my colleague from Alaska, the Dean of the House here, Mr. YOUNG, for his strong efforts for many years on opening up this important piece of en-

ergy for our country and for our whole grid.

It is fascinating to listen to the debate here. Every piece of land, everything we would ever go to develop, whether it is for a pipeline, for energy, for forestry, the moment somebody approaches that resource, these God-given resources we have all over this country, it now becomes this pristine, untouchable, non-usable land that we shouldn't have anything to do with as humankind.

Salvage logging after a fire, oh, we can't do that. We have to sue over that. So we hear a lot about Big Oil.

How about big enviro? There are a lot of people who make a lot of money, six-digit numbers and more, in this town, a lot of dollars that come in by invoking a picture of an animal who probably was a victim of a fire in a forest because we are not managing that.

We have 47,000 acres of burning fire right in my district, in Plumas County in northern California, because we are not allowed to go out and manage these lands.

Almost everybody here in this Congress that lives more than a few hundred miles away flew here by a jet to get to this place to do this session. So where is the hypocrisy being talked about with the amount of energy everyone uses?

Energy has to come from somewhere, Mr. Chairman, for us to live as we do, to keep the lights on in this place, to keep it cool in here, to keep it warm in the winter—especially in the northeast where it is extremely cold. Oil is needed. Energy is needed.

We need to develop it in this country. We hear: We are exporting oil. We are importing oil. Well, there are different types of oil for different types of purposes, too. You have different types of food you exchange for different recipes. We have different types of oil and different types of energy.

Do we want to be relying on have our European allies relying on Iranian oil? Is that what we are asking here? Do we want them to be relying upon Russian natural gas in our European theater? No. We need to be part of that matrix, the United States. If we are an exporter or self-sufficient, we need to be active on this.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, we know how to ecologically do it well. This isn't 1850. We are not going to go out and do horrible environmental damage. We know how to do this right and we will be responsible. When that resource is done being used someday, we are going to put it back how it was.

We need to develop within our own country under our own rules, instead of having the arrogance of relying on other countries who do it without rules, such as China, such as the Middle East, and others that don't have

our best interests or even the environment at heart.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time. I am prepared to close.

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

Mr. Chair, I insert in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy on this bill which indicates that the President's advisers would recommend that we veto it, even though it is unlikely that it will ever get to his desk.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 205—PROTECTING AND SECURING FLORIDA'S COASTLINE ACT OF 2019—REP. ROONEY, R-FL, AND 18 COSPONSORS

H.R. 1146—ARCTIC CULTURAL AND COASTAL PLAIN PROTECTION ACT—REP. HUFFMAN, D-CA, AND 182 COSPONSORS

H.R. 1941—COASTAL AND MARINE ECONOMIES PROTECTION ACT—REP. CUNNINGHAM, D-SC, AND 51 COSPONSORS

The Administration opposes H.R. 205, the Protecting and Securing Florida's Coastline Act of 2019, H.R. 1146, the Arctic Cultural and Coastal Plain Protection Act, and H.R. 1941, the Coastal and Marine Economies Protection Act. These bills would undermine the Administration's commitment to a prosperous American economy supported by the responsible use of the Nation's abundant natural resources. Development of our resources enhances our energy security and energy dominance, and produces high-paying American jobs; provides increased revenue to the Treasury, States, tribes, and local communities; and is a critical source of conservation funding.

H.R. 1146 would prohibit the Department of the Interior's Bureau of Land Management from administering an oil and gas leasing program in the Coastal Plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) in Alaska. The bill would repeal a provision of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 that directed the Secretary of the Interior to establish a program for the development of the Coastal Plain that would allow the use of no more than about 0.01 percent of the total acreage of ANWR for surface development of production and support facilities. The Administration supports environmentally responsible energy development in the Coastal Plain, also known as the 1002 Area, of ANWR. Such development is expected to increase America's energy security and independence, create jobs, and provide affordable, reliable energy for consumers while providing much-needed revenue to both the State of Alaska and the Federal Government.

Similarly, H.R. 205 and H.R. 1941 would both restrict future oil and gas development in the Federal waters of the U.S. Outer Continental Shelf (OCS). H.R. 205 would amend the Gulf of Mexico Energy Security Act (GOMESA) to make permanent the current temporary leasing moratorium on offshore leasing in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico, off the west coast of Florida. H.R. 1941 would amend the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (OCSLA) to permanently remove from consideration acreage for offshore leasing on both the Atlantic and Pacific OCS. Both of these bills would undermine OCSLA, which established a periodic, multi-stage planning process involving State and tribal consultation and a thoughtful comparison and balancing of the benefits and impacts to all the regions of the OCS. These bills would permanently constrain this careful administrative process. Under the bills, large swaths of the OCS would be off limits for resource development without the benefit of periodic assessments of the potential economic, social, and

environmental effects of development, as required by existing law. Excluding these areas from leasing consideration could place more pressure for development on other OCS areas and constrain our ability to meet national energy needs as required by OCSLA.

Additionally, each of these bills would eliminate the potential for future direct revenue that would otherwise be provided to the Treasury, and through revenue sharing, to the States, tribes, and counties where the development activities occur. In Fiscal Year 2018, energy development on Federal and Indian lands and waters generated approximately \$9 billion in direct revenue from royalties, bonus bids, and rents. Of that revenue, \$1.78 billion was disbursed to 35 States. The top States receiving Fiscal Year 2018 revenues were New Mexico (\$634.9 million); Wyoming (\$563.9 million); Colorado (\$112.5 million); Louisiana (\$91 million); and Utah (\$76 million). Additionally, more than \$1 billion was disbursed to Indian tribes and individual Indian mineral owners; \$1.22 billion to the Reclamation Fund; \$970 million to the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF); \$150 million to the Historic Preservation Fund; and \$3.5 billion to the general fund of the Treasury.

Prohibiting energy development in new Federal areas would hinder future administrations' efforts to make up for revenue lost as production declines from leases in aging energy fields. Such restrictions will tie the hands of future administrations and reduce their ability to enhance energy security through strong domestic energy production and to ensure affordable energy for American families.

If these bills were presented to the President, his advisors would recommend he veto them.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I also insert in the RECORD a letter in strong opposition to this bill signed by over 20 entities, including the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Consumer Energy Alliance.

SEPTEMBER 5, 2019.

U.S. CONGRESS,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: We rely on American made energy to power our daily lives, communities and to grow a more prosperous future. Americans deserve clean, safe, reliable, abundant and affordable energy so that our families, communities and businesses can all share the opportunities American energy creates. Our country cannot afford to block access to new energy supplies and risk losing our energy advantage. That's why we ask you to oppose legislation being considered by the U.S. House of Representatives next week that would slow scientific surveys and prevent access to new sources of American offshore energy in the Outer Continental Shelf.

For more than seven decades, energy development in the Gulf of Mexico has worked collaboratively alongside tourism, fishing and Defense Department training activities. But H.R. 205 would permanently extend the eastern Gulf of Mexico moratorium on oil and natural gas activities. The Congressional Budget Office conservatively estimates that this could cost taxpayers \$400 million in revenue over the next 10 years. Similarly, H.R. 1941 would block offshore energy development in the Pacific and Atlantic planning areas, and H.R. 1146 would lock up energy resources in the Alaskan Coastal Plain.

Congress should support progress. Modern energy technologies have enabled an impressive record of environmental stewardship and innovation. But when the government chooses to arbitrarily and permanently close

off areas to exploration and potential development, we simply increase our dependency on foreign sources. This reality is visible in places like California and Massachusetts. Despite abundant offshore oil and natural gas resources, California imports 57 percent of its oil supply, a staggering 37 percent of which comes from Saudi Arabia. Meanwhile, to meet energy needs each winter, Massachusetts imports liquefied natural gas from Russia.

American energy is produced with a smaller carbon footprint under significantly stronger environmental protections than energy produced anywhere else in the world. We ask you to embrace these homegrown opportunities that benefit American families, create high-wage jobs, strengthen the U.S. economy and protect our environment.

Next week, the House of Representatives is expected to consider legislation undercutting domestic energy security and economic opportunity by limiting American energy access. We urge you to reject these bills and instead stand up for energy produced in America, by American workers for the benefit of American families.

Sincerely,
American Chemistry Council, American Council of Engineering Companies, American Forest & Paper Association, American Gas Association, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Petroleum Institute, American Pipeline Contractors Association, Consumer Energy Alliance, Distribution Pipeline Contractors Association, Energy Equipment and Infrastructure Alliance, Independent Petroleum Association of America.

International Association of Drilling Contractors, International Association of Geophysical Contractors, Laborers' International Union of North America, National Association of Manufacturers, National Ocean Industries Association, National Utility Contractors Association, Offshore Marine Service Association, Portland Cement Association, Power and Communication Contractors Association, U.S. Chamber of Commerce, U.S. Oil and Gas Association.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I also insert in the RECORD a letter of opposition from the Laborers' International Union of North America.

LiUNA!
September 9, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN MCCARTHY,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER PELOSI AND MINORITY LEADER MCCARTHY: On behalf of the 500,000 members of the Laborers' International Union of North America (LiUNA), I want to express our opposition to H.R. 205, which would permanently extend the moratorium on oil and gas leasing in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico; H.R. 1146, to once again prohibit oil and gas drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR); and, H.R. 1941, which would bar offshore drilling along the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts.

Once again, jobs of LiUNA members who work in the energy sector are being targeted for elimination by environmental radicals for purely political purposes. There is absolutely no chance for these "message bills" to be enacted into law this Congress. So, instead of working to enact real job creating infrastructure legislation, union members see their jobs once again being denigrated and belittled.

Energy independence is central to the future of the American economy and our standard of living. Unfortunately, the enemies of job creation continue to try to wall off and strand our domestic energy resources

from development; killing jobs, prolonging our energy dependence on unfriendly foreign regimes, and saddling middle-class and lower-income families with rising energy costs.

LiUNA members, in Alaska and elsewhere, know first-hand that when done responsibly, with union-trained workers, energy development can coexist with environmental stewardship. LiUNA and the other building trades unions invest significant resources into the training of our members that help develop the knowledge and skills they need to work safely and productively while constructing energy and other infrastructure to the highest standards.

For the hard-working members of LiUNA and other building trades unions, these jobs put food on their families' tables and roofs over their heads. These jobs enable them to put their children through college, to save for retirement, and to spend money in business establishments that employ others.

I urge you to vote against these ill-conceived bills.

With kind regards, I am

Sincerely yours,

TERRY O'SULLIVAN,
General President.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I insert in the RECORD a letter from the president of Voice of the Arctic Inupiat, which is in strong opposition to this legislation.

VOICE OF THE ARCTIC INUPIAT
Point Hope, AK, March 20, 2019.

Congressman JARED HUFFMAN,
Washington, DC.

REPRESENTATIVE HUFFMAN, Voice of the Arctic Inupiat (VOICE) strongly opposes H.R. 1146 amending Public Law 115-97 to repeal the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) oil and gas leasing program. Beyond the fact that your bill would repeal an opportunity that the Inupiat people have fought for decades to achieve, we are struck by the lack of knowledge displayed in this legislation, which completely ignores the existence of the Inupiat people, and especially the people of Kaktovik. The Native Village of Kaktovik is a federally recognized tribe and the Kaktovikmiut have occupied the Coastal Plain for at least 11,000 years.

The Coastal Plain is home to more than just caribou and none of the Coastal Plain is wilderness. It is not a place without people; it never has been—it has been continuously occupied by the Inupiat people and our ancestors for millennia, and we find it insulting that you fail to acknowledge this history. Currently, the Coastal Plain is the home of a community of over 200 people. People who live, hunt, fish, raise their families, and hope for a secure economic future for their children. People who walk in the footsteps of their ancestors all over the land that Congress, without our permission, designated as the 1002 Area of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. People that you have completely disregarded because they generally do not agree with you. In light of this, Congressman, your concern about human rights seems a bit pale.

When we, Indigenous peoples, use terms like self-determination, sovereignty, economic equality, cultural survival, and traditional lands, they are more than just buzzwords. These are objectives that have long been denied us and for which we have had to fight for generations. It is not for you to ignore those ideas, nor the people fighting for them, in favor of those who are more aligned with your political agenda. To us, this issue goes beyond politics to the very sustainability of our communities, culture, and economy.

The Arctic Cultural and Coastal Plain Protection Act undermines the wishes of those

of us living closest to ANWR and negates years of work by local stakeholders toward ensuring a sustainable economy for the people and communities of our region. We hope this letter might help you better understand the realities of life in the Arctic. H.R. 1146 preaches a "moral responsibility to protect this wilderness heritage as an enduring resource to bequeath undisturbed to future generations of Americans", but fails to acknowledge the basic needs of future generations of Arctic Inupiat. Our regional government, the North Slope Borough (NSB), is responsible for more territory than any other local government in the nation. The NSB receives over 96% of its revenue from property taxes levied on industry infrastructure on the North Slope, which enables them to provide services that were never accessible before in the Arctic. The Borough School District provides vocational and academic education for people of all ages; NSB health clinics provide modern medical services to residents in even the smallest and most remote of villages. The Municipal Services Department operates water, sewage, and electric utilities, plows roads and runways, and maintains landfills. Other NSB departments provide housing, police and fire protection, search and rescue, and other critical services to our communities. Altogether, the NSB is the single largest local employer on the North Slope, employing over 63% of the workforce. These benefits of modern American civilization, common in the rest of the nation, have been built on the foundation of the North Slope oil industry.

It is hypocritical of you, Congressman, to stifle the efforts of Kaktovik to secure jobs, a local economy, and income for their community while your state makes billions of dollars off the development of its own oil and gas resources. If you are concerned about the impacts of resource development, we suggest that you focus on your own state of California, which despite its green image, produces the dirtiest crude in America and has some of the largest refineries on the West Coast, which in addition to refining much cleaner Alaska North Slope Crude, also imports and refines oil from foreign countries like Saudi Arabia and Angola. The message this bill sends is that you prioritize the leisure whims of your California constituents above the needs of the Native people of Kaktovik.

H.R. 1146 cites climate change as one of the main drivers of the bill. In reality, climate change—and the world's response to it—add additional layers to existing burdens that we, the Arctic's Indigenous people, are facing. We agree that climate change has deeply affected our traditional Inupiat ways of life. We do not agree that the solution to that problem is to create more wilderness that hinders our ability to provide for our people and respond to the impacts that we are facing. It is unfair for you to ask that we, as Indigenous peoples, carry the burden of climate change and the burden of mitigation so that you can fly back and forth to your home district with an easy conscience.

Even with the services our local government provides, many of the people in the Arctic live in conditions that fall below acceptable standards of living, despite being citizens of one of the richest countries in the world. We are concerned and puzzled, then, by your focus on protecting eco-tourism and this idea of pristine, unspoiled wilderness—at the expense of an economy to sustain our children—that rich elites across America "cherish." While we are certainly used to this harmful narrative by now, it does not seem in line with your democratic values. For our part, we do not see any contradiction between developing our resources and at the same time protecting our environment

and wildlife. These are not diverging priorities but an integral piece to balance in the Arctic.

The bill as introduced further ignores the historical and cultural trauma that is a part of this land and the Kaktovikmiut who inhabit it. The people of Kaktovik, in recent memory, have suffered through three forced relocations at the hands of the American military. Then, in 1980, the federal government took 23 million acres of land—without consent, consultation, nor a treaty between parties—and gave the people of Kaktovik back 92,000 acres of land immediately surrounding their village. A mere fraction of their traditional and ancestral lands. The "deal" was that this land was locked up, the Kaktovikmiut were unable to access Native allotments, cultural sites, and subsistence areas in the newly expanded Refuge in the summer months. No, they now live with extreme restrictions on how they can use their own lands as a result of the changes made by the federal government in how the land is designated, lands that the Inupiat people have been stewards over for thousands of years. Do you consider these human rights violations, Representative Huffman? We hope, at the very least, that this does not diminish "the integrity of the National Wildlife Refuge System," which in itself operates on the mistaken Western idea that Indigenous peoples are incompetent at managing their own lands.

The views of the Inupiat who call ANWR home are frequently ignored, and your bill reinforces the perception that the wishes of people who live in and around the Coastal Plain are less important than those who live hundreds and thousands of miles away. Mr. Huffman, you do not have to tell the Inupiat people, who have lived on this land for generations, the importance of our homelands—we see it, we know it, we depend on it, we are a part of it. We have something very important in common, that often gets lost in this debate—this false dichotomy of "for" vs. "against", republican vs. democrat, economy vs. environment—we all share a commitment to protecting this land and we would welcome the opportunity to work collaboratively with you and the Gwich'in people, to whom we have extended many invitations for discussion, to protect this balance between responsible development and environmental protections that is integral to our way of life and the long-term sustainability of our culture.

The Inupiat people have existed, and even flourished, in one of the most severe climates in the world for generations. We understand the balance needed to sustain our way of life and our communities; this priority is currently dependent on successful and safe oil and gas developments. We are confident that the health of the Porcupine Caribou Herd can be maintained given our success in maintaining the health of three other caribou herds that migrate within our region. We respectfully request that you remove your bill from consideration and come visit our communities to better understand the needs of our people and our communities. We would welcome the opportunity.

Taikuu,

SAYERS TUZROYLUK,
President, Voice of the Arctic Inupiat.

REX A. ROCK SR.,
Chairman.

JOHN HOPSON JR.,
Vice Chairman.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), the former chairman of the committee and ranking member at this time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I was hoping the gentleman would insert me as well.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the opportunity of being here. We are here today on day two of the Democrat week of energy proposals. And once again, we will quote Earl Weaver when he went out to the umpire and said:

Is this as good as it gets, or are you going to get better?

I will say the same thing on this bill as we did yesterday. Is this as good as it gets, or are you actually going to get better?

This is the same concept we had with the first bill that we did. We voted second, but we actually discussed it as the first bill yesterday, in which we did things that are basically illogical, not for science reasons. Science was essentially taken out and shoved into a trash can, but, actually, we did it for political reasons.

It is signified by the amendments that the Rules Committee, unfortunately, made in order in which we made amendments in order to have all sorts of studies on the issue.

In the real world, you would try and do a study, come up with results, and then come up with the policy. That is not what we did yesterday. We decided on a policy, and then we are going to institute a lot of non-comprehensive, skewed studies to try and see if we can come up with arguments in favor of the policy we already did. It is backwards.

It is okay to do it. You have the votes to do it. That is fine. Just don't have the audacity to say that this administration doesn't trust science or that we don't trust science over here, when you also put an amendment in there to deny any kind of seismic research, which would give you the data we haven't had since the 1980s, but only some of that seismic data. It is a skewed approach to it.

But the most significant issue is the one that Mr. HUFFMAN has raised several times today in which he was right—slightly off center with it—but he is actually right.

Yesterday, many of the arguments that were made were that the States and State populations in these areas want a kind of moratorium on drilling in their areas. I get that. Listening to those people is a good thing to do. But where the gentleman got it wrong, though, is that they weren't talking to the States who were wanting that. We are not talking about the areas within their States or even the water that abuts their States as legally theirs. They wanted the ability to control what happens on Federal waters, which is not part of the State's concept.

Once again, if you would allow me the ability to have control of what happens on Federal lands in my State, in the State, we might have an apples-and-apples situation, but that ain't it.

There is also the concept that there was not consultation with Native Americans who live in Alaska and that, once again, is actually inaccurate.

There have been consultations going on since the gentleman was playing volleyball in college. And they will continue to go on from that side.

In fact, that is where the difference comes. The people in Alaska who live there don't want this bill. And, once again, they don't want it because it is impacting their State, their property, their land, which is not what was happening yesterday, where States were trying to impact what was happening on Federal water.

It was sad that when we had the hearing on this bill, the Democrats did not invite those residents of this area to testify. We did. And when they came in March to testify, the Tribal leaders from the only village in this coastal plain, the one that is closest to this area, simply said they were against this bill.

Their exact words were: "The Arctic Inupiat will not become conservation refugees. We do not approve of efforts to turn our homeland into one giant national park, which literally guarantees us a fate with no economy, no jobs, reduced subsistence, and no hope for the future of our people."

□ 1015

That is what they want in their area. When some of the other speakers said there is no consultation, that is not true.

Mr. YOUNG is saying exactly what the constituents want in their area. Even though this land is controlled by Fish and Wildlife, the mineral resources are not Federal. These people who are testifying that they don't want this bill own a majority or a significant portion of those mineral rights. It is their mineral rights, and they should have the ability to say what they want, too. They have spoken clearly year after year.

That is where the difference of yesterday and today is significant, and the gentleman is glossing over that. That is significant.

These people need to have the ability to control their own destiny. They are not trying to control something that is not within the State. It is their resources. It is their area.

We have had this debate before. We had it when I first came here. It is going to continue on ad nauseam.

The problem is this is not a good energy position for the future. What we produced yesterday as Republicans is a program that increases jobs, increases the economy, and makes this country stronger. The stuff the Democrats are putting on in their energy week is disjointed, discombobulated, and doesn't actually help anyone at all.

Once again, Mr. Chair, I agree with Mr. YOUNG. Trust his people on what they want to do with their resources—not Federal—their resources.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, it is important to remember that we are talking about a Federal wildlife refuge, America's Arctic refuge.

Mr. Chair, you would lose sight of that, perhaps, listening to the pretzel

logic we just heard from my friend who at the end of the day cannot square the selective concern for local voices when it comes to drilling in a Federal refuge and yet the flouting of local voices when it comes to drilling, in the Federal interest, the Outer Continental Shelf on the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts. The disconnect is dizzying.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE), who is one of the Members of Congress who has actually spent some time in the Arctic refuge.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chair, in 2017, with little debate, the Republican-led Chamber quietly approved a provision to open up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas drilling. ANWR is our Nation's largest wildlife refuge, and it is the ancestral home to the Gwich'in people and current home to more than 250 species of wildlife, including threatened species like polar bears that raise their cubs there.

As the chairman said, I have traveled to this special place. I have met with the Gwich'in people. I saw the pristine beauty of the coastal plain, and I saw thousands of Porcupine caribou in their annual migration process. I know how important this refuge is to our entire ecosystem.

Instead of protecting this important environment, this administration is going to open it up to drilling and allow it to be destroyed for an indeterminate amount of oil. Why? The American people are overwhelmingly opposed to this plan. They want this land preserved, not destroyed.

This bill, H.R. 1146, will block the administration's disastrous plan and protect the refuge.

Mr. Chair, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support it.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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

I rise in opposition to this unwarranted legislation. Like the two bills we debated yesterday, this bill is another attempt to hinder American energy dominance and our national security.

As someone who has visited the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, I know the support that responsible energy production in section 1002 has among the local population.

Responsible energy production will provide much-needed employment opportunities to the local population as well as critical tax revenue for local government services. Not only does energy development in section 1002 have the support of inhabitants in the region, but it also has the support of our colleague, Congressman DON YOUNG, and Alaska's two Senators. In addition, the majority of Alaskans support it; every Alaskan Governor since 1980 has supported it; 100 percent of Alaska's congressional delegation since 1980 has supported it; and the Natives who live right there, the village of Kaktovik,

the Inupiat, the proper Tribe that is closest to them and the only Tribe within section 1002, support it.

This bill follows a bad pattern of how Democratic members on the Natural Resources Committee operate. They do not care that local representatives and residents oppose this legislation. They believe that Washington, D.C., and extremist national environmental groups know best and everyone else should just go along with their extremism. And it double-crosses the tax bill passed just last year.

Section 1002 has the potential to benefit greatly our country's energy security. Estimates from the U.S. Geological Survey believe section 1002 contains more than 12 billion barrels of oil, not to make mention of natural gas.

Once again, Mr. Chair, we have an example of the other side putting left-wing extremism and their environmental donors ahead of local voices, our national security, and the needs of the American people. I am a firm believer in an all-of-the-above approach to responsible energy production and multiple use. Our public lands, like section 1002, have nearly unlimited potential to power our country.

Further, we can do all this while protecting the environment. Section 1002 is a small sliver in this area, 2,000 acres, in fact.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this legislation.

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

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, does the gentleman from California have the right to close?

The CHAIR. The gentleman from California has the right to close.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, this is a sham bill. I have heard people say there was no consultation. There has been consultation. The gentleman from California has driven a wedge between two groups of Alaska Natives, one that lives there, resides there, and is directly affected, and the other one is 400 miles away. We had testimony from that group.

By the way, I am a Gwich'in. I may not be one, but my daughters are. My wife was. She would turn over in her grave right now if she heard this nonsense about the Gwich'in.

You invited a group in Alaska. This used to be the House of the people. Instead of people putting their nose in my business, I am going to put it in your business. I will figure out a way to do that because this is wrong. This has been debated for 40 years, an area set aside by this Congress for exploration.

By the way, we gave the Alaska Natives who live there at Kaktovik 70,000 acres of land for their social and economic well-being, and you are taking it away from them. You talk about a cultural aspect, you are hurting those people, and you don't care. I remember who you represent, and I understand that. You are a lawyer.

To me, to have this type of bill on the floor is not only a waste of time for this House body but a bad thing for this Nation, but worse than that is going back on their word.

I represent the whole State of Alaska. The people who live there, live on the Arctic slope, want this legislation, not the Gwich'in. Yes, they are being, very frankly, shilled and used for a sham, and that is a shame.

You can be what you want to be. You can stand there holier-than-thou. You are doing something wrong to this Nation, the Alaska people, and the Alaska Native. You listen to one side.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I have a lot of respect and affection for the dean of the House. I am sorry that we are on opposite sides of this issue. I am also sorry that it seems when it comes to oil and gas development in the Arctic refuge, he is listening to only some of the voices in the Alaska community.

Mr. Chair, this week, dozens of indigent Gwich'in leaders flew all the way to Washington, D.C., as they have done many, many times over the years, long before I started working on this bill. They do that because the Arctic refuge is not simply a policy issue for them. It is not about energy supplies, geopolitics, profits, or scoring political points. It is about their entire way of life.

Those of us on the floor today don't worry that our entire history and our entire culture hinge on the outcome of this vote. But for the people in the gallery today, the Gwich'in who are in the gallery behind me right now, that is exactly what is at stake.

For those on the other side who would have us destroy this wild and sacred area for some petroleum profits, I would ask them this: Why now? Why do we need to do this now? Because once it is done, it is done. The coastal plain will never be the same again after the drill rigs roll in.

If we wait, if we conserve, if we protect, and if we treat this special area with the care it deserves, then it will still be there, wild and undisturbed for future generations to enjoy. Or maybe my grandchildren will still be debating Congressman YOUNG's great-great-grandchildren over this same issue on this very floor.

Do you know what? That is fine. I don't mind the debate. That is what this country is all about. But recklessly throwing open one of the most special places in this country because a few oil companies want even higher profits and President Trump wants a win? That is not fine. That is not worth it.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to protect the Arctic, stand with the Gwich'in people, and vote "yes" on the Arctic Cultural and Coastal Plain Protection Act.

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

The CHAIR. The Chair would remind Members to avoid referencing occupants of the gallery.

All time for general debate has expired.

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

In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, the amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-30, modified by the amendment printed in part C of House Report 116-200, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as an original bill for purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule and shall be considered as read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 1146

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Arctic Cultural and Coastal Plain Protection Act".

SEC. 2. REPEAL OF ARCTIC NATIONAL WILDLIFE REFUGE OIL AND GAS PROGRAM.

Section 20001 of Public Law 115-97 (16 U.S.C. 3143 note) is hereby repealed.

SEC. 3. INSPECTION FEE COLLECTION.

Section 22 of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1348) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(g) INSPECTION FEES.—

"(1) ESTABLISHMENT.—The Secretary of the Interior shall collect from the operators of facilities subject to inspection under subsection (c) non-refundable fees for such inspections—

"(A) at an aggregate level equal to the amount necessary to offset the annual expenses of inspections of outer Continental Shelf facilities (including mobile offshore drilling units) by the Secretary of the Interior; and

"(B) using a schedule that reflects the differences in complexity among the classes of facilities to be inspected.

"(2) OCEAN ENERGY SAFETY FUND.—There is established in the Treasury a fund, to be known as the 'Ocean Energy Safety Fund' (referred to in this subsection as the 'Fund'), into which shall be deposited all amounts collected as fees under paragraph (1) and which shall be available as provided under paragraph (3).

"(3) AVAILABILITY OF FEES.—Notwithstanding section 3302 of title 31, United States Code, all amounts deposited in the Fund—

"(A) shall be credited as offsetting collections;

"(B) shall be available for expenditure for purposes of carrying out inspections of outer Continental Shelf facilities (including mobile offshore drilling units) and the administration of the inspection program under this section;

"(C) shall be available only to the extent provided for in advance in an appropriations Act; and

"(D) shall remain available until expended.

"(4) ADJUSTMENT FOR INFLATION.—For each fiscal year beginning after fiscal year 2020, the Secretary shall adjust each dollar amount specified in this subsection for inflation based on the change in the Consumer Price Index from fiscal year 2020.

"(5) ANNUAL FEES.—Annual fees shall be collected under this subsection for facilities that are above the waterline, excluding drilling rigs, and are in place at the start of the fiscal year. Fees for fiscal year 2020 shall be—

“(A) \$25,300 for facilities with no wells, but with processing equipment or gathering lines;

“(B) \$40,700 for facilities with 1 to 10 wells, with any combination of active or inactive wells; and

“(C) \$75,900 for facilities with more than 10 wells, with any combination of active or inactive wells.

“(6) FEES FOR DRILLING RIGS.—Fees shall be collected under this subsection for drilling rigs on a per inspection basis. Fees for fiscal year 2020 shall be—

“(A) \$73,700 per inspection for rigs operating in water depths of 500 feet or more; and

“(B) \$40,700 per inspection for rigs operating in water depths of less than 500 feet.

“(7) FEES FOR NON-RIG UNITS.—Fees shall be collected under this subsection for well operations conducted via non-rig units as outlined in subparts D, E, F, and Q of part 250 of title 30, Code of Federal Regulations, on a per inspection basis. Fees for fiscal year 2020 shall be—

“(A) \$29,172 per inspection for non-rig units operating in water depths of 2,500 feet or more;

“(B) \$25,366 per inspection for non-rig units operating in water depths between 500 and 2,499 feet; and

“(C) \$9,834 per inspection for non-rig units operating in water depths of less than 500 feet.

“(8) BILLING.—The Secretary shall bill designated operators under paragraph (5) annually, with payment required within 30 days of billing. The Secretary shall bill designated operators under paragraph (6) within 30 days of the end of the month in which the inspection occurred, with payment required within 30 days after billing.”

SEC. 4. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part D of House Report 116–200.

Each further amendment printed in part D of the report may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part D of House Report 116–200.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

On page 1, line 6, strike “Section” and insert the following:

(a) Section

On page 1, after line 7, insert the following:

(b) TRIBAL CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT.—The repeal made by subsection (a) shall not take effect until—

(1) the Secretary of the Interior completes a thorough consultation with the Inupiat people regarding the effect of this Act on the

quality of life, human rights, and future of the Inupiat people; and

(2) by formal action Kaktovic Village approves of such repeal.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 548, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, we discussed before that this bill was written by the gentleman from California. It only impacts Alaska and impacts it only, and I am the only Congressman. I strongly oppose this legislation.

My amendment, very frankly, was to try to solve one of the problems, the lack of consultation with the people in Kaktovik, the Inuits, and only listen to one side, the Gwich'in.

This amendment says, yes, they will have to consult with the Inuits, and they have to consult with the people of Kaktovik, and it would require them to understand that if they didn't agree with it, very frankly, this would not go forth.

It is a good amendment. If the gentleman says this is culturally real, you have to listen to both sides. You have divided us. This amendment solves that problem.

Adopt this amendment and make this bill a little bit better but not totally good.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, unfortunately, this amendment is a stall tactic to delay the bill's protections for the Arctic refuge from taking effect until the Secretary of the Interior—a walking conflict of interest who became the subject of investigations into ethical violations just 4 days into his job—has conducted a “consultation” process and received formal action from one village, the village of Kaktovik. I wish that same concern for Native American community consultation had existed before the Republican tax bill was amended to insert this drilling mandate without any consultation with Native American Tribes, certainly not the Gwich'in people who may technically live a little further away from the drilling area, but we are talking about people who for millennia have depended on the Porcupine caribou herd that absolutely depends on this pristine beating heart of America's Arctic refuge.

□ 1030

So again, we are cherry-picking, I am afraid, which voices matter, which voices get to be listened to, and certainly putting this Secretary of the Interior in charge of that process would be a cruel joke.

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

Mr. YOUNG. Again, might I may say, Mr. Chairman, this bill has been de-

bated. It passed out of this House 14 times—14 times—with consultation.

And with all due respect to my friend from Gwich'in, I would like to take a count of the caribou they have harvested in this last year and the year before. It is a very small number. The people who live there, right on the shores and with them, are saying this is okay.

We developed Prudhoe Bay. We have more caribou now than we have ever had.

This is, again, a sham. It is such a dishonest presentation of something that is not fact at all. But, again, in society, people can do that. I understand that.

But we ought to understand one thing: This bill should never have come to the floor.

Number two, it is not the first time. There was consultation. We did pass it—again, 14 times—out of this House, even when you were in control, and now it is the wrong thing to do. The Senate didn't pass the bill once, and Bill Clinton beat it to death.

So I am just saying, again—not much use talking about it much more—that we can go ahead and vote on this today, but this amendment solves one of the problems: true consultation with two groups of individual Alaska Natives, both having some say in it, one totally not listened to because you have never asked them, and that is an unfortunate thing.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, let's do be careful about the facts.

More caribou than we have ever had before? That is certainly the case for the Porcupine caribou herd, precisely because it has had the benefit of the wilderness management of the coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge so critical to its migratory pattern and its calving.

Throughout the rest of the Arctic, caribou are in real trouble. Herds are declining, and a very recent study has confirmed that. So let's take note of the fact that we have one place where caribou are thriving. Let's not wreck that place with oil and gas development.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND), chair of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment. As a 35th-generation American, it is well known that I am deeply committed to ensuring proper consultation with Indian Tribes about Federal policies and laws that impact them.

But this amendment isn't really about Tribal consultation. If it were, Republicans would have insisted on this provision before the Arctic Refuge was added to the tax bill and opened up for drilling. And they would also be insisting on consultation with all Tribes, including the Gwich'in people, who get sustenance from the Porcupine caribou

herd that will be directly impacted by drilling on the coastal plain.

Just because certain Alaska Natives don't "live there" doesn't mean they don't have ancestral ties to the land. And, in fact, this land is imperative to their present and future existence. The real purpose of this amendment is to delay protecting the refuge until this administration is able to give it away to oil and gas companies, when it will be too late.

If we stop the leasing process first, I would fully support a thorough consultation with the Inupiat and Gwich'in people and would look for ways to improve the quality of life of the people of Kaktovik without drilling the Arctic Refuge. We can't drill first and ask questions later, because there is no going back.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chair, I am urging a "yes" vote on this amendment and "no" on the legislation itself.

And, again, I think the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) has done a great disservice to the people of Alaska, especially the natives. He has divided us, and that is not right.

The floor of this House has divided a culture, different cultures, Alaska Natives, and it is for that I am deeply regretful. It shows what you can do when you interfere with other people's districts.

This House used to be a House of the people. Now it is a House of what? What have they done in 2 years? Nothing.

Now they are trying to undo what was done legitimately in 40 years. And so I understand it. You have the votes. I understand that. It is not going to become law. I hope you understand that.

And we are going to have a sale—I hope you understand that—and then my people that I represent will, in fact, get their just due. I know that.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, as I said, this amendment is a delay tactic to ensure that the current administration will lock in a lease sale before protections can go into place or before they are finally run out of office.

It does not require consultation with the Gwich'in people, many of whom are here today. These are the folks who consider the coastal plains sacred. They have relied on the Porcupine caribou since time immemorial for their cultural, spiritual, and physical sustenance, as well as food security.

There was no demand for Tribal consultation prior to this little provision being slipped in to the tax giveaway in the previous Congress. What we are hearing today is a very selective interest in consultation that would place the entire process in the hands of a Department of the Interior whose only interest is serving the interests of big oil.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment and "yes" on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part D of House Report 116-200.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:
SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 2 of this Act shall not be effective until the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, finds that the repeal under section 2 will not adversely affect jobs available to Native Americans, other minorities and women.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 548, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment that allows the section 2 moratorium in this bill to go into effect when the Department of the Interior, in consultation with the Department of Labor, certifies that the anti-energy moratorium in the bill will not kill a substantial number of Tribal, minority, and women jobs.

We heard arguments from Democratic Members on the other side of the aisle against a similar amendment that this amendment doesn't matter and is meaningless. How callous that response. Tell the opponents of this amendment to tell that to the single mother working to put food on the table for her two children that her job doesn't matter.

How about the minority family who just moved into a new neighborhood so their kids could go to better schools? Tell those hardworking minority parents these jobs don't matter.

Tell those local Tribe members, the Inupiat, the only Tribe within the 1002 section who want these jobs, whose prosperity comes to their community with these jobs, that these economic benefits don't matter.

Under the current administration, unemployment has reached record lows. In August, the national unemployment rate sat at 3.7 percent, with the unemployment rate for African American workers sitting at 5.5 percent, breaking the previous record of 5.9 percent, which was set in May of 2018.

According to a recent report by The Washington Post, a bastion of conserv-

ative dictation, nearly 90 percent of the jobs added under this administration have gone to minority communities. This can be attributed to, for the first time, a majority of new hires are people between the ages of 25 and 54 and are from minority communities.

According to statistics published by the American Petroleum Institute, minorities will comprise one-third of the total workforce in the oil and gas sector by 2030. Women already comprise more than 15 percent of the oil and gas workforce.

These are good-paying jobs, \$90,000 and above, that hardworking families depend on. This legislation puts these employment opportunities and associated economic benefits at risk.

America's energy renaissance has boosted the economies of previously left-behind towns in areas and sections of this country and has turned them into vibrant communities.

Mr. Chairman, this is a commonsense amendment, protects minority Tribal members and women jobs, and puts the interests of the American workforce first.

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

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

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, I am sorry to say, is another delay tactic in order to buy this administration more time to jam through a lease sale.

We know that former Assistant Secretary Joe Balash said earlier this year that the leased sale will happen in 2019 and that the administration is running over all opposition in order to make that happen, ignoring concerns of wildlife biologists about impacts from seismic testing and oil development itself.

Now, I said "former Assistant Secretary" when I referred to Mr. Balash, because he left the Department of the Interior. Just days ago, he was a top official—remember—pushing for drilling in the Arctic Refuge, and he left to take a job with an oil company that stands to profit from the Trump administration's oil giveaway bonanza.

You can't make this stuff up, folks. Anyone who thought Teapot Dome was the high watermark of corruption at the Department of the Interior I hope is paying attention to the incredible craven levels of corruption that we are seeing today. These are the folks who this amendment would entrust with the authority to call the shots on whether drilling should proceed.

Unfortunately, this is not a serious proposal. I urge my colleagues to oppose it, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, how offensive. How offensive that argument, particularly when you look at the Department of Labor. Hardly a bastion in regards to the corruptness, at least in this administration.

Amazing. Amazing that jobs that we see the empowerment of people, taking them away from the victims, victimhood, that Democrats so desperately need, particularly, the Native Americans who are empowered right here with the money and the jobs to lift them out from the poverty that they actually see.

Amazing. Absolutely amazing.

So it seems to me that when you start looking at this application in consultation with the Department of Labor, makes a big, big difference.

Now, when you look at this, American oil and gas production is nearly responsible for 10 million jobs. That is a huge amount of sector. And we discussed earlier that 90 percent of these jobs in this sector are going to women and minorities. That is a fabulous number. That is the American Dream.

This is a commonsense application that Congress has got to get used to to understand the ramifications, the true ramifications of our intent.

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

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

Mr. Chair, the impacts on jobs for Native Americans, for minorities, for women, this should not be used as a pretext for more oil and gas drilling, especially in a pristine place like the Arctic Refuge. These are frontline communities that often bear the brunt of pollution and environmental justice impact. And it is deeply cynical to try to suggest that their interest would be a reason to push for more drilling in a place like the Arctic Refuge.

Mr. Chairman, if my colleagues want to work on jobs and the economic interest of these communities, we have got a lot to work together on, but we should do that in a way that looks to the future.

Squeezing a little more fossil fuel out of a special place like the Arctic Refuge is not the future. Developing clean renewable energy resources absolutely is the future. I hope some day we can get to the point of working together to create great, well-paying jobs in those future interests instead of trying to look backward to the era of fossil fuels, which I hope we can bring to an end as quickly as possible.

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

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

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part D of House Report 116-200.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:
SEC. 5. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 2 of this Act shall not be effective until the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, finds that the repeal under section 2 will not adversely affect Caribou herd populations.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 548, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED
BY MR. GOSAR

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment be modified in the form I have placed at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Modification to Amendment No. 3 Offered by Mr. GOSAR:

Strike "Secretary of Labor" and insert "Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service".

The CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman of Arizona?

There was no objection.

The CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

The modified amendment allows section 2 of the bill to go into effect when the DOI, in consultation with the Fish and Wildlife Service, certifies that section 2 of the bill will not harm the caribou herd population.

It has been proven that, over time, the caribou herds of the North Slope can coexist and even thrive with energy development that takes place there.

Many of my Republican colleagues and Members of the Western Caucus have seen this firsthand. We have seen the great lengths that industry and regional governments, Alaska Natives and others have gone through to protect the caribou.

□ 1045

In March of this year, the Tribal administrator of the Native village testified: "Through the use of science and traditional knowledge, best practices have been implemented to reduce or avoid impacts; such as, adequate pipeline height to not impede migrating caribou, sufficient distance between pipeline and road to avoid deterring crossing caribou, specifications on road height and slope, thoughtful design on road placement to avoid funneling migrating caribou, aircraft altitude guidelines, time-area closures, and other restrictions on operations.

"These safeguards have worked to protect caribou across the North Slope,

and we are confident that, through coordination with the people of Kaktovik, these mechanisms can be successfully applied to oil and gas programs in the coastal plain."

In fact, I have seen that the pipelines that go through the area occupied by the caribou herd are now 10 to 15 feet in the air, allowing the herds to easily pass underneath them to facilitate migration and breeding. And this was done voluntarily, at the industry's expense.

Statistics have shown that the caribou herds that inhabit areas in and around areas where oil and gas production is taking place have actually grown in size; whereas, herds that have inhabited areas where no oil and gas activity has taken place have actually declined.

Yes, we have heard the false narrative from the other side today and over the years that caribou populations are declining and oil and gas production is to blame. That is simply not true.

For example, the Porcupine herd located within the proposed development has fluctuated greatly, even without the oil and gas development taking place. From 1989 to 2001, the Porcupine herd population decreased by nearly one third, even while no oil and gas production was taking place on the lands they inhabited.

This stands in stark contrast with the central Arctic caribou herd which inhabits lands adjacent to ANWR, where oil and gas development takes place.

The central Arctic herd grew from 5,000 caribou in 1975, about the time development began, to almost 32,000 in 2002.

In short, oil and gas production has proven to be good for the central Arctic caribou herd, and breeding caribou have even been found to migrate toward the pipelines due to the heat they put off.

The other side uses the caribou herds that live in the ANWR region as political pawns to try and prevent energy development in the area.

Again, statistics show that the caribou herd populations can benefit with responsible oil and gas development.

This amendment challenges the false narrative that has clearly been disproven with the population explosion of the central Arctic caribou herd in oil-and-gas-producing areas.

Further, this commonsense amendment provides further protection for caribou herds by ensuring this bill won't negatively impact these populations.

Mr. Chair, I urge everybody to vote for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, this is, unfortunately, another delay tactic intended to enable this administration to

rush through oil lease sales in the Arctic refuge.

And now I am afraid my friends across the aisle are really stretching. This argument that oil development is good for caribou is something we have heard before. It has been debunked every single time we hear it.

But, if you really want to see the craven nature of this proposal, focus on the fact that the person who would make the decision, who would strike that balance between oil drilling and caribou protection, is none other than the Secretary of the Interior, David Bernhardt, an oil and gas lobbyist who temporarily left the payroll of the oil and gas industry for a little time in public service and has never stopped representing their interests. And we all know that, a year and a half from now, he will be right back on Big Oil's payroll.

So this is not a serious argument. This is a delay tactic.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, once again, we are going to debunk the flawed science that the other side looks at.

Mr. Chair, I have two different articles that have been peer reviewed, and I include them in the RECORD.

CARIBOU CALVES AND OIL DEVELOPMENT—DO THEY MIX?

(By Patti Harper)

One thing's certain about day-old caribou calves. "They are incredibly cute," says Steve Arthur, a biologist with the Alaska Department of Fish and Game in Fairbanks.

Arthur and his research partner, Patricia Del Vecchio, have gotten up close and personal with newborn calves of the Central Arctic caribou herd each June since 2001, in an effort to address an important question: What is the effect of oil field development on wildlife?

Arthur says data they have collected suggest that when cows are displaced from preferred calving areas, their calves are smaller at birth and may not grow as fast or survive as well. It's an important finding because some of the calving and summer ranges of the Central Arctic caribou herd overlap areas of oil development on Alaska's North Slope.

The herd's size increased from approximately 5,000 caribou in 1975, about the time development began, to almost 32,000 in 2002. But Arthur says no easy answer can be gleaned about whether development has affected the herd from looking at changes in the overall number of caribou, because many factors affect growth or decline of caribou populations. Previous researchers have drawn contradictory and controversial conclusions about whether and how much caribou are affected, he said.

When the study started, the Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G) and other management agencies had been encouraging oil field developers to minimize impacts and activities in calving areas, but wanted better data. "My interest is in trying to cut through some of the controversial aspects of some of the previous work that has been done and come up with something concrete and measurable," Arthur said. The goal has been to identify and measure the mechanisms through which development disturbance might affect the caribou population, such as by reducing body condition, reproductive success or calf survival.

The Bureau of Land Management and ConocoPhillips contributed major funding for the project, and the National Park Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service also provided support.

Arthur and his team spent five years measuring calves, and radiotracking cows and calves, to learn more about such things as preferred calving areas, feeding ranges, and calf survival. Each year, they captured 60 to 65 calves during the two-week calving season in June, fitted them with radio collars, weighed them and measured metatarsus (lower leg bone) length. These calves were then located by radio signal every two weeks through October, and the following March and June, to find out how many calves survived. Calves were captured, weighed and measured when they were three and nine months old. Over the course of the study, 58 cows were fitted with Global Positioning System (GPS) collars that provided locations for them every five hours from May through October, and every two days from November through April.

The work was exciting, but it wasn't easy. The team had to hope for good flying weather during what could be a somewhat wintry and blustery June. It was important, Arthur says, to measure calves within a couple of days of their birth. Having some older than others would make it difficult to compare data. Also, at three days old, calves can run pretty fast, making them difficult to catch. The newborns were caught by hand—the helicopter landed, Arthur or Del Vecchio jumped out, grabbed a calf, collared and measured it, and then left as quickly as possible so its mother, watching from nearby, could return.

Netting rather than drug-darting was used to capture older caribou because animals from the herd are an important food source for residents of the area. Skilled net-gunners leaned from low-flying helicopters to release the nets. Caribou caught in the nets were then hobbled and blindfolded to calm them and again, the process of collaring, weighing and measuring took just a few minutes before the caribou were released.

In their recently published interim research technical report, "Effects of Oil Field Development on Calf Production and Survival in the Central Arctic Herd," Arthur and Del Vecchio compare what happened to calves that were born in two different calving areas, an area that is in a mostly undeveloped area east of Prudhoe Bay, and an area west of Prudhoe Bay that has seen increasing development since the late 1980s. In the western area, calving has shifted south since development began, though the researchers point out that it is unclear if the shift resulted from development, increased herd size, or other factors.

The researchers found that newborns from the western area on average weighed a little less and were slightly smaller than those from the eastern area, and that these differences persisted through at least the first nine months of life. They also found that calves that were heavier in September were more likely to survive the following winter. However, statistically, survival rates did not differ between the areas—depending on the year, 53 to 87 percent of calves that were alive at the end of the calving period survived to the end of their first year. The researchers say it is hard to detect small differences in survival rates, and other research has shown that small differences can have significant effects on caribou population trends.

Arthur and Del Vecchio conclude that the differences in size and mass of calves may be largely influenced by the quality of habitat and forage available to cows during the calving period. "Thus, displacement of car-

ibou cows from preferred calving habitats may reduce fitness and survival of calves," they wrote.

As oil exploration and production continue, the approach set out in this research may help to provide solid answers to the question of whether development does or does not adversely affect caribou populations. Arthur and Del Vecchio explain it this way in their interim report: "If further increases in levels of anthropogenic disturbance cause caribou to reduce their use of preferred habitats, it should be possible to detect effects of these changes by measuring birth weights and growth rates of calves. If similar changes do not occur in less-disturbed areas, then this may be taken as evidence of possible effects of disturbance."

Del Vecchio is headed back to the field this June to take final measurements on calves born in 2006, and to recover radio collars used in the study. Then, she and Arthur will take another look at the data and write their final report.

The study collected lots of data. So, when they're finished with the project report, Arthur, Del Vecchio and others will look at other ways to use that data. Arthur says the techniques to analyze GPS data have not kept up with the ability to gather it, so they may be developing new techniques. They hope to look more closely at where caribou move and what habitat they use in relation to oil field infrastructure.

Dave Yokel, wildlife biologist with the Bureau of Land Management, said he's looking forward to that sort of analysis. "We hope we can use the results to mitigate any impacts on the Teshepuk (caribou) herd from development in the NPRA (National Petroleum Reserve Alaska)," he said. To do that, the BLM needs to know more about the impacts on caribou of movement through infrastructure.

Looking back over his experiences in the field, Arthur says he is struck by the resilience of the calves. "The thing that impresses me is how these little calves are so helpless and weak and they're born in these really harsh conditions—and yet most of these little guys still make it."

[From the ANWR Information Brief]

DO THE CARIBOU REALLY CARE?

Are caribou affected by oil development on the North Slope? It would appear not, based on the growing population of herds that use land in the existing oil fields in northern Alaska. The population of the Central Arctic caribou herd, which migrates north each summer into the oil fields near Prudhoe Bay, has been growing about 8.5 percent per year. Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game biologists counted 31,857 caribou in aerial surveys of this herd in July 2002. In July 2000, fish and game biologists counted 27,128. In 1997, the count was 19,730.

Caribou herd populations rise and fall with natural cycles, but one explanation biologists have for the increasing population of the Central Arctic Herd is good calf production and survival, and high survival of adults.

Pregnant caribou cows in the Central Arctic herd bear their calves on lands within or near operating oil fields. Some calves are born within a few hundred meters of oil field roads.

The Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game findings are backed by the Argonne National Laboratory. Argonne found no evidence that oil development harmed the Central Arctic Herd in the lab's work on the Environmental Impact Statement for an extension of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline System federal right-of-way.

ARCTIC CARIBOU HERDS

Caribou herds rise and fall in natural cycles, and it is interesting that while populations have been rising in the Central Arctic Herd (see chart) which use lands in the North Slope oilfields, populations have been declining in the Porcupine herd (see chart) which do not use lands where there is oil and gas development. The Central Arctic Herd increased to 32,000 animals in 2002, up from 27,000 in 2000. The Porcupine herd was estimated at 123,000 in 2001, 129,000 in 1998 and 152,000 in 1994. In 1989, the population was counted at 178,000. Most recent survey taken in 2002.

CENTRAL ARCTIC, PORCUPINE CARIBOU MINGLE

There is now evidence that caribou mix between all of the North Slope caribou herds, the Porcupine, Central Arctic and Western Arctic herds. Using analysis of DNA, researchers from the University of Alaska, Texas A&M University and the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture found that caribou in the three herds are genetically related. This reflects migration of animals between the herds over many generations.

THE TRUTH ON ARCTIC CARIBOU

Caribou use of the 1002 Area of ANWR varies dramatically from year to year. In 1995, 92% of the Porcupine Caribou Herd used this area to calve. In 2000 none did so.

In some years, the Porcupine Herd calves only in Canada.

Choice of calving area depends on snow melt and early growth of forage plants.

Caribou live a boom and bust cycle, due to predation, weather, and overhunting.

During the summer, caribou frequently use oil field roads and gravel pads as insect relief habitat: they stand on the elevated gravel pads because fewer mosquitoes and flies harass them there.

North slope oil facilities are specifically designed to allow caribou migration with elevated pipes to allow caribou to freely walk underneath and limited use of service roads.

With 30 years of contact with oil development to go by, the industry has shown that caribou and oil fields can successfully co-exist. The Central Arctic Herd, which calves in the vicinity of the Prudhoe Bay, Kuparuk, and Milne Point oil fields, has increased 900% from an estimated 3,000 animals in the early 1970s to 32,000 in 2002.

ANWR FACTS:

Refuge totals 19.6 million acres.
8 million acres designated Wilderness;
Coastal Plain, 1.5 million acres, set aside by Congress for study of oil potential;
Only a small percentage of Coastal plain, about 2,000 acres, would be impacted by oil development;

THE COASTAL PLAIN IS NOT A PRISTINE WILDERNESS:

About 40 guide outfits offer hunting and recreation services in the coastal plain; A community, Kaktovik, exists in the Coastal Plain; Military installations operate on the Plain now and in the past.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, once again, we see the caribou herds that have been associated with oil and gas drilling actually expanding from 5,000 to 32,000.

Facts are hard to come by when they don't benefit you in the discussion. It is simply untrue what they have been trying to narrate in this respect.

This truly shows that you can work hand in hand, being environmentally friendly and having energy independence, empowering local communities and Tribes, looking at this in a comprehensive fashion.

This is a commonsense amendment. This is not about delay. This is about proper orientation, whether it be jobs associated with it or whether it be the numbers of critical habitat and numbers of populations within that critical habitat.

The facts just don't stand up for the other side.

Mr. Chair, once again, this is a very good amendment. Once again, when we want to start talking about facts, facts that are exploited by the other side that are truly false, we have to start looking at, didactically, the facts.

When a herd goes from 5,000 caribou to 32,000 when it is associated with oil and gas drilling in that area, where a herd declines by one third where there is no drilling there, there has got to be some kind of a prospect here.

Heat doesn't just rise. It is associated with the protection.

So, when you start looking at what industry and the individuals have done to promote these herds, this is a stellar amendment.

Mr. Chair, I hope that everybody votes for this, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Chair, well, again, this canard that oil and gas drilling is good for caribou is right out of the "thank you for smoking" playbook. It is just not true.

And rather than subscribe to these alternative facts, we need look no further than the latest credible science that we have—it is from the 2018 Arctic Report Card—which found that caribou populations across the Arctic have actually declined by 56 percent over the last two decades. Yet, there is one exception to that trend, and that is the Porcupine caribou herd, which has shown strength.

This is good news. It shows the importance of the National Wildlife Refuge system and the wisdom of protecting this area in the first place.

There is one place in the Arctic where caribou are thriving. It is a place where we haven't done oil and gas development.

Let's not wreck the coastal plain of the Arctic refuge. If we care about caribou, then, by all means, absolutely vote "no" on this amendment and vote "yes" on the underlying bill.

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

The CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part D of House Report 116-200 on

which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 3, as modified, by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 193, noes 230, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 526]

AYES—193

Aderholt	Gallagher	Marshall
Allen	Gianforte	Massie
Amodei	Gibbs	Mast
Armstrong	Gohmert	McCarthy
Arrington	Gonzalez (OH)	McCaul
Babin	Gonzalez (TX)	McClintock
Bacon	González-Colón	McHenry
Baird	(PR)	McKinley
Balderson	Gooden	Meadows
Banks	Gosar	Meuser
Barr	Granger	Miller
Bergman	Graves (GA)	Mitchell
Biggs	Graves (LA)	Moolenaar
Bilirakis	Graves (MO)	Mooney (WV)
Bishop (UT)	Green (TN)	Mullin
Bost	Griffith	Newhouse
Brady	Grothman	Norman
Brooks (AL)	Guest	Nunes
Brooks (IN)	Guthrie	Olson
Buchanan	Hagedorn	Palazzo
Buck	Harris	Palmer
Bucshon	Hartzler	Pence
Budd	Hern, Kevin	Perry
Burchett	Herrera Beutler	Peterson
Burgess	Hice (GA)	Posey
Byrne	Higgins (LA)	Ratcliffe
Buchanan	Hill (AR)	Reschenthaler
Calvert	Holding	Rice (SC)
Carter (GA)	Hollingsworth	Riggleman
Carter (TX)	Hudson	Roby
Chabot	Huizenga	Rodgers (WA)
Cheney	Hunter	Roe, David P.
Cline	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (AL)
Cloud	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Cole	Johnson (OH)	Rose, John W.
Collins (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Rouzer
Comer	Jordan	Roy
Conaway	Joyce (OH)	Rutherford
Cook	Joyce (PA)	Scalise
Costa	Katko	Schweikert
Crawford	Keller	Scott, Austin
Crenshaw	Kelly (MS)	Sensenbrenner
Curtis	Kelly (PA)	Shimkus
Davidson (OH)	King (IA)	Simpson
Davis, Rodney	King (NY)	Smith (MO)
DesJarlais	Kinzinger	Smith (NE)
Diaz-Balart	Kustoff (TN)	Smucker
Duncan	LaHood	Spano
Dunn	LaMalfa	Stauber
Emmer	Lamborn	Stefanik
Estes	Larsen (WA)	Steil
Ferguson	Latta	Steube
Fleischmann	Lesko	Stewart
Flores	Long	Stivers
Fortenberry	Loudermilk	Taylor
Foxx (NC)	Lucas	Thompson (PA)
Fulcher	Luetkemeyer	Thornberry
Gaetz		

Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker

Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westernman
Williams

Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Young
Zeldin

□ 1119

Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ and Mr. TED LIEU of California changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

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

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The 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 noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 184, noes 237, not voting 17, as follows:

[Roll No. 527]

AYES—184

NOES—230

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Español
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gottheimer

NOT VOTING—15

Abraham
Castro (TX)
Clyburn
Collins (NY)
Correa

Cummings
Radewagen
Reed
Rice (NY)
Wilson (FL)
Yoho

Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small
(NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Yarmuth

Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Costa
Crowford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz

Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
González-Colón
(PR)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul

Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westernman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

NOES—237

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Español
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)

Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (SD)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Phillips
Pingree
Plaskett
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Richmond
Rooney (FL)
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sablan
San Nicolas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

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

□ 1126

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment, as modified.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment, as modified.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 187, noes 237, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 528]
AYES—187

Aderholt	Gallagher	McClintock
Allen	Gianforte	McHenry
Amodei	Gibbs	McKinley
Armstrong	Gohmert	Meadows
Arrington	Gonzalez (OH)	Meuser
Babin	Gonzalez-Colón (PR)	Miller
Bacon	Gooden	Mitchell
Baird	Gosar	Moolenaar
Balderson	Granger	Mooney (WV)
Banks	Graves (GA)	Mullin
Barr	Graves (LA)	Newhouse
Bergman	Graves (MO)	Norman
Biggs	Green (TN)	Nunes
Bilirakis	Griffith	Olson
Bishop (UT)	Grothman	Palazzo
Bost	Guest	Palmer
Brady	Guthrie	Pence
Brooks (AL)	Hagedorn	Perry
Brooks (IN)	Harris	Peterson
Buchanan	Hartzler	Posey
Buck	Hern, Kevin	Ratcliffe
Bucshon	Herrera Beutler	Reed
Burchett	Hice (GA)	Reschenthaler
Burgess	Higgins (LA)	Rice (SC)
Byrne	Hill (AR)	Riggleman
Calvert	Holding	Roby
Carter (GA)	Hollingsworth	Rodgers (WA)
Carter (TX)	Hudson	Roe, David P.
Chabot	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Cheney	Hurd (TX)	Rogers (KY)
Cline	Johnson (LA)	Rose, John W.
Cloud	Johnson (OH)	Rouzer
Cole	Johnson (SD)	Roy
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Rutherford
Comer	Joyce (OH)	Scalise
Conaway	Joyce (PA)	Schweikert
Cook	Keller	Scott, Austin
Costa	Kelly (MS)	Shimkus
Crawford	Kelly (PA)	Simpson
Crenshaw	King (IA)	Smith (MO)
Curtis	King (NY)	Smith (NE)
Davidson (OH)	Kinzinger	Smucker
Davis, Rodney	Kustoff (TN)	Spano
DesJarlais	LaHood	Stauber
Duffy	LaMalfa	Steil
Duncan	Lamborn	Steube
Dunn	Latta	Stewart
Emmer	Lesko	Stivers
Estes	Long	Taylor
Ferguson	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Fleischmann	Lucas	Thornberry
Flores	Luetkemeyer	Timmons
Fortenberry	Marshall	Tipton
Foxx (NC)	Massie	Turner
Fulcher	McCarthy	Upton
Gaetz	McCauley	Walberg

Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)

Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

NOES—237

Adams
Aguilar
Alfred
Amash
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutsch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Español
Evans
Finkenauer
Fitzpatrick
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer

Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hill (CA)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeb sack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe y
Lujan
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Mast
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
Norton
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta

Womack
Woodall
Wright
Young
Zeldin

□ 1133

So the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. HARDER of California. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 528.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BUTTERFIELD). There being no further amendments, under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CASTEN of Illinois) having assumed the chair, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, 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. 1146) to amend Public Law 115-97 (commonly known as the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act) to repeal the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge oil and gas program, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 548, he reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CURTIS. Yes, in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Curtis moves to recommit the bill, H.R. 1146, to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith with the following amendment:

At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. ____ EFFECTIVE DATE.

Section 2 of this Act shall take effect on the date the President certifies that the enactment of this Act will not result in a net increase of Russian oil and gas imports into the United States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Utah is recognized for 5 minutes in support of his motion.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, we are all familiar with the famous line from Thomas Jefferson, "The government closest to the people serves the people best." So how is it that we are here today considering a bill that has been opposed by every member of the Alaskan delegation since 1980? Not just the Alaskan delegation, but every Governor of Alaska since 1980 and even the gubernatorial candidates last year, two Republicans, an independent, and a Democrat, opposed this bill.

NOT VOTING—14

Abraham
Castro (TX)
Clyburn
Collins (NY)
Correa

Cummings
Gabbard
Harder (CA)
Huizenga
Marchant

McEachin
Radewagen
Rice (NY)
Yoho

This week, many of my friends across the aisle sought to protect their coastlines by banning offshore energy development. They know what is best in their States. Apparently, the same standard of local control does not apply to Mr. YOUNG, who is the only person in this body elected by the residents of Alaska.

Not only is this bill opposed by the entire Alaskan delegation, it is opposed by the local Alaska Native population and written without their consultation.

As a Member who represents Bears Ears, I hear from my colleagues all the time how important it is to have Native American consultation, and they are right. However, with local Alaska Native opposition to this bill and no consultation, there seems to be a double standard.

In fact, just 3 days ago, I sat in a hearing where BLM was criticized for not working with the Native population. They held 11 hearings, 7 listening sessions—apparently, not enough.

Unless I missed 18 trips of my colleagues to Alaska, we are working with a double standard.

Those of you from States with very little Federal ownership have a difficult time understanding what it is like being from a State or county with 90 percent Federal ownership. Imagine being a local elected official maintaining roads, police, fire, sewers, and parks when only 10 percent of your property generates property tax.

At the end of the day, Mr. YOUNG and the native Alaskans, not the rest of us, should be determining the fate of Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, I have heard the argument that this development will contribute to climate change. Really? I am listening. This is one Republican who believes the climate is changing and man is influencing it, but I am baffled why so many of my colleagues will give a pass to a human rights-violating dictator in China and deny the local native Alaskans the right to have a living off the land.

If we were serious about climate change, I have an idea. Let's take all the natural gas we are putting back into the ground in ANWR and send it to China and India. We would do more to reduce global carbon emissions than by implementing the entire Green New Deal.

I have heard the term "science denier" tossed around, but I ask, who is denying science the most? Those who ignore 85 percent of carbon coming from outside the United States, or those who think that impacting 0.01 percent of ANWR will destroy the Alaskan environment?

Let's put this in perspective. ANWR is less than 5 percent of Alaska. This project is less than 0.01 percent of ANWR. For perspective, that is like taking a janitorial closet in the Capitol of 175 feet and putting HVAC in it to keep us warm and cool. That is the perspective.

When the other side is ready to fight climate change, Republicans stand ready. This is not one of those times.

To start, my friend GREG WALDEN and his colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee seem to have the ability to generate a bill almost daily that would truly impact the true problems with climate change.

Mr. Speaker, this motion to recommit will prevent the bill from taking effect until the President certifies that it will not result in a net increase of Russian oil and gas imports into the United States.

The answer to climate change is not making the U.S. more reliant on foreign fossil fuels. A vote for this MTR is a vote to support local Alaska Natives.

I repeat, the answer to climate change is not making the U.S. more reliant on foreign fossil fuels. The last time I checked, Ryan Zinke was the only one riding a horse.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support of the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, for those who have flights to catch and would like to get out of here, I think I have some good news. I think we can keep this pretty short and pretty simple because this is a very simple bill. It reflects the proposition that there are some places that are simply too special, that are too unique, that are too environmentally vital, and that are too sacred to indigenous people to wreck them with oil and gas development. Surely, that is something that most Americans and even most people in this body, regardless of their party, could agree upon.

In fact, we saw bipartisan votes yesterday that reflected the same proposition that the pristine coasts of the Atlantic, the Lowcountry in South Carolina, and the beautiful California coast are places too special to wreck them with new oil and gas development. If my colleagues believe in this simple proposition, then, surely, it must apply to America's largest wildlife refuge and to the beating biological heart of that refuge, the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. That is the simple thing that this bill is all about.

Unfortunately, this motion to recommit is an attempt to distract us from that, to delay protections against this drilling, so that this administration can rush a lease plan forward. Frankly, by that time, it is too late. You can't go backward once you open a place like this up to drilling.

Now, my friends' concern for the local voices, some of whom in Alaska want to see drilling, would be a lot more persuasive if, yesterday, we hadn't had a vote where my friends across the aisle thumbed their nose at the local voices in California, South

Carolina, Florida, and other places that don't want offshore drilling. So let's be consistent about what local voices matter, and let's acknowledge the reality that the only voice they really are hearing is that of Big Oil.

The truth is that this bill will not affect or impact our role in global energy markets in the slightest. The minority seems to believe that we can provide enough oil, if we just drill everywhere, to let everyone in the world break free of Russian gas or Saudi Arabian oil.

The truth is that we are, right now, the largest oil producer in the world. We produce over 12 million barrels of crude oil every single day, and we are not going to be able to corner the market. I certainly don't think, in light of that fact, that we should put at risk America's coastal jobs or our biggest wildlife refuge in the Arctic under this misguided notion of so-called energy dominance.

Now, I want to just close with two things. First, for those who may still have some fiscal sensibility, I think there are still a few in this House who would like to talk about fiscal issues. Last week, Taxpayers for Common Sense said in an op-ed: "Drilling in the Arctic Refuge will be difficult and costs from mistakes high. Right now, oil and gas is plentiful and prices are low, so this isn't the time to develop marginal areas. It's not like the oil is going away. So without huge returns, this action will put taxpayers on the hook for a lot of risk with little potential reward. In the current fiscal and energy climate, if drilling proposals in the Arctic Refuge move forward, the joke's on us."

Let the joke not be on us, colleagues.

Finally, I want to close by pointing out that there are some people who have traveled thousands of miles to be with us today, all the way from Alaska, the Gwich'in people, an indigenous community that since time immemorial have depended on the Porcupine caribou herd and its migratory route and its calving grounds that are absolutely in the heart of the coastal plain of the Arctic Refuge. Many of them are here today.

And, ladies and gentlemen, none of us here on this floor have to worry about what our ancestors and what our family depend on for our way of life, for our culture, for what is sacred for them, depending on the outcome of this vote. For Gwich'in people, that is exactly what is at stake.

So, colleagues, let's do the right thing for the environment. Let's recognize that some places are too special to wreck with oil and gas drilling. Let's do right by the Gwich'in people. Vote "no" on this motion to recommit and "yes" on the underlying bill.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 189, nays 229, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 529]

YEAS—189

Aderholt	Gooden	Nunes
Allen	Gosar	Olson
Amodei	Granger	Palazzo
Armstrong	Graves (GA)	Palmer
Arrington	Graves (LA)	Pence
Babin	Graves (MO)	Perry
Bacon	Green (TN)	Posey
Baird	Griffith	Ratcliffe
Balderson	Grothman	Reed
Banks	Guest	Reschenthaler
Barr	Guthrie	Rice (SC)
Bergman	Hagedorn	Riggleman
Biggs	Harris	Roby
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Rodgers (WA)
Bishop (UT)	Hern, Kevin	Roe, David P.
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Brady	Hice (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Higgins (LA)	Rose, John W.
Brooks (IN)	Hill (AR)	Rouzer
Buchanan	Holding	Roy
Buck	Hollingsworth	Rutherford
Bucshon	Hudson	Scalise
Budd	Hunter	Schweikert
Burchett	Hurd (TX)	Scott, Austin
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Sensenbrenner
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Shimkus
Calvert	Johnson (SD)	Simpson
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Smith (MO)
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Smith (NE)
Chabot	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Cheney	Katko	Spano
Cline	Keller	Staubert
Cloud	Kelly (MS)	Stefanik
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Steil
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Steube
Comer	King (NY)	Stewart
Conaway	Kinzinger	Stivers
Cook	Kustoff (TN)	Taylor
Crawford	LaHood	Thompson (PA)
Crenshaw	LaMalfa	Thornberry
Curtis	Lamborn	Timmons
Davidson (OH)	Latta	Tipton
Davis, Rodney	Lesko	Turner
DesJarlais	Long	Upton
Diaz-Balart	Loudermilk	Wagner
Duffy	Lucas	Walberg
Duncan	Luetkemeyer	Walden
Dunn	Marshall	Walker
Emmer	Massie	Walorski
Estes	Mast	Waltz
Ferguson	McCarthy	Watkins
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	McHenry	Webster (FL)
Flores	McKinley	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Meadows	Westerman
Foxx (NC)	Meuser	Williams
Fulcher	Miller	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Mitchell	Wittman
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Womack
Gianforte	Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Gibbs	Mullin	Wright
Gohmert	Newhouse	Young
Gonzalez (OH)	Norman	Zeldin

NAYS—229

Adams	Blunt Rochester	Cartwright
Aguilar	Bonamici	Case
Allred	Boyle, Brendan	Casten (IL)
Amash	F.	Castor (FL)
Axne	Brindisi	Chu, Judy
Barragán	Brown (MD)	Cicilline
Bass	Brownley (CA)	Cisneros
Beatty	Bustos	Clark (MA)
Bera	Butterfield	Clarke (NY)
Beyer	Carbajal	Clay
Bishop (GA)	Cárdenas	Cleaver
Blumenauer	Carson (IN)	Cohen

Connolly	Kennedy	Pressley
Cooper	Khanna	Price (NC)
Costa	Kildee	Quigley
Courtney	Kilmer	Raskin
Cox (CA)	Kim	Richmond
Craig	Kind	Rooney (FL)
Crist	Kirkpatrick	Rose (NY)
Crow	Krishnamoorthi	Rouda
Cuellar	Kuster (NH)	Roybal-Allard
Cunningham	Lamb	Ruiz
Davids (KS)	Langevin	Ruppersberger
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Davis, Danny K.	Larson (CT)	Ryan
Dean	Lawrence	Sánchez
DeFazio	Lawson (FL)	Sarbanes
DeGette	Lee (CA)	Scanlon
DeLauro	Lee (NV)	Schakowsky
DeBene	Levin (CA)	Schiff
Delgado	Levin (MI)	Schneider
Demings	Lewis	Schrader
DeSaulnier	Lieu, Ted	Schrier
Deutch	Lipinski	Scott (VA)
Dingell	Loeb sack	Scott, David
Doggett	Lowenthal	Serrano
Doyle, Michael	Lowe	Sewell (AL)
F.	Lujan	Shalala
Engel	Luria	Sherman
Escobar	Lynch	Sherrill
Eshoo	Malinowski	Sires
Espallat	Maloney	Slotkin
Evans	Carolyn B.	Smith (NJ)
Finkenauer	Maloney, Sean	Smith (WA)
Guest	Matsui	Soto
Fletcher	McAdams	Spanberger
Foster	McBath	Speier
Frankel	McBath	Stanton
Fudge	McCollum	Stevens
Gallego	McGovern	Suozzi
Garamendi	McNerney	Swalwell (CA)
Garcia (IL)	Meeks	Takano
Garcia (TX)	Meng	Thompson (CA)
Golden	Moore	Thompson (MS)
Gomez	Morelle	Titus
Holding	Moulton	Tlaib
Green, Al (TX)	Mucarsel-Powell	Tonko
Grijalva	Murphy	Torres (CA)
Haaland	Nadler	Torres Small
Harder (CA)	Hastings	(NM)
Hastings	Neal	Trahan
Hayes	Neguse	Trone
Heck	Norcross	Underwood
Heck	O'Halleran	Van Drew
Higgins (NY)	Ocasio-Cortez	Vargas
Hill (CA)	Omar	Veasey
Himes	Pallone	Vela
Horn, Kendra S.	Panetta	Velázquez
Horsford	Pappas	Visclosky
Houlahan	Pascrell	Wasserman
Hoyer	Payne	Schultz
Huffman	Perlmutter	Waters
Jackson Lee	Peters	Watson Coleman
Jayapal	Peterson	Welch
Jeffries	Phillips	Wexton
Johnson (GA)	Pingree	Wild
Johnson (TX)	Pocan	Wilson (FL)
Johnson (TX)	Porter	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—14

Abraham	Cummings	McCaul
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	McEachin
Clyburn	Gonzalez (TX)	Rice (NY)
Collins (NY)	Huizenga	Yoho
Correa	Marchant	

□ 1154

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 529.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, noes 193, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 530]

AYES—225

Adams	Grijalva	Panetta
Aguilar	Haaland	Pappas
Allred	Harder (CA)	Pascrell
Axne	Hastings	Payne
Barragán	Hayes	Perlmutter
Bass	Heck	Peters
Beatty	Higgins (NY)	Phillips
Bera	Hill (CA)	Pingree
Beyer	Himes	Pocan
Bishop (GA)	Horn, Kendra S.	Porter
Blumenauer	Horsford	Pressley
Blunt Rochester	Houlahan	Price (NC)
Bonamici	Hoyer	Quigley
Boyle, Brendan	Huffman	Raskin
F.	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Brindisi	Jayapal	Rooney (FL)
Brown (MD)	Jeffries	Rose (NY)
Brownley (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Rouda
Bustos	Johnson (TX)	Roybal-Allard
Butterfield	Kaptur	Ruiz
Carbajal	Keating	Ruppersberger
Cárdenas	Kelly (IL)	Rush
Carson (IN)	Kennedy	Ryan
Cartwright	Khanna	Sánchez
Case	Kildee	Sarbanes
Casten (IL)	Kilmer	Scanlon
Castor (FL)	Kim	Scanlon
Chu, Judy	Kind	Schakowsky
Cicilline	Kirkpatrick	Schiff
Cisneros	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Clark (MA)	Kuster (NH)	Schrier
Clarke (NY)	Lamb	Schrier
Clay	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Connolly	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Lawson (FL)	Shalala
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Sherman
Cox (CA)	Lee (NV)	Sherrill
Craig	Levin (CA)	Sires
Crist	Levin (MI)	Slotkin
Crow	Lewis	Smith (NJ)
Cunningham	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Davids (KS)	Lipinski	Soto
Davis (CA)	Loeb sack	Spanberger
Davis, Danny K.	Lofgren	Speier
Dean	Lowenthal	Stanton
DeFazio	Lowey	Stefanik
DeGette	Lujan	Stevens
DeLauro	Luria	Suozzi
DeBene	Lynch	Swalwell (CA)
Delgado	Malinowski	Takano
Demings	Maloney,	Thompson (CA)
DeSaulnier	Carolyn B.	Thompson (MS)
Deutch	Maloney, Sean	Titus
Dingell	Matsui	Tlaib
Doggett	McAdams	Tonko
Doyle, Michael	McBath	Torres (CA)
F.	McCollum	Torres Small
Engel	McGovern	(NM)
Escobar	McNerney	Trahan
Eshoo	Meeks	Trone
Espallat	Meng	Underwood
Evans	Moore	Van Drew
Finkenauer	Morelle	Vargas
Fitzpatrick	Moulton	Veasey
Foster	Mucarsel-Powell	Velázquez
Frankel	Murphy	Visclosky
Fudge	Nadler	Wasserman
Gallego	Napolitano	Schultz
Garamendi	Neal	Waters
Garcia (IL)	Neguse	Watson Coleman
Garcia (TX)	Norcross	Welch
Golden	O'Halleran	Wexton
Gomez	Ocasio-Cortez	Wild
Gottheimer	Omar	Wilson (FL)
Green, Al (TX)	Pallone	Yarmuth

NOES—193

Aderholt	Bilirakis	Calvert
Allen	Bishop (UT)	Carter (GA)
Amash	Bost	Carter (TX)
Amodei	Brady	Chabot
Armstrong	Brooks (AL)	Cheney
Arrington	Brooks (IN)	Cline
Babin	Buchanan	Cloud
Bacon	Buck	Cole
Balderson	Bucshon	Collins (GA)
Banks	Budd	Comer
Barr	Burchett	Conaway
Bergman	Burgess	Cook
Biggs	Byrne	Costa

Crawford	Johnson (SD)	Rodgers (WA)
Crenshaw	Jordan	Roe, David P.
Cuellar	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Curtis	Joyce (PA)	Rogers (KY)
Davidson (OH)	Katko	Rose, John W.
Davis, Rodney	Keller	Rouzer
DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Roy
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford
Duffy	King (IA)	Scalise
Duncan	King (NY)	Schweikert
Dunn	Kinzinger	Scott, Austin
Emmer	Kustoff (TN)	Sensenbrenner
Estes	LaHood	Shimkus
Ferguson	LaMalfa	Simpson
Fleischmann	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Fletcher	Latta	Smith (NE)
Flores	Lesko	Smucker
Fortenberry	Long	Spano
Fox (NC)	Loudermilk	Stauber
Fulcher	Lucas	Steil
Gaetz	Luetkemeyer	Steube
Gallagher	Marshall	Stewart
Gianforte	Massie	Stivers
Gibbs	Mast	Taylor
Gohmert	McCarthy	Thompson (PA)
Gonzalez (OH)	McCaul	Thornberry
Gooden	McClintock	Timmons
Gosar	McHenry	Tipton
Granger	McKinley	Turner
Graves (GA)	Meadows	Upton
Graves (LA)	Meuser	Vela
Graves (MO)	Miller	Wagner
Green (TN)	Mitchell	Walberg
Griffith	Moolenaar	Walden
Grothman	Mooney (WV)	Walker
Guest	Mullin	Walorski
Guthrie	Newhouse	Waltz
Hagedorn	Norman	Watkins
Harris	Nunes	Weber (TX)
Hartzler	Olson	Webster (FL)
Hern, Kevin	Palazzo	Wenstrup
Herrera Beutler	Palmer	Westerman
Hice (GA)	Pence	Williams
Higgins (LA)	Perry	Wilson (SC)
Hill (AR)	Peterson	Wittman
Holding	Posey	Womack
Hollingsworth	Ratcliffe	Woodall
Hudson	Reed	Wright
Hunter	Reschenthaler	Young
Hurd (TX)	Rice (SC)	Zeldin
Johnson (LA)	Riggleman	
Johnson (OH)	Roby	

NOT VOTING—14

Abraham	Correa	Marchant
Baird	Cummings	McEachin
Castro (TX)	Gabbard	Rice (NY)
Clyburn	Gonzalez (TX)	Yoho
Collins (NY)	Huizenga	

□ 1202

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. VELA. Mr. Speaker, at the end of a long vote series today, I unintentionally voted nay for H.R. 1146, the Arctic Cultural and Coastal Plan Protection Act, on rollcall number 530. Had I been able to correct my vote at that time, I would have voted "aye."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Miss RICE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I was necessarily absent from votes on Thursday September 12, 2019. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 526; "nay" on rollcall No. 527; "nay" on rollcall No. 528; "nay" on rollcall No. 529; and "yea" on rollcall No. 530.

DIRECTING THE CLERK TO PROVIDE AUDIO BACKUP FILE OF DEPOSITION OF ROGER J. STONE JR.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk a resolution (H. Res. 553) directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to provide a copy of

the on-the-record portions of the audio backup file of the transcribed interview of Roger J. Stone Jr. conducted by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on September 26, 2017, to the prosecuting attorneys in the case of the United States of America v. Stone, No. 1:19-cr-00018-ABJ (D.D.C.), and ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

There was no objection.

The text of the resolution is as follows:

H. RES. 553

Whereas on September 26, 2017, Roger J. Stone Jr. appeared in Washington, DC, and was interviewed by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House of Representatives in connection with that Committee's investigation into Russian interference in the 2016 United States election;

Whereas the Department of Justice requested in a December 14, 2018, letter to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence that the Committee provide a transcript of its September 26, 2017, interview with Mr. Stone, as well as any other written submissions or correspondence from Mr. Stone or his attorneys before and after his interview;

Whereas on December 20, 2018, pursuant to a bipartisan Committee vote on that date authorizing the release of Executive Session materials, the then-Chair and ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence jointly sent the Department of Justice the transcript of Mr. Stone's September 26, 2017, interview, as well as an enumerated list of related materials;

Whereas on January 24, 2019, Mr. Stone was indicted by a grand jury on seven counts, including one count of obstruction of an official proceeding, in violation of sections 1505 and 2 of title 18, United States Code, and five counts of making false statements in violation of sections 1001(a)(2) and 2 of title 18, United States Code;

Whereas the Department of Justice requested via letter on August 20, 2019, that the House voluntarily provide to it a copy of the on-the-record portions of the audio backup file of Mr. Stone's September 26, 2017, transcribed interview;

Whereas by the privileges and rights of the House of Representatives, an audio backup file of Mr. Stone's transcribed interview may not be taken from the possession or control of the Clerk of the House of Representatives by mandate of process of the article III courts of the United States, and may not be provided pursuant to requests by the court or the parties to *United States v. Stone* except at the direction of the House; and

Whereas it is the judgment of the House of Representatives that, in the particular circumstances of this case, providing a copy of the on-the-record portions of the audio backup file of Mr. Stone's transcribed interview to the prosecuting attorneys in the case of *United States v. Stone* would promote the ends of justice in a manner consistent with the privileges and rights of the House: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives directs the Clerk of the House to provide for use at trial a copy of the on-the-record portions of the audio backup file of the transcribed interview of Roger J. Stone Jr. that was conducted by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence of the House

of Representatives on September 26, 2017, to the prosecuting attorneys in the case of *United States of America v. Stone*, No. 1:19-cr-00018-ABJ (D.D.C.).

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Miss Kaitlyn Roberts, one of his secretaries.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate, and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday of next week, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate, and 12 p.m. for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, and last votes are expected no later than 3 p.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. The complete list of suspension bills will be announced by the close of business tomorrow.

The House, Mr. Speaker, will consider a clean continuing resolution to fund the government past September 30. While the House did its work, and sent 10 appropriation bills to the Senate, funding 96 percent of the government—the first time that is been done in over three decades—I am disappointed that the Senate failed to pass a single appropriation bill. Not one.

Not only that, they haven't filed any until just the other day when we got back from the summer break.

I am disappointed that the Senate failed to introduce a single appropriation bill for the first time in more than three decades. So that while we were very successful, the Senate failed to move forward.

Therefore, as we wait for them to complete their work so that we can begin conference negotiations, a continuing resolution will be necessary to prevent another government shutdown like the one we experienced earlier this year.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 1423, Forced Arbitration Injustice Repeal Act, called the FAIR Act, and the legislation would eliminate forced arbitration in employment, consumer, and civil rights cases so that Americans, as they have under the Constitution, would have the right to seek redress of grievances through the courts.

This would restore access to justice for millions of Americans who are currently locked out of the court system and are forced to settle their disputes against companies in a private system of arbitration.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, as it relates to the funding of government, I know that it is important that as we finally got an agreement a few months ago to come up with a 2-year budget process where we agreed on numbers of funding, especially for the Defense Department which needs that certainty, they don't want these short-term CRs. They need the long-term certainty so they can go out and acquire the kind of equipment we need to keep our men and women in uniform safe to effectively do their jobs in a safe manner.

One of the things I would point out, as the gentleman talked about the Senate process, let's be clear that the House bills that were passed out moved on a very partisan basis. There were no bipartisan agreements as you passed the bills out of the House.

The Senate does work differently. The Senate has to have a 60-vote margin to get any bills moved, so they have been in negotiations to try to get, not a partisan agreement but a bipartisan agreement, and, unfortunately, so far, they have had a lot of problems with some of the Senate Democrats who try to put poison pills in those budget talks that would ultimately not yield something that can get signed into law and would not comply with the 2-year budget agreement that we reached.

So I would encourage both on our side, there should have been a bipartisan agreement on the bills that are moved through, and at least there are some talks going on, but they haven't resulted in bipartisan legislation that can get signed by the President.

The Senate needs to do the same thing. And so we are beyond the time for partisan differences. Now is the time where we need to come together and agree on those things that we can put in a bill that can get signed into law. Drop this idea of these poison pills that everybody knows will gum up the works. Let's get the certainty that we deserve for a full budget process for the year.

We are not there yet. If we have to do a short-term budget agreement or short-term CR, then that is one thing that we may consider next week. We haven't seen the final details, of course. It would have to be clean with no poison pills attached to it. But, hopefully, that yields talks that are truly bipartisan, which we haven't, unfortunately, seen to this point.

So I would hope that we can get beyond that next week. It gives us more time to have real negotiations that can result in something that can get signed into law and give certainty to our men and women in uniform and all of the other agencies that rely on us doing that work on a bipartisan basis.

I would like to shift gears and ask the gentleman about the United

States-Mexico-Canada Agreement, USMCA. I yield to the gentleman if he has something to add to that.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I understand the gentleman said a lot of things about reaching bipartisan agreements and all of this sort of stuff, and the Senate needed 60 votes. They didn't introduce a bill. Not a single appropriation bill was introduced.

□ 1215

They had the same 60-vote requirement last year, and they passed a lot of bills last year. The reason they didn't pass bills is that the President of the United States wouldn't come to the table and agree on caps. They could have done the same thing we did.

We are an independent branch of government. We are the Article I branch of government. We appropriate money. We spend money. But the Senate has not done its work.

If you brought the bills to the floor and couldn't get 60 votes, we get it. But I will tell my friend that there is great frustration. For the first time since my friend has been a Member of the Congress, we passed 96 percent of the funding for government by June 30, otherwise known as 3 full months before the end of the fiscal year, giving the Senate a lot of time.

But, no, we had to wait and wait and wait until the President sent down Secretary Mnuchin, and we finally made an agreement on 302(a)s, in other words, the caps, what we were going to spend.

With all due respect to all this talk about bipartisanship and that we need to work together, that is, of course, true. It was not true in the Congresses when my friend's party was in the majority. The Republicans passed partisan bills, and they went over to the Senate. The Senate didn't take them, and we went back and forth.

There has been no back and forth. We did our work, and although the Republicans disagreed with the numbers publicly, privately, very frankly, a lot of my friend's Members told me the numbers were pretty good numbers, and they liked them, including defense. We passed a Defense bill with a substantial increase for our troops, readiness, operations, and training.

I say that to Mr. Whip not to criticize my friend but to simply say that of all this verbiage about being nice to get together and do something, the regular order is we pass bills, the Senate passes bills, and then we have a conference. Unfortunately, we have gotten away from that, which I think is very bad for the House, the Senate, and the American people.

We cannot go to conference if the Senate doesn't even pass a bill, doesn't even introduce a bill, waiting on the President of the United States to say, "Simon says."

We can't get a bill supported by 90 percent of the American people, comprehensive background checks, which

90 percent, a majority of my friend's party, a majority of my party, and a majority of independents thinks makes common sense. We passed it in February, and we can't even have it on the floor in the United States Senate.

Not only are they not doing appropriations bills, but they are not doing any other bills either. They spend all their time on judges.

We are a little frustrated on this side because we have done our work. Ninety-six percent of government is funded, and, yes, there could have been differences of opinion. They should have passed bills and said, no, we don't agree.

Mr. Speaker, the problem they would have had, I tell my friend, is that they didn't want to have bipartisan bills because, yes, it would have required them to get 60 votes, and they didn't want to make the compromises necessary to get 60 votes.

We are here, just a little more than 15 days before the end of the fiscal year, and the Senate has not passed a single bill while we have funded 96 percent of government. This CR is necessary. Nobody wants to shut down government, I hope. Hopefully, the CR will not have anything that either party will disagree with, and we will extend some things that need to be extended because we haven't acted upon them in a timely fashion. But I am hopeful that the CR will get to the Senate, that we will pass the CR, that there will be no drama, and then, as the gentleman suggests, and I agree with him, that we will sit down in a bipartisan way and try to reach agreement on each 1 of the 12 appropriations bills and either put them separately or in a minibus or omnibus and pass them to fund the government and not have what we had last year and into the first part of 2017, a shutdown of the Government of the United States. That was not good for the people of our country, not good for our government employees, and not good for the Congress of the United States to be unable to do its work, resulting in a shutdown of government.

I appreciate the gentleman's sentiment about doing things in a bipartisan way, but you can't do things in a bipartisan way if they don't come to the floor. If the leader over there doesn't have 60 votes, then he needs to reach a compromise because we need to get our business done. We passed all of our bills. Some were not partisan, I think, in many ways, but there was a determination not to vote for them because we hadn't reached a caps number. I think that was unfortunate because I think, as someone who served on the committee for 23 years, Mr. Speaker, we passed our bills in many, many instances—most instances—in a bipartisan fashion.

I didn't want the comment to go not responded to, in terms of the Senate's refusal and unwillingness to act and do its business. And here we are, not a single bill—not one—has been passed through the committee.

The gentleman's party has the majority on the committee. At least my friend could report them out of committee and then work on getting 60 votes.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, there were a number of items that my friend brought up. I will start with the government shutdown that the gentleman referred to last year. When we were in the majority last year, we passed bipartisan bills to fund over 70 percent of the government prior to October 1—no shutdown—more than 70 percent of the government that we worked with Democrats and President Trump to get an agreement on, including defense, so our men and women in uniform did not have that uncertainty and had that full year of funding. All of that was worked out.

Clearly, we had a difference of agreement over the Homeland Security Department because of funding for border security. The government shutdown was clearly over whether or not we were going to have a secure border and all the things that were involved, including physical barriers. We resolved it, and the President was able to get over \$4.5 billion of new money to continue putting that physical security in place to secure our Nation's border. That took a few more months, but we resolved it.

Keep in mind, over 70 percent of the government was fully funded prior to the end of the fiscal year, working with Republicans and Democrats in the House and Senate.

As the gentleman brags about passing over 96 percent of the bills out of the House, it has to be noted that the majority didn't work with Republicans to do it. The easy thing is just to say that we will just talk amongst ourselves, knowing it will never get signed into law. Of course, a partisan bill is not going to get signed into law when you have a President of the different party or when you have a Senate controlled by a different party.

The Senate works differently than us. We can have that debate for another day. We would probably both agree on a lot of the differences we have with how the Senate operates. But because of their 60-vote requirement, they know nothing is going to pass unless they have Republican and Democratic agreement in those negotiations.

Let's be clear about what is bottling up those negotiations. There are Senate Democrats in Democratic leadership on the Democratic side who are offering up things that everybody knows are poison pills that would not get signed into law.

They are at an impasse. They need to break that impasse. That is their issue. But, Mr. Speaker, you can talk to some of the Senate Democrats who are trying to offer up things that everybody knows will not happen or become law or pass over there, but both sides need to come together.

Mr. Speaker, when you pass an NDAA bill—and the gentleman from Maryland

knows this. The National Defense Authorization Act is a bill that a Republican-controlled House or a Democratic-controlled House, no matter who has been in charge, we have come together always. Every single year that we have moved an NDAA, it has been bipartisan. This is the first year that the majority broke from that.

The majority passed a partisan bill on defense knowing it was never going to become law but not working with Democrats and breaking the tradition that every year we have followed, that Republicans and Democrats would come together and say that we have all of these other differences—and there are a lot of differences that we have that we need to work through. We might get some; we might not get others. But we put defense on the side and said that this is one where we will come together, Republicans and Democrats in every year we did it, including last year when we were in the majority.

This year, the majority did not. They broke that tradition. It is unfortunate because, again, that will never become law.

My friend can brag they got it done, but they got something done that will never get signed into law and broke a tradition that we have always had that that bill was bipartisan, making sure that we work together to take care of our men and women in uniform in a way that they deserve and in a timely way.

I would hope that we would get those things done before October 1. But we all know what came out of this House is not what is going to be a final product.

Let's work better to get these addressed, working with Members of both parties and the President, who, by the way, did agree with us on the numbers. We are in agreement. The House, the Senate, and the White House have finally agreed on the numbers.

Now it is up to us in the Congress to come to an agreement. It is not just, hey, we passed our bill with just members of our party. It is going to have to mean people work together through those differences as we have done in the past.

Sometimes we disagreed. Seventy percent of government was funded last year prior to October 1. Ultimately, we got agreement on the rest.

Does the gentleman have anything else to say on that before I move on?

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the defense bill passed this House with almost every Republican voting against it. It was a bill that provided \$733 billion, a figure that the Joint Chiefs of Staff suggested publicly. It was a figure that I know personally was a figure that was deemed acceptable by the leadership of the authorizing committee and the appropriating committee on the

Republican side. The rhetoric was totally partisan.

We have now made a deal, and we are now going to save defense because we did \$5 billion more. The figure last year, of course, was somewhere around \$700 billion, a little over.

I will tell my friend that we believe on our side of the aisle that the opposition to the defense bill was totally partisan, no attempt at bipartisanship. Yes, the Republicans had some success in getting bipartisan bills through. Why? Because we were prepared to vote in a bipartisan way.

That is the difference. We were prepared to vote in a bipartisan way. We were prepared to accept my friend's party was the majority.

Mr. Speaker, we understand when you are in the minority you work to get the best objective you think is possible. We did that, and the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, says that they got bipartisan bills done because Democrats voted for them, including me. But I know the number was an acceptable number, and it was a number suggested by the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Yet we heard rhetoric after rhetoric of how this was letting down the Defense Department.

What did they do? They made a deal, not \$733 billion, \$738 billion. My goodness, what an extraordinary difference. They voted against funding the men and women in uniform, funding operations, and funding overseas contingencies.

I hope that we get off this. If you want to talk bipartisan, act bipartisan, Mr. Speaker. Talk is cheap. It was clear that Democrats, in fact, when the Republicans were in the majority, did vote on a number of occasions, not every occasion, for bipartisanship. But you can't have bipartisanship if you don't introduce a bill.

Mr. Speaker, the Republicans have the majority in the United States Senate on the committee. They don't need 60 votes in the committee. They don't need 60 percent. They don't need two-thirds. All they need is a simple majority to pass a bill out of committee, as the gentleman pointed out when he said we did fund some pieces of government before. Why? Because we got bipartisan agreement.

□ 1230

And I have never seen, as I say, in three decades, the Senate fail to even introduce an appropriation bill prior to the end of July.

I hope the Senate will move with some degree of alacrity. I hope that we will get to agreement on these 12 bills. I hope that we will fund the government and not have a shutdown, as we had the last time. The first time it has ever happened in a new Congress where the government was shutdown—all over the wall—which a number of Republicans have said is not a useful thing to do.

I won't name them. I am sure the minority whip, the Republican whip,

knows a lot of them. They served in this body. Some are chairman of committees over there now.

So I am hopeful that we will move together on the appropriations process and do our business, do it on time, as we have done here in the House so that the American people can be well-served.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, let's be clear on the funding of government. From last year, we did fund over 70 percent of the government, and we didn't play a partisan game with our Nation's defense.

This bill, the NDAA, you can talk about what both sides should do.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCALISE. Let me make this point, because you have made some points that aren't completely accurate.

The number we agreed upon—but if you say, Okay, we agree on a certain spending level, that is one part of the debate. But you then go put policies in the bill at that level that undermine, not only our beliefs of what is best for national defense, but what the President needs to do to be able to do his job to secure our border. You did that in the bill knowing that that would make it partisan. It was a bipartisan bill, and then you added provisions, like things that would undermine the ability to secure America's border in that bill knowing it was partisan.

If you took that out, you knew it would have been a bipartisan bill, but you left it in. And that is a pattern we have seen from Speaker PELOSI's majority this year.

We had a bill in the Committee on Energy and Commerce to lower drug prices—a major problem in this country. Republicans and Democrats worked for months and came up with a bill in the committee of jurisdiction to solve the problem and lower drug prices.

And you know what happened? It was a unanimous vote—unanimous vote.

People looking at Congress going, Wow, here in the year 2019, on a major issue like lowering drug prices, Republicans and Democrats came together and figured out a way to lower drug prices, and the vote was unanimous.

You would figure we would put that on suspension the next day to pass it out, so we could get it signed by the President as soon as possible and lower drug prices as soon as possible.

And you know what happened? It just happened a few months ago. As that bill came out of committee unanimously to lower drug prices, the Speaker made a decision that she was going to put a poison pill in it—after it came out of committee, before it was voted on on the House floor—knowing what that would do.

And it immediately became a partisan bill because you put something in that you knew was not going to get Republican support. And so the bill passed out of the House. And you can brag you passed it, but it is not going to go anywhere.

It will not become law, but we had a bill that was unanimous out of committee to lower drug prices. It would be signed into law today if you wouldn't have done that. But you wanted to play political games, and it has happened over and over.

And so you can talk about what you passed, but when there was a bill that was unanimous out of the committee of jurisdiction, where doctors, people in the healthcare professions, people in business, people on both sides of the aisle that know this issue figured out a way to put all of their differences aside and pass a bill to lower drug prices, you had to make that partisan after it came out of committee unanimously.

That is what has been done over and over that undermines the ability for us to get our job done. We could have gotten that done. It could be signed by the President today, and we could all hail that as a major accomplishment.

That is just one example, and it is happened over and over again, and it shouldn't happen that way.

So, yes, we need to move this process along, but we move it along by working together. Defense could have been done in a bipartisan way. The things that were added in that you knew would make it partisan shouldn't have been put in that bill. It had never happened that way before, ever.

We had always passed a bipartisan NDAA bill through the House, and this is the first year that didn't happen. Drug pricing could be solved, but it hasn't happened yet. It should happen. I hope we get it done, but it should have been done in a partisan way when the committee figured out a way to do it unanimously.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE) for yielding.

We can discuss all sorts of bills, but we discussed the appropriations process. And the gentleman expressed how they were able to pass 70 percent of funding of the government because they had the Defense bill and the Labor-Health, which are the two biggest bills, passed and signed by the President.

Why were they able to do that, Mr. Speaker, when it requires 60 votes in the Senate? They didn't have 60 votes in the Senate because Democrats acted in a bipartisan way to affect that end.

This year, we have had no opportunity to do that. We have had no opportunity to conference on our bills. Republicans lead the Senate, passed your bills, and if you can't get 60 votes, yes, you would have to compromise in the Senate.

You didn't compromise when you were in charge, frankly, on an awful lot of things that had closed rules, more than any other Congress, so we didn't have an opportunity to even amend.

But that aside, when you claim that you passed those bills you did, and the only reason you could do it is because

the Democrats acted in a bipartisan fashion because you did not have the votes to pass them on your own, you needed Democratic votes. Democrats gave you those votes because we knew that in order to get things done you had to move in a bipartisan fashion.

That is the only way you were able to do it. We have not been given the opportunity in the United States Senate because there are no bills yet to consider, except for the last 3 days the bills came forward.

But for the first 9 months of the year, no bills came forward, Mr. Speaker, not one.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I would hope those Senators on both sides of the aisle, as they are having negotiations—and, yeah, they don't have a bill, but they are negotiating. And there are Senators that know that some of the provisions they are insisting upon are things that will not become law because they undermine our Nation's security. And yet, they keep insisting. And so they are not at an agreement, but they need to keep working just like we need to work in a bipartisan way on those issues. And they will get resolved if we do that.

And, again, I think if you go look at the example of what the House Committee on Energy and Commerce did on lowering drug prices, it is a great model to follow.

That bill should have been brought to the floor. That bill should not have been changed by the Speaker at the last minute to become partisan, and now it is not law.

I would like to move on to something that has been troubling that we have been seeing out of the Committee on the Judiciary, and that is this drumbeat towards impeachment. It seems like there is an infatuation by this majority to impeach the President of the United States, whether or not the facts are there. And so there was the Mueller report that went on for years.

And all of these members—chairs of your own committees—saying there was evidence that they had, and it was going to show the President colluded here and there. And then it turned out to be false; there was no collusion.

We know that. The report showed that. Russia tried to interfere with our elections when Barack Obama was President. Maybe they should be investigating why he didn't do more to stop the Russians from trying to interfere with our elections, but there was no collusion.

So instead of saying, Okay, that is it, move on—as the American people would like to see us do—maybe that committee that has jurisdiction over the border, over immigration law, that has serious problems that should be worked out in a bipartisan way, and could be worked out in a bipartisan way, but it is not, because the committee of jurisdiction is infatuated with impeaching the President.

In fact, the chairman of the committee just said today: This is formal

impeachment proceedings. The chairman of the committee said that today, as they are having a hearing on impeaching the President without even evidence to impeach him. There is nothing to impeach him on. They have Articles of Impeachment drawn up with blanks that they are just looking around to fill in on this witch hunt, and they are just going to look and look and look.

Imagine if somebody said, We are going to target a person and we are going to try to indict him. We don't have anything to indict him on, but we are going to write up an indictment and then look around and look around and hope to find something.

And that is what is going on in the Committee on the Judiciary. So they had this hearing today. They changed the rules. They had this big drama. The media is all covering it. The chairman says: This is formal impeachment proceedings.

And then you look at the rules that they brought forward. The rules that they brought forward allow the chairman to do things he can already do. It was a farce. It was a farce to try to appease the radical left base that wants to impeach the President, even though there is nothing to impeach him on. And instead of just giving it up and focusing on their job, the things they should be focused on, they are just going to keep meandering around on this witch hunt.

And I know some in your majority—maybe even the majority leader himself—are trying to distance themselves from it because they know the American people think that it is lunacy to be wasting time trying to impeach the President, even though there is nothing to impeach him on and just driving around on a witch hunt.

And so I guess the real question is, if the chairman of the committee—your chairman—today, said: This is formal impeachment proceedings. He talked about, hopefully, by the end of the year they will vote on Articles of Impeachment—“hopefully,” by the end of the year.

There is nothing to impeach him on, and yet they are going to actually go out on a witch hunt and say, We are going to look for something, and by the end of the year, we hope to impeach the President.

So I would ask the gentleman: Are you all bringing Articles of Impeachment to the floor? Is the chairman rightly going down an impeachment road? And what exactly are those articles?

What are the Articles of Impeachment, if the committee today—your chairman of your committee—said: This is formal impeachment proceedings? What exactly is the gentleman planning on impeaching the President of the United States on? And are you, if he brings those Articles of Impeachment out of committee—blanks that haven't even been filled in—if they bring them to the floor, or

if they move them out of committee by the end of the year, as the chairman hopes, is the gentleman prepared to bring that to the floor of the United States House of Representatives?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee spoke about their process. Their process has been a fact-finding process. That is our responsibility as a Congress. That is his responsibility and the committee's responsibility as a committee.

The majority party claims that they have an agenda for the people, and the people believe we ought to exercise our responsibility. That is what the committee is doing. I do not want to anticipate what the committee's findings will ultimately be nor what the committee's actions will finally be. We will wait to see. But it is exercising its responsibility as a coequal branch of government as provided in the Constitution.

I am not going to get into an argument, Mr. Speaker, about the premises in the Mueller report, other than to say I disagree with the characterization made by the Republican whip. That will be for another day to argue that.

The committee is doing its duty and it will continue to do so. And if it decides that that requires further action, my presumption is it will pursue that as well.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, but I don't think the question has been answered. Because the gentleman says the committee has a responsibility, and I agree. But the committee has a responsibility to be responsible, and it is highly irresponsible. It is reckless and dangerous for the committee to start impeachment proceedings when there is nothing to impeach the President on.

We were in the majority when the President of the United States was somebody we had a lot of disagreements with. We never filed Articles of Impeachment or talked about impeaching the President because there was nothing to impeach the President on. We never did that.

We might have disagreed with them on a lot of things, but there were no committee hearings where the chairman said: This is formal impeachment proceedings, with nothing to impeach the President on.

If he does something years down the road when he gets reelected, you know, this is not the time to go and try to harass the President when there is nothing that you have found—and you have looked. There has been this witch hunt going on for years.

It didn't yield what you were hoping for it to yield. We all should have applauded when the Mueller report said that there was no collusion. But instead of closing it out, there is still—I guess he says, by the end of the year he wants to move Articles of Impeachment. So I guess that means they have

drafted it up and are hoping to find something to fill in the blanks.

But that is irresponsible of that committee to be moving down a course of impeachment when there is nothing to impeach the President on, and especially, when there is so much other work that needs to be done by that committee.

We have a border that is out of control right now; thousands of people coming across every day. Good thing the President of the United States has actually worked in agreement with Mexico. The President was able to achieve that recently, where the Mexican President said that he is going to start putting thousands of troops at the Mexican southern border.

And you know what? It is starting to yield results. But we still have human trafficking coming across our border. We still have drugs coming across our border. And there has been requests made to get more funding to secure that border, to put technology in place, to put other tools in place so that our border patrol agents can do their job securing America's border. And that is the committee of jurisdiction, and they are not bringing bills out of committee to solve that.

They are filing Articles of Impeachment or hoping to move Articles of Impeachment in the next 3 months. And there is not even anything filled in, because there is nothing the President has done to be impeached upon.

This is a serious responsibility the committee has, and, yet, they are acting in such a reckless fashion such to appease the radical left base, who wants to impeach the President, even though there is nothing to impeach him on.

But everybody else in America says, Do your job and focus on the things that are in front of you and drop this daily harassment and drumbeat of impeachment and witch hunts.

□ 1245

It is time to move on and do the work of the committee instead of focusing on impeaching a President, even though there is nothing to impeach him on.

If there is something, show us what it is. But to recklessly say in an open hearing that they are going to impeach the President and move Articles of Impeachment to this House floor by the end of this year, on what?

This has to end. We have to focus on the things that need to be fixed by that committee and this Congress and drop this witch hunt.

Look, at some point, the other side is going to have to figure out which way they want to go because some people in the gentleman's radical base might want to impeach no matter what, but everybody else knows it is the wrong thing to do. Everybody else knows it is irresponsible for that committee to act that way.

I would hope that y'all would make the right decision and say that you are

going to move forward on the things that need to be addressed by the committee. If there is something that comes up, sure, they go look at it, but there is not anything. If there was, they would have filed it already. But to say they are going to file it even if there is nothing, that is dangerous, reckless, and irresponsible.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I didn't want to get into this debate, and I don't want to prolong it, but I do not want the premises articulated by the whip, Mr. Speaker, to stand unobjected to.

In my view, Mr. Speaker, the Mueller report is replete with instances of cooperation by members of the Trump team with the Russians, page after page after page. As a matter of fact, one of them was Page, of collusion.

Now, "collusion" is not a legal term. "Conspiracy" is the legal term. Mr. Mueller said we didn't look at collusion because it was not a legal premise.

In fact, Mr. Mueller made it very clear that the reason they didn't find criminal wrongdoing was because they believed, under Justice Department rules, a President cannot be indicted during the course of his term. They did not absolve him.

Whether it was obstruction of justice, using a foreign government that is, essentially, not our ally, not our friend, or meeting with Putin secretly and not allowing the American people or the Congress to know what was said, my friend's premise that there is no smoke, no fire, is wrong.

Very frankly, as someone who has served here a long time and who has seen some of the most irresponsible attacks on the President during the Obama administration—hearings, over and over and over again. A tragedy in Benghazi—seven hearings, seven hearings, all concluded nothing there, so they had an eighth hearing.

The gentleman talks about Judiciary. Eight hearings on Benghazi, four lives lost tragically, with an attempt over and over and over again to be made a political issue. The eighth found nothing there either.

When I see this wringing of hands, Mr. Speaker, I am not impressed. I have been here for a long time. I have seen irresponsible action, and the American people have seen it.

The Judiciary Committee is doing what it pledged to do when they all raised their hands to defend and support the Constitution of the United States of America.

The President would like us to think everything is fake news. The gentleman hasn't used "fake news" but "the witch hunt."

"Poor me. I am the victim of all these people," when, daily, the President says things that are demonstrably not true.

Mr. Speaker, the Judiciary Committee will continue to pursue its duties, as it needs to do.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, if you talk about Benghazi, there are a lot of serious questions that have not been answered yet.

Mr. HOYER. Eight hearings, all Republican-led.

Mr. SCALISE. Eight hearings, and maybe more should have been had, to investigate why those deaths happened that should not have happened.

Mr. HOYER. And all found nothing there.

Mr. SCALISE. It shouldn't have happened. It should have been stopped.

Mr. HOYER. All found nothing there, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SCALISE. It was unwarranted, what happened there. Fast and Furious, a lot of questions raised.

There were multiple times when the President took action where, ultimately, he was found to be out of compliance with the law, where courts reversed what the President did. We never moved Articles of Impeachment for that. That doesn't warrant high crimes and misdemeanors.

Surely, we investigated those things, and in most cases, it turned out we were right.

With Benghazi, those questions still haven't been answered, about why they died and shouldn't have, because everybody knew the dangers.

Mr. HOYER. Eight hearings found nothing there.

Mr. SCALISE. Found nothing there?

Mr. HOYER. All led by Republicans.

Mr. SCALISE. Found out that Americans died when it was known that it was dangerous where they were. Why weren't planes circled? You could have flown jets over there in 15 minutes to scare away the people who were attacking that Embassy and killing Americans.

We looked into it, and it raised a lot of questions.

Mr. HOYER. Eight times you looked into it.

Mr. SCALISE. Maybe it should have been more to look into why those Americans died so that it doesn't happen again. Things like that, which shouldn't have happened, we should find out what went wrong. Why did people miss telltale signs and let those people die who shouldn't have died?

Yes, those hearings were warranted, but we never filed Articles of Impeachment. We never said we were going to move to impeach so now let's go figure something out, see if we can find something, and even if we don't find something, we are still going to do it.

That is reckless. They took an oath, absolutely, like all of us, to uphold this Constitution and protect this country.

We have a border that is not secure. We have thousands of people coming over every single day, including people who are bringing drugs, trafficking humans, young kids who are being abused. We all know what is happening.

That is the committee of jurisdiction, and they are ignoring it. They haven't produced a single bill to go and solve that problem.

Are they okay with what is going on at the border? They don't think that legislation is warranted to address it, to close the asylum loopholes that everybody knows are a magnet that is bringing people over here illegally, coming through other countries that are offering them asylum to come here illegally? But we don't want to fix that problem because the committee is focused on impeachment.

We will see what they do. But the American people are watching, too, and the American people are tired of those kinds of games—every single day, focusing their energies and taxpayer dollars on attacking the President, on attacking his family, on attacking his Cabinet members and people who did business deals with him 20 years ago who are getting subpoenaed and who have nothing to do with his Presidency just because they want to harass the President because they don't like the fact that he was duly elected in 2016.

The American people did duly elect him President, and he is doing his job. He is carrying out his mission despite all that.

Shame on that committee for continuing to abuse their power by going after something whether it is there or not. Every prosecutor knows you don't try to go find something on somebody. You should follow the facts. If the facts lead you to a dead end, then you end. You don't keep looking. It is not there.

They want to keep doing it and abusing their power. But there is accountability that happens, too. That is why we have elections.

If that is what the committee wants to do, and if that is what the leadership of this House Democratic Caucus wants to do, people are watching.

I want to talk about one final thing, and that is USMCA, an opportunity for us to get something big done for this country.

I had a meeting yesterday with Ambassador Lighthizer, the U.S. Trade Representative, who I know has been meeting with Speaker PELOSI and her team. In fact, a few weeks ago, the Speaker, through her trade working group on USMCA, sent a letter to Ambassador Lighthizer, identifying some areas that they would like addressed in the USMCA trade agreement.

I understand that, last night, Ambassador Lighthizer sent a reply, including things that he has worked with the Democratic majority on, to try to address some of those issues and ultimately get this done.

I say this in the most sincere way: I really do think USMCA is something that we can do together, that we can get an agreement with our friends from the north and south. Canada and Mexico have both come to the table and agreed to make NAFTA work better for American workers, for American industries, for our dairy farmers that can't sell their products into Canada right now that will be able to have better open markets, better working conditions.

Clearly, we want to make sure there is enforcement, and I know that is being worked through, to put belt and suspenders.

At the end of the day, every day we wait means more jobs we are missing out on creating for our economy. I know that there is still the opportunity to get this done, maybe in the next few weeks.

We have a whip team that has been put in place specifically for USMCA. I know there are a lot of Democrats that have been working with Ambassador Lighthizer as well, to try to get this done.

I would ask the gentleman if he has any idea of where that process is on his side, if there is any idea of a timeline to finally bring this to the floor, pass this important agreement that would send a message not only to our friends from the north and south, Canada and Mexico, but to our friends all around the world, to Japan and other countries that want to get trade agreements with America but this is holding back because they want to see if this can get done.

Then, ultimately, let's shift our focus to China and all the countries around the world that want China to have to comply with the rules that everybody else has to comply with, to finally get these tariff fights over so we can have an even stronger economy.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, we have said all along that we want to get to yes on the USMCA. Frankly, we think it is an improvement over NAFTA, which needs improving.

As the gentleman may know, the Speaker and I were here when we voted on NAFTA. We both voted for it.

There were some promises made and side agreements that the rights of workers and the environment would be protected. Unfortunately, that did not turn out to be true, so that, in adopting a change to NAFTA, we want to make sure that the promises made in the agreement are promises that can be enforced.

As the U.S. Chamber of Commerce has often said, the commitments in a trade pact aren't worth the paper they are written on if they can't be enforced.

Mr. Speaker, that has been the posture of the Speaker, myself, and of so many others, that enforcement is critical. Unfortunately, the NAFTA enforcement mechanisms have been a failure.

In 25 years, as I am sure the whip knows, the U.S. has taken only one successful enforcement action under the NAFTA dispute resolution procedure, and none in the past 20 years. Not a single enforcement has prevailed. We have been completely unable to enforce its labor provisions, not one successful enforcement action.

We want to get to yes. And, yes, I want to say that Ambassador Lighthizer is somebody who we respect

and think is operating in good faith. We think he is a positive interlocutor. He is somebody who we can work with and have been working with.

On the other hand, we sent a letter 6 weeks ago, and as the gentleman pointed out, we got an answer yesterday. So, it is taking some time for our task force to get answers to questions and to determine how we can move forward to ensure that the matters included in the agreement become reality, not simply words on paper.

That is important for workers. It is important for our environment. Very frankly, it is also important in terms of trying to contain drug prices, here and around the world.

The gentleman talked about prescription drugs. That is one of the items that is still in dispute. We want to get to yes. We think this is an improvement on what exists.

Therefore, I am hopeful that we will be able to get to an agreement. We believe it will require that the agreement be opened and that enforcement be included so that, as the chamber said, it can really be enforced.

If that happens, I am hopeful that we can pass that agreement, with the agreement of our friends in labor, with our friends at the Chamber of Commerce, and in a bipartisan way on this floor. Let's hope that happens.

But we have made it very, very clear that, if it is just words on paper and not enforceable, it is not a good agreement for America or America's workers.

But I hope that we can move forward and achieve an agreement on this issue so that we can pass it.

□ 1300

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I share the gentleman from Maryland's optimism about the ability to get there, to get this done, to get to "yes." And with the provisions that are already in place on enforcement, if there is a way to make them stronger, I know that that is something that Ambassador Lighthizer has been working with the gentleman's team on.

That is why, while the letter was sent 6 weeks ago, Ambassador Lighthizer started going to work right away, sitting down with folks on both sides, including Democratic leadership in the House, to address those as best as both sides could get agreement; and that is where the letter, I think, finally lays out the remedies to those issues that were brought up.

It is my hope that, as that is reviewed, we get to a place where we can find agreement and then get it passed. Mexico has already passed it. Canada is waiting on us. And I think we would send a strong signal to the world that, not only is America the best place to do business, with the strongest economy in the world, but we are also able to reach better trade deals, both for Americans and for our friends. Then there are a lot more folks in line waiting for us to be a part of those kind of deals, too.

So I look forward to the ability to keep working on that. I would love the ability to work with the gentleman as the Republican whip, the leader, laying out a floor schedule for when that comes, and we can celebrate something big for this country and the workers of America.

I thank the gentleman for his work and for this discourse, and I yield back the balance of my time.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 13, 2019, TO TUESDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, September 17, 2019, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

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

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed a bill of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 178. An act to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China.

The message also announced that the Secretary of the Senate be directed to request the House to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1790) "An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes."

PERMISSION TO EXTEND REMARKS

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein extraneous material notwithstanding the fact that it exceeds two pages and is estimated by the Director of the Government Publishing Office to cost \$2,433.98.

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

There was no objection.

CONGRATULATING ELKS LODGE 2839

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

Mr. VAN DREW. Mr. Speaker, Elks Lodge 2839, in greater Cape May, South Jersey, recently won first place in the Division IV ENF Chairman's Challenge at the National Convention. It was also named number one in the entire State of New Jersey.

Anne Krause, the lodge's ENF chairperson, is truly a dedicated member whose leadership has helped make this Elks Lodge the very best of its kind.

Elks Lodges help our community by offering programs to keep children healthy and to keep them drug-free. They also meet the needs of veterans and help improve the quality of their life, work that is so much needed in today's times.

In addition to these services, Elks Lodges have a generous charitable foundation that gives millions of dollars in scholarships each year to help shape the future of the community of our children.

I feel very lucky to have such a well-run community center as a place for people to come to gather, to grow closer in our beautiful district.

To all the members and staff of Elks Lodge 2839: Congratulations on your awards, and thank you for all you bring to our community. South Jersey is proud of you; New Jersey is proud of you; and the United States of America is proud of you.

God bless you.

HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF MARCA BRISTO

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

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to celebrate the life of Marca Bristo, whose unyielding commitment to advancing disability rights improved the lives of millions.

As the founder of Access Living and a leader of the National Council on Disability, the National Council on Independent Living, and the United States International Council on Disabilities, Marca fought passionately to ensure that people with disabilities have the same rights as their able-bodied peers, including the right to live independently in the community.

She was a crusader for the Americans with Disabilities Act, and her steadfast advocacy was instrumental in the passage of this landmark civil rights legislation.

Her work tearing down barriers cleared the way for people with disabilities to pursue their own dreams, which, ultimately, also helped me realize my dream of becoming a United States Congressman.

Marca's legacy is the continued improvement of the lives of people with disabilities. She made a difference, and my condolences go out to her entire family and her friends.

CONTINUATION OF THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN TERRORIST ATTACKS—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES (H. DOC. NO. 116-62)

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read and, together with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed:

To the Congress of the United States:

Section 202(d) of the National Emergencies Act, 50 U.S.C. 1622(d), provides for the automatic termination of a national emergency unless, within 90 days before the anniversary date of its declaration, the President publishes in the *Federal Register* and transmits to the Congress a notice stating that the emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. Consistent with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* the enclosed notice, stating that the emergency declared in Proclamation 7463 of September 14, 2001, "National Emergency by Reason of Certain Terrorist Attacks," is to continue in effect beyond September 14, 2019.

The threat of terrorism that resulted in the declaration of a national emergency on September 14, 2001, continues. The authorities that have been invoked under that declaration of a national emergency continue to be critical to the ability of the Armed Forces of the United States to perform essential missions in the United States and around the world to address the continuing threat of terrorism. For these reasons, I have determined that it is necessary to continue in effect the national emergency declared on September 14, 2001, in response to certain terrorist attacks.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, September 12, 2019.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot going on today, a lot going on this week. I wish I could say it was all good, but we spent until 10 p.m. the night before last working on bills that would find ways to take people's guns away and, unfortunately, not give them the kind of due process that we think the Constitution affords people.

During my days as, well, a prosecutor and as a felony judge, thousands of criminal cases went through my court. I don't remember anywhere a criminal defendant bought his gun at a sporting goods store, gun store, applied for a gun. That is not the way criminals work.

And so I didn't see anything in our hours and hours and hours of com-

mittee hearings trying to amend bad bills with good amendments that the majority didn't allow to be passed. We thought they might be joining us on some. They said they would look at some, but, basically, defeated every amendment.

Today, we met in the Judiciary Committee at 8 a.m. to take up a semi, sort of, kind of, a bit of an impeachment resolution. We had amendments that would have made a bad resolution a little better—still not good—but we had a hard time figuring out, on the Republican side: What is this?

It sounds like—in Texas, we would say we're fixing to do something. A lot of times people say, "I am fixing to do that," but it means it may get put off and I may not really be serious, because if I was really serious, I would do it right now.

But this resolution—and I have it here—it, in the first paragraph, talks about the committee making discovery requests. But the second paragraph is really the one that deals with allegations that would be an impeachable offense, or offenses—at least, it is supposed to.

And so it says: "Whereas, Special Counsel Robert Mueller's report released on April 18, 2019, found that the Russian Government interfered in the 2016 election in 'sweeping and systematic fashion.'"

Okay. But the Mueller report made very, very clear, and those who investigated, I thought, made it very clear there was no collusion or, to use the legal term, conspiracy by anyone in the Trump campaign with the Russian Government—none. That part didn't happen.

Even though we have networks like CNN and MSNBC, and I don't know who all else, but for 2 or 3 years they have talked about the crimes of this President and their collusion with Russia.

Well, when people who have law degrees talked about collusion between the Trump campaign and Russia, that immediately sent up red flags with me because that is not—"collusion" is not a legal term that is used in talking about crimes; it is conspiracy. And so it immediately begins to raise questions.

Are they really serious about some type of crime? Because if they were, they would use words that are used in criminal terminology.

But here, this is a completely deceptive allegation when it comes to President Trump because they take this initial allegation and say Mueller found that the Russians really were trying to interfere in our 2016 election.

Okay. But it didn't involve anybody in the Trump campaign. That was clear.

So they tried to brush over that and make it sound like, yeah, even though there was nobody, President Trump or the Trump campaign who were involved at all, but we are going to kind of word this, put it in the same sentence so that it kind of sounds like,

yeah, President Trump was involved with Russia, because then it jumps into another gear.

It says, “that there were at least 10 separate episodes of President Trump using his official powers to”—and here is the word—“thwart or attempt to thwart the special counsel’s investigation.”

□ 1315

And that is also very troubling language for those of us that have dealt with legal terminology in criminal cases. I don’t know of anybody that has dealt with criminal cases. I didn’t hear from anybody on the committee that has ever heard of a crime involving thwarting. We are familiar with obstruction of justice. But these are the kind of games you play with words when you know, yes, there is no evidence a crime was committed, but maybe if we use different terminology it will sound like some kind of bad crime was committed. And clearly, we are not going to be able to remove a President from office with the Senate understanding that even the Mueller report, even the Mueller special counsel team that had all these people that hated Donald Trump, they still couldn’t find anything that would be indictable.

Now, some say, Well, but there was obstruction of justice. We even had one, I would say, incompetent law professor come before our committee and say she could guarantee that she could get a conviction and win on appeal. Well, I have tried enough cases in State and Federal court and in the Army that I know—and I have told people that were looking for lawyers in my days as a judge—I couldn’t recommend a lawyer, but I would warn people—if you ever hear a lawyer who tries cases who says they can guarantee you a win in a trial, then that lawyer is either totally incompetent or is one of the biggest liars in the legal profession. I don’t know which one this professor was. I got the impression she just really didn’t know what she was talking about, because no one swears, Oh, yes, I can guarantee you, you know, I can win this case at trial and on appeal. That is not a good lawyer. That is somebody who doesn’t know what they are talking about.

What we have found now after thousands and thousands of interviews, subpoenas, documents, millions of documents, there was no crime. And the reason there was no obstruction of justice by President Trump or anybody that was assisting him is because the President made very clear as soon as he heard about some collusion, conspiracy, whatever you want to call it with Russia to rig the election, he knew he never colluded. He knew that he never conspired, nor did anybody in his campaign conspire with Russia to affect the election. That never happened, and he knew it.

But he could see from what these 17 or so people on the special counsel’s

team were trying to do. They were trying to frame him. And this guy that was dishonored and was no longer respected by MI6 that he used to work for in England and there was information that he was discredited, not just his information, but he had been discredited, but that is who was hired by Fusion GPS, that was hired apparently by the Clinton campaign and the Democratic National Committee to try to dredge up dirt on candidate Donald Trump so that they could rig the election against Donald Trump.

And we have gotten to the bottom of it, almost. We know that Christopher Steele is the one that didn’t just collude, he conspired with people in Russia who he ultimately had to admit, yes, it is quite possible they could have been working for Vladimir Putin. So Christopher Steele, it appears most likely he was the one that was conspiring with people from Russia, sounds like Putin’s agents, to try to destroy Donald Trump.

And there has been noise made about, oh, gee, you know, Russia really wanted Donald Trump to win. That is not the way Vladimir Putin thinks. He wants the old Soviet empire back. It really bugs me when educated people say, you know, he is such a complicated guy. No, he isn’t. He is one of the most easily discernible people in the world. He wants the old empire back. He is a former KGB guy, and he will do whatever it takes to try to get it back. I don’t think he cared so much who won the election. He wanted to divide America, and lo and behold, he was able to see the Fusion GPS, Christopher Steele, the Clinton campaign, DNC, they were able to take all this information that were nothing but lies in the dossier—they have even given dossier a bad name—and divide America.

And at least one political party in America has been totally willing to be complicit to help divide America over a bunch of lies in a dossier that was created as political fodder when it became very clear very quickly to those who had paid for the dossier that it was not only not verifiable, the person that gathered the information didn’t really know the people, the Russians that gave him the lies about Donald Trump, and that got taken before a FISA court to get a warrant to spy on a campaign; to wit, the Trump campaign. That is scary stuff; when one administration can use the powers of the office of President, the Intel community, the FBI, the Department of Justice, use all those powers to destroy another campaign. And as Newt Gingrich has pointed out, if Ms. Clinton had won, we would have never known how corrupted and weaponized the DOJ and FBI had become.

And I know there are some of my friends here in Congress on our side of the aisle that think Michael Horowitz is doing a good job, because look at all the evidence of wrongdoing, bias, all this that he has found. Well, if you look at the most recent report, just

like the first one, in the first report Horowitz found—and he was a good Obama appointee as inspector general there at the Department of Justice, good Democrat, good appointee.

And so he does his digging, finds hundreds of pages of the most outrageous political bias—it’s actually a personal hatred for Donald Trump and absolute love and affection for candidate Hillary Clinton—so much overwhelming bias, and every conclusion that these biased, prejudiced, bigoted investigators had was 100 percent consistent with all of their conclusions. That speaks for itself.

Now, if half of their conclusions had gone against their bias and prejudice, bigotry, then you would say, well, you know, maybe it really didn’t affect the outcomes of their investigations. But when every conclusion is consistent with the bias and prejudice, even though it is clear, like in the case of the investigation into the Clinton emails, you had Strzok and Page examining emails, and they were making the calls on whether documents are classified, knowing full well if they said something was classified that Hillary Clinton was being set up legitimately to be indicted and convicted. So they wanted Hillary Clinton to win. They wanted to do whatever they could to stop Donald Trump from winning, and if he didn’t win, as they said, they needed an insurance policy, you know, just in case he won.

And Horowitz did a grave injustice within the Justice Department, and he says there is no indication that all that bias had anything to do with the outcomes of the cases. That is just garbage. He is being disingenuous. He wasn’t doing his job in his conclusions. And I know there were a lot of Republicans that said, Yes, okay, but, boy, when he investigated, when that report comes out on Comey, it is going to end up sending him to prison.

Well, Comey did leak information that he should not. He did keep documents that he was not permitted to keep. He secreted them, kept them after he had left government service. He is not allowed to do that. And the biggest thing about those and whether or not they were felonies that would put him in jail would be: Was this information classified and at what level?

And we find out, you know, on page one and two of the Horowitz IG report, the FBI investigated, and the FBI determined that this wasn’t classified; the FBI this and that. And you have to wait 40 pages to see who he means by the FBI. Well, it turns out, the two most important people, because they had the most experience in analyzing documents to determine their classification level, it was a couple named Peter Strzok and Lisa Page. And he has the gall, Horowitz does, to even point out—to try to get more credibility to Strzok and Page’s work on deciding whether Comey should go to prison, because they were classified at a high level. He said, Oh, but they had

more experience, because they did all this work on the Clinton emails determining whether those were classified or not.

For heaven's sake, somebody needs to wake up. Michael Horowitz does not need to be doing the investigation. Maybe let him do the investigation, but he doesn't need to be doing the reports. In a lot of places people would say he doesn't know sic 'em from come here when it comes to proper conclusions. It is outrageous.

And he justified not having them re-examined because time was of the essence 2 years ago in 2017, back before Strzok and Page were fired. But not to worry, because a guy named Bill Priestap was going to rubber stamp whatever Strzok and Page decided on classifications.

There was another unit chief. Didn't give us that name. That tells you something right there.

But Priestap was supposed to have the final decision, apparently rubber stamp whatever our experienced Strzok and Page decided when they knew full well if they classified things at a certain level that it meant Jim Comey was going to prison.

So they did Comey a favor. And so then Horowitz, he didn't want to have them rereviewed for proper classification away from the bias of Strzok and Page and Priestap that—you know, there were reports of him going to London trying to help out Steele's credibility.

So Horowitz said time was of the essence, so nobody reconsidered the classification that the bigoted bias and prejudice of Page and Strzok would not be determinative.

And I know that people, Republicans, many of them are saying, well, look, there is no question that McCabe lied, perjured, he should end up going to prison. But I am telling you as a history buff, a historian, if you would, it is true. History is often the best indicator of what someone will do in the future.

□ 1330

The indications are that Obama's IG, Horowitz, will find some terrible things, but he will do it in such a way that he will give not only Comey, Strzok, and Page a get-out-of-jail-free pass, but he will do that with McCabe and with anybody else he is investigating, because that is his history. He knows which side his bread is buttered on and who is doing the buttering, who got him in the position he is in.

We end up now being told, well, this isn't a formal impeachment hearing, the investigation we started today in the Judiciary Committee. Then, toward the end of our hearing, we heard from two different Democrats who wanted to go on record to make it very, very clear that this was an impeachment hearing, an impeachment investigation.

That is what it is. It is not just a resolution for investigative procedures, as it says here on the resolution.

There was so much fraud involved in this case. I am not talking about from anybody with the Trump campaign. I am talking about a guy like James Comey who should have known better. He swore and apparently verified the application and affidavit information to go before the FISA court so he could get a warrant to spy on the Trump campaign, all while he was lying to the President about him not being under investigation and also trying to set the President up by doing little memos.

I hope and pray one of the things that comes out of all this Department of Justice, FBI, and intel abuse is a practice the FBI has had for years. It is section 302, where FBI agents, after they do an interview, they sit down and type up their own version of what they think or what they recall a witness said. Most of the ones I have seen over the years in my different roles in the justice system appear to be very accurate. But it is a problem when every other local and State law enforcement entity I am aware of, when they want credibility for a statement, they record it.

I saw it from juries in my court. "Look, you are telling us this is what the defendant said. Why didn't you record it so we could see for ourselves, hear for ourselves, see the body language?"

That is why local governments all over the country have come up with billions of dollars altogether so that they can make sure that they get video and audio of someone being questioned, so there is no question what they say.

But not at the FBI. Oh, no. They will talk to a witness and then write out their own version of what is said. Thankfully, most of them do a great job, but it also allows unscrupulous FBI or DOJ officials, as now we have seen existed under the Obama Justice Department, it allows them to twist the FBI's or the DOJ's version of what a witness says and use that, as they have thousands and thousands of times, I don't know how many times, to convict people, saying, "This is what he said because I wrote it down in my own notes after I did the interview."

"Really? Well, let's see the video. Let's hear the audio."

"Well, we don't do that at the FBI. We only write down our version of what is said because we really would rather you hear our version and not the defendant's version of what he said, because we get more credibility than any defendant."

At least that used to be the way it was. But I hope one of the things that will come out of all of this is, in order for the FBI to get back the credibility they used to have as the greatest law enforcement agency in the world, they are going to need to start doing audio and video so that we can see what a witness said, hear what they said for ourselves, and so that juries can hear that and judges can see and hear that. But we don't have that here.

People like the biased Strzok and Page, who hated Trump and loved Hillary Clinton, when you talk about obstruction of justice, I don't know how you can be more obstructive than to get a subpoena for emails and then BleachBit, take all the stuff off so nobody can ever see and then beat up with hammers cellphones and whatever you need to, to destroy the evidence. That would seem to be a classic case of obstruction.

Fortunately, for people involved with Hillary Clinton, it was Strzok and Page on the job, so they didn't see anything, didn't hear anything that might resemble something that should be prosecuted.

But we end up today with this resolution that the majority passed without allowing any amendments, and they used this word "thwart," that the President used his official powers to thwart or attempt to thwart. Nobody has ever been convicted of thwarting.

You just can imagine, say the Democrats got exactly what they wanted and were able to impeach or charge President Trump with thwarting an official investigation. It goes to the Senate. They get what they want, and President Trump is removed. Years down the road, they say, "You used to be President. You were removed? What were you removed for?"

"Well, I was a thwarter, apparently. I have been branded a thwarter."

Maybe we ought to put a "T" on their head so everybody knows: Here comes a thwarter.

The only thing he was thwarting, if at all, is massive injustice from the Justice Department. He knew he had not conspired with anybody in Russia, nor had anybody in his campaign.

The evidence has borne that out. Even Mueller, Weissman, the people who hated the President, had to come around to saying they couldn't find any evidence of them conspiring with Russia.

Nonetheless, we still have to go through this hearing today, and I am sure there will be other hearings.

The truth is, President Donald Trump never obstructed or thwarted justice. He knew that if there was true justice, this effort to frame him for colluding with the Russians would be found false and would be found to be a frame-up job. He wanted justice.

The DOJ could never convict someone of obstructing justice when all they did was what they could to ensure that an injustice did not occur. They were seeking justice to make sure there wasn't a successful frame-up. That is not obstructing or thwarting justice. That is seeking justice. But there certainly were people inside the DOJ who were doing what they could to inflict an injustice on President Trump.

So here we go into this impeachment exercise that started today.

I think about those in England who would say, "God save the Queen," "God save the King." God save this Republic.

We are in a lot of trouble when we have caught the Justice Department red-handed trying to impose a massive injustice, conspiring to do so, even having an Acting Attorney General who we found out from the emails this week—and some of us knew this because we knew from other information that Rosenstein, the Acting Attorney General, did not just once say sarcastically: I will wear a wire. I can get into the White House. I will wear a wire and record the President.

Then, they could try to remove him under the 25th Amendment for not being competent. They formulated a response to act like he was being sarcastic when everybody there knew he was not being sarcastic.

Apparently, from what I understood, the reason he brought that up is because others there in the meeting were mad at him. They said: You have been helping the President instead of helping us get the President. You wrote that memo that gave him a basis to fire Comey. Whose side are you on?

That is the kind of context where Rosenstein says: Look, I will wear a wire if you want.

He wanted to show that he was an Obama team player, a Sally Yates team player, a Loretta Lynch team player, that he was not a Trump team player: I will even wear a wire and go in.

That wasn't the only place he brought it up. He brought it up at another meeting, such that McCabe went back and told people: You know, Rosenstein brought it up again. He still says he is willing to wear a wire.

That is because Rosenstein was trying to convince them he was a good team player and would go set up and try to frame the President to help remove him from office.

That is not all that has gone on this week. We had the vote today. The House has voted to eliminate the tiny, little part of ANWR where Jimmy Carter said that drilling would be allowed.

Now, this is Jimmy Carter who says everybody is supposed to wear a cardigan and turn your temperature in winter way down, wear a sweater, you know, shiver a little bit. It is okay because we are going to save energy.

Even he said it is right that part of ANWR, that tiny, little part of that huge area, nothing is there, so it is not going to affect any wildlife, really, so that can be an area that can be drilled.

Since then, Democrats have done all they could to put it off-limits. Sometimes you see these pictures of all this wildlife, this beautiful, pristine area. Well, if that is what you see, that isn't the part of ANWR where drilling would be allowed.

We can get a little perspective on the size. There was another poster up here somewhere. It has a map of how big Alaska is, and then it has the size of ANWR. Then there is a red dot that you can't see more than a few feet away that is the tiny, little part, comparatively, where drilling would be allowed.

There are people here in this body who are absolutely wonderful people, friends on both sides of the aisle. Some of my Democratic friends, I know they would never lie to me. They are honest people. We just have disagreements on things.

One of the most honorable people I ever knew in this body was chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee back initially when Democrats took the majority in January 2007. He wanted socialized medicine. We disagreed on that. But I knew the man's heart. He wanted to help poor people.

□ 1345

That is why he didn't want to pass the cap-and-trade bill, because he knew it would cause the price of energy to skyrocket. And he knew it was a tough blow to the Nation's poor, to our senior citizens on Medicare, but especially on Social Security, a fixed income. If you start skyrocketing the price of energy to those folks, it is devastating.

That is why John did not want to pass the cap-and-trade bill. He wanted to do everything he could to help poor people. That was his nature. He knew if you start doing this kind of stuff for the rich with energy prices—gasoline, electricity, propane, and those things going up—it is an inconvenience, but for those on a fixed income, it is absolutely devastating.

America, under the Trump administration, has been allowed to gather up more of our own blessed energy sources. The economy gets better. More people are working now than ever. Unemployment is the lowest it has ever been for minorities since they started recording those numbers. It is fantastic. Energy prices have come down low, and it has been stabilized because we are finding so much of our own energy and using it.

We disagree about a lot of things on both sides of the aisle. I don't know anybody who serves in this body on either side of the aisle who doesn't want a clean environment. But those who know our history of the world know that, if you have a struggling economy, the number one thing that suffers, besides the people, is the environment.

In China, that government, as big and totalitarian as it can be, they know if people get laid off and are not working, they could have another revolution, and they don't want that. They are more concerned about people being busy and working and having money than they are about the environment.

In India, they are scared to death of too many people not being able to work or have income.

We get all of this pollution from the other side of the world. I heard today that 85 percent, somebody said, of the pollution that we have in our atmosphere is coming from these other countries. When those countries' economies are struggling, there is more pollution. That is just the way it works, because you just can't help afford to clean up the environment like we are and have been in the United States.

We need a vibrant economy to continue to clean up our environment. We have lakes that were dead, now brimming with activity and with wildlife. These are good things. In Texas, it seems like our air gets cleaner every year.

I asked my staff to find a picture, as best they could, that would reflect what we are talking about in ANWR in that tiny—well, relatively speaking, tiny area of ANWR where drilling would be allowed. This is from Google Maps. This isn't actually the area, but it looks like most of the area where drilling would be allowed.

From time to time, there will be wildlife across this area, in the area where drilling would be allowed, but they can't stay because they can't live there in that area. There is just not enough to sustain life there.

As Jimmy Carter figured out, it is an ideal place to drill, and that is why they designated it for that. But we have been waiting over 40 years to use that as a place to even further reduce our cost of energy, which will also allow us to export energy, which means European countries don't have to be blackmailed or extorted by Russia.

There is one country that hopes the Democrats are very, very successful—well, of course, the OPEC nations. But Russia is probably the most hopeful that the Democrats are successful in preventing us from getting the energy that we have been blessed with in this area where you don't have caribou or things, wildlife, like you do in other parts of ANWR. They don't want us to drill because they know we will be able to get energy to Europe. And we won't blackmail Europe. We won't extort Europe the way that Putin often has, countries that he supplies natural gas to.

If we export that, we can help give more freedom to the world. We can bring down our own prices even further. Why wouldn't we do that?

This picture was near the proposed exploration area. It is from Google Maps. It is taken on Dalton Highway, just south of Prudhoe Bay. It is facing east towards the coastal area of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. So it is not right in the refuge, but it is a very fair representation of the coastal areas found within the refuge.

It is actually a more accurate depiction of the proposed exploration area than the images that we have been seeing around here about the mountains and rainbows and all the herds of animals. This is much more representative than any of those types of pictures.

I want to touch on one more thing about the Russians meddling in our election.

Sean Hannity had a great article 1½ years ago, February of 2018. In there, he quotes from President Obama. President Obama said: "There is no serious person out there who would suggest somehow that you could even rig America's elections. There's no evidence that that has happened in the

past or that there are instances in which that will happen this time.”

That was at the height of the 2016 election.

He goes on to say: “And so I invite Mr. Trump to stop whining and go try to make his case to get votes.”

President Trump did nothing. It turns out they knew that the Russians were trying to meddle in our election. So why wouldn't Obama try to stop the Russians from meddling in our election? He did nothing.

There is speculation that he knew Hillary Clinton was going to win, and he was afraid if they started admitting what they knew was true—that Russia was trying to meddle in our elections—and then Hillary Clinton won, it might make her victory look suspect if they talked about the effort they knew Russia was engaged in to affect our election.

But the truth is that Putin wants to divide America as much as he can. Divide and conquer is what he hopes to do. And he has been successful.

The Russians that they had who gave their lives to Christopher Steele, the discredited former MI6 guy, that he provided to Fusion GPS that apparently the Clinton campaign and the DNC had hired, it has done what they wanted. It has done what Putin wanted. It has adversely affected the President of the United States. It has divided our country, and it has pitted family against family.

Someone once said that the last phase of a civil war involves guns, but we have been in a nonfirearm civil war for a while now. And this Mueller investigation—the whole Russia dossier, the lies in there about candidate, now President, Trump—the Russians, just like Putin wanted, have been successful in dividing this country.

As of yesterday, being 9/11, we can disagree, like John Dingell and I did, but I loved the guy. He was a brilliant, caring, honorable man of integrity. We have those on both sides of the aisle. You have some that you have got to be careful on both sides. But there are people on both sides of the aisle; and we can work together because they are honest, honorable people, and we can disagree when we need to.

I need to touch on, before we finish the week here, of course, we have seen in the news Afghanistan peace talks with the Taliban broke down. The Taliban continue to kill Americans, and they are going to continue to kill Americans. It is who they are. It is what they are.

In my trips to Afghanistan and other places, I made friends with some of those Muslims who were part Afghan, Muslims who were part of the Northern Alliance. It is no longer called the Northern Alliance. But these were Muslim friends of the United States. They just wanted their freedom. They are Muslims, but they did not want ruthless totalitarians like the Taliban running their country.

The enemy of our enemy were people we could work with. Unfortunately, our

intelligence was not sophisticated enough, plugged in enough, so that a day or so before 9/11, when Ahmad Shah Massoud, sometimes called the Lion of Panjshir because he was such a hero—he was a great warrior, soldier; he was a great politician, beloved in Afghanistan. The Taliban wanted to kill him, but he had good security.

The Taliban, they may be crazy, they may be haters and want to kill all Americans, but they are not stupid at all. They knew that if the United States figured out that the 9/11 attack had originated in Afghanistan with al-Qaida and the Taliban, that the United States would come to Afghanistan, and we would look for an Afghan leader that the people would rally behind, who could lead the country to destroy the Taliban. And they knew that would most likely be the Lion of Panjshir, the hero of the Afghan victory over Russia, Ahmad Shah Massoud.

A day or so before 9/11—I think it was around 36 hours or so before—they had gotten Massoud to agree to an interview. His security people checked out the reporter, known reporter, the cameraman there, let him in, and, when they start the interview, the cameraman blows up the bomb in his camera and kills Massoud.

If our intelligence people had been on top of their game, they would have known something was about to happen. Something was about to happen for them to kill Massoud now, this national hero.

Ahmad Shah Massoud has a brother, Ahmad Zia Massoud, and I think of him as a friend. I hope he thinks the same way. He fought with and under his older brother. His brother used him as a diplomat, but he was one of many of the Northern Alliance.

The movie “12 Strong” shows General Dostum that we got after 9/11, getting around October, got other tribal groups to agree to fight with Dostum as the leader. Some of them weren't happy, but they agreed. And we provided air cover, and we provided weapons for them.

□ 1400

We have 300 or so, as I have understood it, special ops, Special Forces, CIA, in there, and only our guys could call down bombs and direct them at specific targets.

Between the weapons we provided the Afghans, the bomb support from B-52s 40,000 or so feet up, the Northern Alliance, our Afghan Muslim allies, they destroyed the organized Taliban, within—some say, maybe it was March, but February, March of 2002. Without a single American casualty, we defeated the Taliban.

Then I think it was a mistake. We were considered heroes. We came in. We helped get rid of the Taliban that a majority of Afghanistan did not want running the country. And then we came in and started what appeared to be occupying. And that probably could have been okay if we could have helped

them get a new government going and then get out.

Condoleezza Rice, as I have heard from others, relied on recommendations to use a guy named Zalmay Khalilzad, a Pashtun. You can be Pashtun and not be Taliban. He is not Taliban. But you can't be Taliban and not be Pashtun, as I understand it.

And anyway, she relied heavily on him. I talked to a guy who said he was part of the inner circle, and the decision was: What kind of government are we going to give Afghanistan now that we have destroyed the Taliban? Unfortunately, that shouldn't have been our decision, but there were people who said, Look, this is a Tribal country and nothing would fit this area better than to have strong local and state or province governments, and then it is a Federalist society where the national government is kind of an umbrella, but the real power is in the provinces and the local government.

That is not what we did. The wrong people were listened to. And we pushed a constitution through that gives the power to the President, almost making him a dictator. The President is elected in Afghanistan, but then he appoints the governors. He appoints the mayors. He appoints the police chief. It just cut the local folks and the province folks out of governing themselves.

And as my friend Massoud said: You know, look, we know you are going to end up having to pull out some day, so please help us get an amendment to our constitution that allows each province to elect its own governor and allows each city and town to elect their own mayor. Let us pick our own police chiefs, not somebody that Karzai, and now Ghani who is President would pick, but let us pick our own leaders.

And the reasoning I thought was very sound. He said, when America leaves Afghanistan with this strong central government where the President has all power, all I have got to do is either knock off or corrupt the President, and they are right back in charge of Afghanistan.

The Taliban hate Americans, so they are going to come kill a bunch more once they take back over Afghanistan. And then you are going to have to come back and Americans die all over again for nothing.

If you will simply allow us to have that local provincial power so we elect our own leaders and not have them appointed from Kabul, then, yeah, maybe the Taliban gets one or two provinces, but the rest of us can rise up like we did before and defeat the Taliban again, and you don't have to have Americans die like you have for all of these years.

That made sense. But the only trouble is, the guy that helped get Afghanistan this ridiculous constitution that has created basically a totalitarian Presidency, that is who was negotiating with the Taliban. There are rumors that he wanted to be President of Afghanistan at one time himself, but

regardless, this guy, he gave the Bush administration bad advice. He gave the Obama administration bad advice.

They were trying to cut a deal with the Taliban. The Taliban, you can cut a deal with them and then they are going to cut your throat the first chance they get.

It makes no sense. But we have people from the Bush administration through the Obama administration. Khalilzad is still being listened to, and he wanted to do this deal with the Pashtun brothers, the Taliban.

We don't need to be dealing with our enemies. We need to be dealing with our allies. And this was one of the great dangers, by rejecting those who lost family members, risked their own lives to help us take out the Taliban, eliminate the organized Taliban originally, without a single loss of American life, why wouldn't we want to put them in positions of power? They can get elected, if we just—I said to Massoud: What makes you think we could help you amend your constitution?

And he said: You are still paying for most of our government operations. If you threaten to pull out all of that money prematurely, yeah, we will change the constitution. But we need your help to do it, so you don't have to keep losing American lives here in Afghanistan.

It made so much sense. But, unfortunately, the deep state just continues to be deep and Khalilzad has been part of that from the beginning. He seemed like a nice guy when I met him in Iraq back in 2005. He seemed like a nice guy. He is just the wrong person to be listened to.

Americans have continued to be killed while he has been wanting to have peace talks with the Taliban, not with the northern or former Northern Alliance people who risked their lives and lost family members fighting with us and for us. Oh, no, we are not going

to deal with them. We are going to leave them. And all of the former Northern Alliance, they know that when we leave and we cut a deal with the Taliban or leave things so that the Taliban can take right over again, they are all going to be killed.

Then there isn't going to be anybody in Afghanistan who will be able to stand up and fight against the Taliban. On top of that, even if there were, they wouldn't want to cut a deal with us, because they will have seen the way the Northern Alliance risked lives and lost lives to help us defeat the Taliban.

What do we do? Do we leave them high and dry? Do we allow the Taliban to come in and kill them when we go? No. No. We need to be talking to our friends who fought with us and got rid of all of the organized Taliban by February or March of 2002 before we became occupiers, more or less.

There needs to be a Federalist system there, and we need our friends, our allies who fought the Taliban and don't want them back in positions of authority. And I think President Ghani would be willing to do that, but, you know, deep state just keeps getting deeper. We need to negotiate with our friends, so they are in a position to help our enemies not get back in control to kill Americans again.

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

REQUESTING RETURN OF S. 1790, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following privileged message from the Senate:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (S. 1790) entitled "An Act to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2020 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activi-

ties of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the request of the Senate is agreed to, and S. 1790 will be returned to the Senate.

There was no objection.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 178. An act to condemn gross human rights violations of ethnic Turkic Muslims in Xinjiang, and calling for an end to arbitrary detention, torture, and harassment of these communities inside and outside China; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs; in addition, to the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence; and to the Committee on the Judiciary for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

BILL PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 11, 2019, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 831. To direct the Secretary of Transportation to request nominations for and make determinations regarding roads to be designated under the national scenic byways program, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 13, 2019, at 9 a.m.

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAYGO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, the attached estimate of the costs of H.R. 1146, the Arctic Cultural and Coastal Plain Protection Act, for printing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 1146 (RULES COMMITTEE PRINT 116-30)

	By fiscal year, in millions of dollars—												
	2019	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2019-2024	2019-2029
NET INCREASE OR DECREASE (-) IN THE DEFICIT													
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Effects	0	0	-95	500	-100	-100	201	-99	-104	-104	-104	205	-5

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2069. A letter from the Alternate OSD FRLO, Office of the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Recoupment of Nonrecurring Costs (NCs) on Sales of U.S. Items [Docket ID: DOD-2018-OS-0088] (RIN: 0790-AK24) received August 23, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2070. A letter from the Special Agent, Chief, Policy Branch, Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting

the Department's final rule — Individual Requests for Access or Amendment of CID Reports of Investigation [Docket ID: USA-2019-HQ-0016] (RIN: 0702-AB00) received September 5, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2071. A letter from the Under Secretary, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Entities to the Entity List and Revision of Entries on the Entity List [Docket No.: 190814-0013] (RIN: 0694-AH86) received September 5, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2072. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's guidance and interpretation — Commission Interpretation and Guidance Regarding the Applicability of the Proxy Rules to Proxy Voting Advice [Release No.: 34-86721] received August 23, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2073. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's guidance — Commission Guidance Regarding Proxy Voting Responsibilities of Investment Advisers [Release Nos.: IA-5325; IC-33605] received August 22, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2074. A letter from the Deputy Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Affairs, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Paying Benefits received September 5, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and Labor.

2075. A letter from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Electric-Powered Vehicles: Electrolyte Spillage and Electrical Shock Protection [Docket No.: NHTSA-2019-0009] (RIN: 2127-AM10) received August 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2076. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Minnesota; Flint Hills Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂) Revision [EPA-R05-OAR-2018-0731; FRL-9998-49-Region 5] received September 11, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2077. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Texas; Control of Air Pollution from Motor Vehicles [EPA-R06-OAR-2018-0811; FRL-9997-58-Region 6] received September 11, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2078. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Electronic Delivery of MVPD Communications [MB Docket No.: 17-317]; Modernization of Media Regulation Initiative [MB Docket No.: 17-105] received August 23, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2079. A letter from the Associate Chief, Auctions Division, Office of Economics and Analytics, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Incentive Auction of Upper Microwave Flexible Use Service Licenses in the Upper 37 GHz, 39 GHz, and 47 GHz Bands for Next-Generations Wireless Services; Notice and Filing Requirements, Minimum Opening Bids, Upfront Payments, and Other Procedures for Auctions 103; Bidding in Auction 103 Scheduled to Begin December 10, 2019 [AU Docket No.: 19-59] [GN Docket No.: 14-177] received August 23, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2080. A letter from the Under Secretary, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Temporary General License: Extension of Validity, Clarifications to Authorized Transactions, and Changes to Certification Statement Requirements [Docket No.: 190814-0012] (RIN: 0694-AH86) received September 5, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2081. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Addition of Certain Entities to the Entity List, Revision of Entries on the Entity List, and Removal of Entities From the Entity List [Docket No.: 190808-0011] (RIN: 0694-AH50) received August 23, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2082. A letter from the Senior Attorney-Advisor, Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — FAST Act Section 5516 "Additional State Authority" Implementation [Docket No.: FHWA-2018-0042] (RIN: 2125-AF86) received August 27, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2083. A letter from the Attorney Advisor, Office of Chief Counsel, Federal Railroad Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — System Safety Program [Docket No.: FRA-2011-0060, Notice No. 11] (RIN: 2130-AC81) received August 29, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2084. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Endicott, NY; Correction [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0347; Airspace Docket No.: 19-AEA-6] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2085. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airspace Designations; Incorporation by Reference [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0627; Amendment. No.: 71-51] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received September 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2086. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket

et No.: FAA-2018-1012; Product Identifier 2018-NM-132-AD; Amendment 39-19708; AD 2019-16-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2087. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0187; Product Identifier 2018-NM-172-AD; Amendment 39-19715; AD 2019-16-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2088. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters Deutschland GmbH Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0643; Product Identifier 2019-SW-013-AD; Amendment 39-19719; AD 2019-10-51] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2089. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0322; Product Identifier 2019-NM-039-AD; Amendment 39-19722; AD 2019-16-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2090. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2019-0608; Product Identifier 2019-NM-084-AD; Amendment 39-19713; AD 2019-16-10] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received September 6, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2091. A letter from the Chairman, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Regulations Governing Fees for Services Performed in Connection With Licensing and Related Services-2019 Update [Docket No.: EP 542 (Sub-No. 27)] received August 23, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2092. A letter from the Regulations Policy Coordinator, Office of Regulations Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary (OOREG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Rental and Utility Assistance for Certain Low-Income Veteran Families (RIN: 2900-AQ40) received August 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2093. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Domestic Partnerships and S Corporations Filing Under Proposed GILTI Regulations [Notice 2019-46] received August 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2094. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only

rule — Implementation of Nonresident Alien Deposit Interest Regulations (Rev. Proc. 2019-23) received August 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi: Committee on Homeland Security. H.R. 3356. A bill to provide PreCheck to certain severely injured or disabled veterans, and for other purposes (Rept. 116-203, Pt. 1). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

DISCHARGE OF COMMITTEE

Pursuant to clause 2 of rule XIII, the Committee on Veterans' Affairs discharged from further consideration. H.R. 3356 referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

CONSENSUS CALENDAR

Under clause 7 of rule XV, the following motion was filed with the Clerk: Motion No. 8, September 12, 2019 by Ms. Speier on H.R. 1773.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. KIM (for himself, Ms. DEAN, and Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico):

H.R. 4295. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out a pilot program under which the Secretary determines the exposure of certain children of members of the Armed Forces to perfluoroalkyl and polyfluoroalkyl substances; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY (for herself, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. MATSUI, and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ):

H.R. 4296. A bill to amend title VI of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to ensure the safe use of cosmetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GOMEZ (for himself, Mr. AGUILAR, Ms. BASS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. CORREA, Mr. COSTA, Mr. COX of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. HARDER of California, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms.

OMAR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. POCAN, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. VELA, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KHANNA, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 4297. A bill to amend the Food and Nutrition Act of 2008 to treat attendance at an institution of higher education the same as work for the purpose of determining eligibility to participate in the supplemental nutrition assistance program; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. HAYES (for herself, Mrs. MCBATH, Ms. SCANLON, Ms. FINKENAUER, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. MENG, Mr. LUJÁN, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. MOORE, Mr. POCAN, and Ms. PORTER):

H.R. 4298. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to restore Federal Pell Grant eligibility for certain periods; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. TONKO, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 4299. A bill to reauthorize through 2024 the National Geological and Geophysical Data Preservation Program Act of 2005; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. DEAN (for herself, Mr. TURNER, Ms. BASS, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 4300. A bill to provide federal housing assistance on behalf of youths who are aging out of foster care, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mrs. MCBATH, and Mrs. HAYES):

H.R. 4301. A bill to require the Secretary of Education, in consultation with Attorney General and the Secretary of Health and Human Services, to publish an annual report on indicators of school crime and safety that includes data on school shootings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 4302. A bill to authorize public housing agencies to share certain data regarding homeless individuals and families for the provision of housing and services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TONKO, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. COX of California, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RUSH, Mr. RICHMOND, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. CRIST, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. FRANKEL, Ms. FUDGE, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BASS, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. EVANS, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. LEWIS, Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GARAMENDI, and Mr. SUOZZI):

H.R. 4303. A bill to designate the Commonwealth of the Bahamas under section 244 of

the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of the Commonwealth of the Bahamas to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on the Budget, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PALAZZO (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. GUEST, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. HILL of California, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 4304. A bill to amend title 51, United States Code, to allow the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration to accept in-kind consideration for certain leases, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. STIVERS (for himself, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Ms. SHERRILL, Mr. DUNN, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. WALTZ, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mr. ROY, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 4305. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to carry out a pilot program on dog training therapy; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. DEFAZIO (for himself and Mr. MALINOWSKI):

H.R. 4306. A bill to require the Administrator of the Federal Railroad Administration to conduct an evaluation of the safety, security, and environmental risks of transporting liquefied natural gas by rail, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PETERS (for himself, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. HECK, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. HILL of California, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H.R. 4307. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, relating to certain requirements for the engineering phase of fixed guideway capital investment grants, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. MORELLE (for himself, Ms. HILL of California, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. BRINDISI, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 4308. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to establish an emergency grant aid program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. BEYER (for himself, Mr. KATKO, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 4309. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a grant program to facilitate the installation, on bridges, of evidence-based suicide deterrents, including suicide prevention nets and barriers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4310. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to clarify that employment in any position at a nonprofit organization is a public service job for purposes of the public service loan forgiveness program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself and Mr. CHABOT):

H.R. 4311. A bill to protect consumers from discriminatory State taxes on motor vehicle rentals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 4312. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify when educational assistance is available for an individual who pursues an approved program of education

leading to a degree while on active duty in the Armed Forces; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. DINGELL (for herself and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 4313. A bill to authorize the Attorney General to make grants to State and Tribal courts in order to allow the electronic service of certain court orders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana (for himself and Mr. MAST):

H.R. 4314. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Defense to appoint officers of the Armed Forces as directors of medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself and Mr. PHILLIPS):

H.R. 4315. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to prohibit a candidate for election to the office of Representative in Congress or Senator from accepting contributions from any political committee other than an authorized committee of the candidate and from establishing a leadership PAC; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 4316. A bill to provide for temporary emergency impact aid for local educational agencies; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. WELCH):

H.R. 4317. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend and expand the new energy efficient home credit, to extend the energy efficient commercial buildings deduction, to eliminate the basis reduction for low-income housing properties receiving certain energy benefits, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself, Mr. STANTON, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, and Mr. GALLEGO):

H.R. 4318. A bill to provide economic stabilization resources to distressed rural communities directly impacted by the closure of an electric generating station, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. PANETTA (for himself, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. CORREA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MENG, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. MURPHY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OMAR, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. VARGAS, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ):

H.R. 4319. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to eliminate the annual numerical limitation on U visas, to require the Secretary of Homeland Security to grant work authorization to aliens with a pending

application for nonimmigrant status under subparagraph (U) or (T) of section 101(a)(15) of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 4320. A bill to ensure that irresponsible corporate executives, rather than shareholders, pay fines and penalties; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4321. A bill to eliminate lead-based pipe and tap hazards in housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. SHALALA (for herself, Mr. GAETZ, and Ms. LEE of California):

H.R. 4322. A bill to promote cannabis research, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STEUBE (for himself and Mr. GAETZ):

H.R. 4323. A bill to provide for the rescheduling of marijuana into schedule III of the Controlled Substances Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. TORRES of California (for herself, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. ENGEL, Mrs. MURPHY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 4324. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to expand to all firearms the requirement that Federal firearms licensees report sales of 2 or more handguns to the same unlicensed person within 5 consecutive business days; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 4325. A bill to amend the Commodity Exchange Act to clarify treatment of privileged information after disclosure to the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. WALBERG):

H.R. 4326. A bill to amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 relating to determinations with respect to efforts of foreign countries to reduce demand for commercial sex acts under the minimum standards for the elimination of trafficking; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. WILD (for herself, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. TRONE, Ms. DEAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. CUELLAR, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. MOULTON):

H.R. 4327. A bill to amend the Higher Education Act of 1965 to promote comprehensive campus mental health and suicide prevention plans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Ms. FOXX of North Carolina (for herself and Mr. ROUDA):

H. Con. Res. 62. Concurrent resolution requiring the supervisors of employees of Congressional offices to submit reports on the outside compensation earned by such employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MCGOVERN:

H. Res. 553. A resolution directing the Clerk of the House of Representatives to pro-

vide a copy of the on-the-record portions of the audio backup file of the transcribed interview of Roger J. Stone Jr. conducted by the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence on September 26, 2017, to the prosecuting attorneys in the case of United States of America v. Stone, No. 1:19-cr-00018-ABJ (D.D.C.); considered and agreed to.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Mr. SIRES):

H. Res. 554. A resolution supporting the designation of September 2019, as "School Bus Safety and Security Month"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. MOORE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. MENG, Ms. HAALAND, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. FOSTER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. DEAN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. TONKO, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BEYER, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. HILL of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. PORTER, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CICILLINE, and Ms. WEXTON):

H. Res. 555. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the relationships between firearm violence, misogyny, and violence against women and reaffirming the importance of preventing individuals with a history of violence against women from accessing a firearm; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Energy and Commerce, Financial Services, Ways and Means, Education and Labor, Natural Resources, and Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. VEASEY (for himself, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. BASS, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. EVANS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SIRES, Mr. DeFAZIO, Mr. VELA, Mrs. KIRKPATRICK, Mr. CLAY, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COSTA, Ms. JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. TITUS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. RUSH, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. RYAN, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. CRIST, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. LOBBSACK, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. ALLRED, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mrs. LAWRENCE):

H. Res. 556. A resolution expressing support for designation of the month of September as "National Voting Rights Month"; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration,

Intelligence (Permanent Select), Oversight and Reform, Science, Space, and Technology, Education and Labor, Ways and Means, Financial Services, Ethics, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

133. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 8, memorializing the Congress and the President of the United States to enact legislation, S. 866, known as the IDEA Full Funding Act, during the current session of Congress to fully fund the federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

134. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 3, requesting the Congress of the United States to enact, and the President to sign, legislation that would repeal the Government Pension Offset and the Windfall Elimination Provision from the Social Security Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. KIM:

H.R. 4295

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—The Congress shall have the Power to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Ms. SCHAKOWSKY:

H.R. 4296.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3
The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. GOMEZ:

H.R. 4297.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. HAYES:

H.R. 4298.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 4299.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Ms. DEAN:

H.R. 4300.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the powers granted to the Congress by Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 4301.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The United States Constitution, including Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

H.R. 4302.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: "The Congress shall have Power . . . To make Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof . . ."

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 4303.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PALAZZO:

H.R. 4304.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. STIVERS:

H.R. 4305.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 13

The Congress shall have Power to provide and maintain a Navy.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 12

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years.

Article I, Section 8, Clause 14

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces.

By Mr. DEFAZIO:

H.R. 4306.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, Clause 3, and Clause 18 of the Constitution.

By Mr. PETERS:

H.R. 4307.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MORELLE:

H.R. 4308.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. BEYER:

H.R. 4309.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 1

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 4310.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 4311.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution, which grants Congress the power to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mrs. DAVIS of California:

H.R. 4312.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 4313.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana:

H.R. 4314.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 4315.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, clause 1 of the Constitution reads "The Times, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed in each State by the Legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or alter such Regulations, except as to the Places of choosing Senators."

So, Article I, Section 4, clause 1 allows states to prescribe the "Time, Places and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives," but allows Congress "at any time" to "make or alter such regulations."

By Mr. KING of New York:

H.R. 4316.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution [Page H3878]

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 4317.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 4318.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. PANETTA:

H.R. 4319.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Ms. PORTER:

H.R. 4320.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RYAN:

H.R. 4321.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. SHALALA:

H.R. 4322.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

to lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts, and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.

By Mr. STEUBE:

H.R. 4323.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States; but all Duties, Imposts and Excises shall be uniform throughout the United States;

To borrow money on the credit of the United States;

To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;

To establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject of Bankruptcies throughout the United States;

To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures;

To provide for the Punishment of counterfeiting the Securities and current Coin of the United States;

To establish Post Offices and Post Roads;

To promote the Progress of Science and useful Arts, by securing for limited Times to Authors and Inventors the exclusive Right to their respective Writings and Discoveries;

To constitute Tribunals inferior to the supreme Court;

and Offenses against the Law of Nations;

To declare War, grant Letters of Marque and Reprisal, and make Rules concerning Captures on Land and Water;

To raise and support Armies, but no Appropriation of Money to that Use shall be for a longer Term than two Years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make Rules for the Government and Regulation of the land and naval Forces;

To provide for calling forth the Militia to execute the Laws of the Union, suppress Insurrections and repel Invasions;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining, the Militia, and for governing such Part of them as may be employed in the Service of the United States, reserving to the States respectively, the Appointment of the Officers, and the Authority of training the Militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress;

To exercise exclusive Legislation in all Cases whatsoever, over such District (not exceeding ten Miles square) as may, by Cession of particular States, and the acceptance of Congress, become the Seat of the Government of the United States, and to exercise like Authority over all Places purchased by the Consent of the Legislature of the State in which the Same shall be, for the Erection of Forts, Magazines, Arsenals, dock-Yards, and other needful Buildings; And

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 4324.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. VAN DREW:

H.R. 4325.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 4326.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

Article I, Section 8, Clause 10

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

Amendment XIII (relating to slavery and involuntary servitude)

By Ms. WILD:

H.R. 4327.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 4: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 99: Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 305: Mr. PALMER.

H.R. 435: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ and Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 444: Mr. CASE.

H.R. 446: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 473: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 485: Mr. MAST.

H.R. 487: Mr. STEUBE.

H.R. 573: Mr. BAIRD and Mr. ARMSTRONG.

H.R. 674: Ms. SPANBERGER.

H.R. 707: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 744: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 777: Mr. MARCHANT and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 878: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 891: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 899: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 943: Mr. HILL of Arkansas, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. AMODEI, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, and Mr. TIPTON.

H.R. 945: Mr. PAPPAS, Ms. BASS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, and Mrs. RODGERS of Washington.

H.R. 991: Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 1043: Mr. SPANO, Mr. SCHIFF, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

H.R. 1052: Ms. MOORE and Mr. ARMSTRONG.

H.R. 1066: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 1109: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.

H.R. 1137: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 1140: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. GOLDEN, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 1154: Mr. CLEAVER.

H.R. 1185: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 1220: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1230: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 1257: Mr. KIND.

H.R. 1266: Mr. ROSE of New York.

H.R. 1297: Mr. RYAN.

H.R. 1309: Mr. MCEACHIN.

H.R. 1360: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 1379: Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. COLE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. LUCAS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. LIPINSKI, and Ms. DEAN.

H.R. 1396: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. CALVERT, and Mr. ROONEY of Florida.

H.R. 1424: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 1488: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 1527: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 1534: Mr. CISNEROS.

H.R. 1551: Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 1570: Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. BILIRAKIS, and Mr. MEUSER.

H.R. 1610: Mr. LAMB.

H.R. 1646: Ms. CRAIG and Ms. WEXTON.

H.R. 1673: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 1680: Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 1692: Mr. LEWIS.

H.R. 1709: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 1713: Mr. RYAN and Ms. JAYAPAL.

H.R. 1750: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 1754: Ms. CRAIG.

H.R. 1766: Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. ESCOBAR, and Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 1824: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 1840: Mr. COURTNEY and Mr. STAUBER.

H.R. 1873: Mr. BURCHETT and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 1944: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 1959: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 1962: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 1978: Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CASE, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 1982: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.

H.R. 2062: Mr. OLSON and Mr. GONZALEZ of Ohio.

H.R. 2091: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 2134: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 2135: Mr. COSTA, Ms. SHERRILL, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2146: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. MOULTON.

H.R. 2147: Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. KINZINGER, Mr. JORDAN, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, Mr. STEWART, Mr. KELLER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. CHABOT, Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. MCADAMS, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL, and Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 2178: Mr. LUCAS.

H.R. 2191: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 2208: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.

H.R. 2214: Ms. UNDERWOOD.

H.R. 2218: Mr. BAIRD.

H.R. 2222: Mr. CASTEN of Illinois, Ms. PORTER, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, and Mrs. WAGNER.

H.R. 2225: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2256: Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Ms. SCANLON.

H.R. 2279: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 2301: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 2339: Ms. STEVENS.

H.R. 2382: Mr. LATTA.

H.R. 2398: Ms. PINGREE.

H.R. 2435: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. HECK, and Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 2441: Mr. NADLER and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 2474: Mr. O'HALLERAN and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 2487: Mr. BILIRAKIS.

H.R. 2568: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 2573: Ms. PINGREE, Mr. PAPPAS, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. LONG, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. MILLER, Mr. SIMPSON, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. FLORES, and Mr. VAN DREW.

H.R. 2628: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 2632: Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 2645: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 2653: Ms. SLOTKIN.

H.R. 2664: Mr. WOODALL.

H.R. 2708: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. RYAN, Mr. LEWIS, Mrs. BEATTY, and Mr. RICHMOND.

H.R. 2720: Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 2721: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 2775: Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 2825: Mr. FORTENBERRY.

H.R. 2846: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2859: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 2862: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Mr. MORELLE.

H.R. 2985: Mr. WENSTRUP and Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 3006: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 3048: Ms. DELBENE.

H.R. 3062: Mr. HOLDING.

H.R. 3071: Mr. CRENSHAW.
 H.R. 3077: Mr. BAIRD.
 H.R. 3114: Mrs. AXNE and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 3116: Ms. LOFGREN.
 H.R. 3129: Ms. SANCHEZ.
 H.R. 3157: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 3172: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois.
 H.R. 3209: Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia.
 H.R. 3214: Mr. MORELLE.
 H.R. 3222: Ms. DEGRETTE, Mr. CASE, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. SUOZZI.
 H.R. 3289: Mr. KING of New York.
 H.R. 3331: Mr. LAMALFA.
 H.R. 3332: Mr. KATKO.
 H.R. 3350: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 3356: Mrs. AXNE, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 3369: Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 3398: Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. MOORE, Mrs. MURPHY, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, and Mr. SUOZZI.
 H.R. 3435: Ms. ESCOBAR, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, and Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H.R. 3446: Mr. TONKO.
 H.R. 3450: Mr. GAETZ.
 H.R. 3464: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
 H.R. 3486: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
 H.R. 3495: Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HUDSON, Mr. STEUBE, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. BOST, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. NEGUSE, and Mr. CALVERT.
 H.R. 3502: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota, Mr. VAN DREW, and Mr. HICE of Georgia.
 H.R. 3510: Mr. STANTON, Mr. LUCAS, and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.R. 3516: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3529: Mr. COSTA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Ms. SHERRILL.
 H.R. 3545: Mr. KATKO and Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 3555: Ms. SCANLON.
 H.R. 3563: Ms. PRESSLEY.
 H.R. 3569: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 3570: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ and Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 3593: Ms. BROWNLEY of California and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 3630: Mrs. WAGNER and Ms. TLAIB.
 H.R. 3644: Mr. MORELLE.
 H.R. 3654: Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. YARMUTH, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
 H.R. 3664: Mr. LUCAS.
 H.R. 3665: Mrs. AXNE.
 H.R. 3681: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 3685: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Ms. PRESSLEY.
 H.R. 3712: Ms. SANCHEZ.
 H.R. 3716: Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. MCADAMS, and Mr. SIMPSON.
 H.R. 3727: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 3731: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 3732: Mr. WITTMAN and Mr. OLSON.
 H.R. 3777: Mr. CASE.
 H.R. 3799: Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois and Mr. MEEKS.
 H.R. 3816: Mr. WEBER of Texas.
 H.R. 3824: Mr. LAHOOD.
 H.R. 3851: Mr. PANETTA, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. CUELLAR.
 H.R. 3917: Mr. KHANNA.
 H.R. 3956: Mr. RUPPERSBERGER and Mr. CUELLAR.
 H.R. 3968: Mr. CRAWFORD.
 H.R. 3971: Mr. CLINE.
 H.R. 3973: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
 H.R. 4014: Ms. HAALAND, Ms. ESHOO, and Mr. POCAN.
 H.R. 4077: Mrs. MCBATH and Mrs. AXNE.
 H.R. 4098: Mr. GOSAR, Mr. CURTIS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. BROOKS of Alabama, Mr. STEUBE, and Mr. NORMAN.
 H.R. 4107: Mr. POCAN and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.
 H.R. 4129: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 4142: Mr. CARBAJAL.
 H.R. 4193: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 4219: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
 H.R. 4226: Mr. HECK.
 H.R. 4230: Ms. BONAMICI and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 4248: Mr. LAMB.
 H.R. 4249: Mr. RASKIN and Mr. DEUTCH.
 H.R. 4254: Mr. SIRES.
 H.R. 4261: Mr. CLINE.

H.R. 4272: Mr. ENGEL, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. SOTO, Ms. LOFGREN, and Miss RICE of New York.
 H. J. Res. 7: Mr. PASCRELL.
 H. Res. 49: Mr. ROSE of New York.
 H. Res. 109: Ms. FUDGE.
 H. Res. 146: Ms. LEE of California, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, and Mr. KING of New York.
 H. Res. 326: Mr. LANGEVIN and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.
 H. Res. 374: Mr. PALMER.
 H. Res. 387: Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. SWALWELL of California, and Ms. WILD.
 H. Res. 454: Mrs. LURIA.
 H. Res. 478: Ms. SLOTKIN.
 H. Res. 493: Mr. HUIZENGA.
 H. Res. 527: Mr. DESAULNIER.
 H. Res. 539: Mr. FITZPATRICK and Mr. COSTA.
 H. Res. 543: Ms. NORTON.
 H. Res. 545: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. KILMER.
 H. Res. 549: Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII, petitions and papers were laid on the clerk's desk and referred as follows:

39. The SPEAKER presented a petition of the City of Miami Commission, relative to Resolution No. R-19-0281, urging the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services to reevaluate and grant Ramon Saul Sanchez's application for permanent resident status; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

40. Also, a petition of House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas Islands, relative to House Joint Resolution 21-4, HD2, To provide mutual consent to amend Article III, Section 303 of the Covenant to Establish a Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands in Political Union with the United States of America to limit birth tourism in the CNMI; jointly to the Committees on Natural Resources and the Judiciary.