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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC, October 30, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable Henry Cuellar to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

DETERIORATING CONDITIONS AT THE MEXICAN BORDER
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Vela) for 5 minutes.

Mr. Vela. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, many of us attended the funeral for our colleague, Elijah Cummings. His story and the service were inspirational. On that same day, this article concerning the deteriorating conditions of the Mexican border appeared in The Texas Tribune about the consequences of the Trump administration’s Migrant Protection Protocols, or MPP.

The article describes America’s inhumanity unfolding in Matamoros, Mexico, a border town in which I, as a child, spent much of my time and in which my ancestors are buried. It is a story about America’s cruelty, for which the President of the United States is directly responsible.

As I thought about what I could do about this situation, I couldn’t help but ask myself: What would Elijah do? By creating obstacle after obstacle, the Trump administration does everything within its power to prevent asylum claimants from having their rightful day in court, whether they are entitled to stay or not.

Its latest obstruction is the Migrant Protection Protocols, which are anything but protection. The MPP forces asylum claimants to wait in dangerous Mexican border towns as their claims are processed, and they have proven to be nothing more than a weapon used to destroy America’s longstanding reputation as the world’s greatest melting pot. It is a blatant violation of the due process clause of the U.S. Constitution.

Our Nation’s asylum laws guarantee the right to live in the United States while claims are adjudicated. Over 1,500 people now live in squalor in Matamoros, Mexico. They have no running water and a marginal number of toilets for all of them. They are housed in tents and forced to bathe naked out in the Rio Grande River. Their daily subsistence depends on the goodness of the volunteers from the Rio Grande Valley and across this Nation who cross into Mexico every day to provide a simple meal. The conditions are worse than those that I have seen in Syrian refugee camps.

This is not the way America is supposed to work.

The administration claims that by creating secret, sham, tent courts along the border that it is processing asylum claims. This is nothing more than a glaring effort to obliterede due process. In these so-called courts constitutional protections vanish, and civil liberties disappear.

The administration’s policy is severely restricting and imposing barriers on the very fundamental bedrock of our legal system—the attorney-client relationship. Lawyers representing these asylum claimants are reporting that the MPP policy is making something as simple as the opportunity to meet with their client an impossibility. As of this August, less than 2 percent of those in MPP court even had lawyers representing them. The forcible removal of claimants to another country while they await adjudication is a judicial charade, represents a total abdication of the principles of fairness that are the foundations of our justice system, and makes a mockery of our Constitution.

Not only are asylum claimants being denied their rights, the public and the press are consistently denied access to these proceedings.

What is there to hide?

The presence of attorneys, advocates, the press, and the public at these hearings preserves our democracy. The president of the National Association of Immigration Judges states as follows:

Normal immigration court is open to the public. In civil proceedings in America, one of the fundamental tenets of our justice system is that there has to be accountability to the public. We do not do stuff behind closed doors. That is not what America is about. And yet, with each immigration policy decision the last 3 years, we are moving closer and closer to a model that does not resemble anything in the American judicial system; it is more like what you might see in China or Russia.

In our system of criminal jurisprudence, a person may be guilty, or they may not be. But with regard to jurisprudence, a party may be culpable or not culpable. But one thing everyone gets is the opportunity to be heard.
So we have a choice. We can turn a blind eye to the horror that is this administration’s asylum policy, or we can answer our colleague, Elijah’s, call to create a system that stands for justice. Let’s tear down the Migrant Protection Protocols. Let’s hire the judges so that we can efficiently and fairly adjudicate asylum claims. Let the asylum claimant live in dignity and give them back their right to be in this country while they wait for their cases to be heard.

If asylum is denied after a fair and just adjudication, let the claimant leave this country knowing that the United States system of government gave them a fair shake.

Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Ohio (Mr. KEVIN HERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, Oklahoma native, Christopher Horton, is one of the namesakes of H. Res. 107 which passed the House yesterday.

Army Specialist Christopher Horton served in the Oklahoma National Guard’s 1st Battalion, 279th Infantry Regiment, 45th Infantry Brigade.

Horton grew up in Collinsville, Oklahoma, and was an exceptional sharpshooter. Horton was killed in action on September 9, 2011, in Afghanistan while serving in Operation Enduring Freedom. His bravery and patriotism are remembered today as his legacy is enshrined 8 years later.

Family members of fallen heroes hold a special place in our society. The program allows law students who will be family members of our fallen heroes the unique opportunity to experience our government up close with a 12-month fellowship in Congress. A front-row seat to the legislative process is a valuable asset to a person deciding where they want to go in their career. These yearlong fellowships will allow the family members of our fallen veterans to become a part of the same democracy that their loved ones fought to defend.

Mr. Speaker, I applaud the passage of this bill and the bipartisan work of my colleagues, TRENT KELLY and MIKE SHERRILL, as well as the tenacious perseverance of both families of the fallen soldiers.

CONGRESSIONAL GOLD STAR FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM
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HONORING VANESSA WHITING OF CLEVELAND, OHIO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Vanessa Whiting of Cleveland, Ohio, the recipient of the 2019 Black Professional of the Year Award. Ms. Whiting will become the 39th individual to receive this distinguished award given by the Black Professionals Association Charitable Foundation at their annual scholarship and awards gala. Each year the organization honors an African American professional for their career accomplishments, community engagement, and civic contributions.

Through her considerable achievements as an attorney, entrepreneur, and civic leader, Ms. Whiting is most deserving of this long overdue recognition. She embodies the mission of the Black Professionals Association Charitable Foundation, which is to create opportunities for African American professionals by providing scholarship, leadership, and career development.

As president of AES Management and a Popeyes Louisiana Kitchen franchisee, Ms. Whiting has made hiring people from minority a priority, creating employment opportunities where there are few options. Ms. Whiting has more than 30 years of experience as an attorney. Throughout her law career, she focused her work on advocating for neighbors and helping small and minority-owned businesses succeed. Ms. Whiting has committed her time and talents to address affordable housing, the need for community centers, and other projects in our area designed to uplift the community and empower its residents.

Ms. Whiting was recently elected chair of the MetroHealth Hospital Board of Trustees where she continues her work promoting diversity and inclusion throughout Cuyahoga County’s public health system. She has served in many key board positions in the Cleveland community, including the NAACP Cleveland Branch, the Tri-C Foundation, Karamu House, and the Cleveland Housing Network Board of Trustees.

Mr. Speaker, I commend Ms. Whiting for her outstanding contributions to Ohio’s 11th Congressional District. My sincere congratulations go to Ms. Whiting on this distinguished accomplishment, and I thank her for her leadership and her service.

CLINCH MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Clinch Memorial Hospital for being named the Hospital of the Year Award in October 2019. According to Census data, there are over 200,000 pharmacists across the U.S., with another 25,000 pharmacy aides. Every day these pharmacists are providing vaccines for a number of illnesses and carefully counseling patients on prescriptions to help heal sickness and reduce pain. Through this work, pharmacists are considered one of the top three most-trusted professions in America.

Mr. Speaker, this month, as well as through the rest of the year, I encourage everyone to visit your pharmacist, ask questions about your prescriptions, and get to know the people who provide your medicine and work to keep you healthy.

As the only pharmacist currently serving in Congress, I am proud to recognize the work these individuals are doing every day to serve their local community and our country.

Keep up the good work.

FORTY-DAY PRO LIFE VIGIL

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize all those participating in the 40 Days for Life Vigil happening September 25 through November 3.

For the past 40 days, individuals in cities across the world have been fasting, praying, campaigning, and holding a vigil in order to end abortion. In the First Congressional District of Georgia, Savannahians have been contributing to the cause through their own vigil and luncheon. The organization has helped save 16,000 lives, close 191 abortion centers, and 191 abortion workers to quit their jobs.

As a medical professional, father, and grandfather, I believe that every life is sacred. I cannot thank these individuals enough for their important work.

Mr. Speaker, after the 40 Days of Life Vigil is over, I hope you will join me in continuing the fight to save the lives of our children.

RECOGNIZING SHEILA MCNEILL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.
Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Ms. Sheila McNeill for receiving the 2019 Distinguished Civilian Award by the Naval Submarine League.

Ms. McNeill was the first-ever woman to work on a submarine and I could not be more proud of the work she has done in the First Congressional District of Georgia over the last 20 years.

Living in Camden County, near the Kings Bay Naval Submarine Base, she has advocated for the U.S. submarine force at national and local levels, often traveling to Washington and meeting with dozens of Members of Congress to keep our submarines at sea, protecting our Nation.

On one specific occasion, Ms. McNeill was critical in retaining the Nation's first four ballistic missile submarines by converting them into guided-missile submarines. Her commitment to the Armed Forces extends deeply into the surrounding communities, ensuring that all submarine beneficiaries have access to the resources they have earned.

Mr. Speaker, I thank and congratulate Ms. McNeill for her work in the First Congressional District of Georgia.

HONORING CONGRESSMAN JOHN CONYERS' LIFE AND LEGACY

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

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life and legacy of the late Congressman John Conyers and to extend my deepest condolences to his wife, Monica, his family, children, former staff, and the people of Detroit, who he served so well for more than 50 years.

Congressman Conyers was a tireless advocate for racial and economic justice and a powerful defender of civil rights. We all owe him a debt of gratitude for his unwavering commitment to pushing our Nation to live up to its ideals of liberty and justice for all. That is his legacy.

I met Congressman Conyers during my time as a staffer to our beloved late Congressman Ron Dellums, who was also a cofounder of the Congressional Black Caucus with Congressman Conyers. They were very close friends and worked closely on many issues, including the establishment of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Federal holiday. I always remember staffing the many meetings with Ron, Congressman Conyers, and the legendary Stevie Wonder, who worked with us as we planned our outside-In strategy for the holiday legislation. And it worked.

John believed in our democracy and the power of the people. He recognized that the only way democracy can work is with the input, vision, and voice of the people.

Congressman Conyers stood on the front lines of the fight for so many important issues during his time in office, and he was cosponsor of the Voting Rights Act of 1965. I probably wouldn’t be standing here as a Member of Congress had it not been for Congressman Conyers.

As a cofounder of the Congressional Black Caucus, he focused the Nation’s attention on racial inequality and injustices faced by African Americans around the country, from inequity in education, to poverty, to mass incarceration. He stood up for those who needed his advocacy the most.

Of course, Mr. Conyers was also a cofounder of the Congressional Black Caucus with Congressman Conyers, he was masterful, drawing a connection between the historical injustices faced by African Americans and the present-day inequities experienced in our communities.

I am so proud to support H.R. 40 today and to continue his work. In his honor, I hope that my colleagues support Congresswoman SHEILA JACKSON LEE’s efforts to take H.R. 40 over the finish line.

Congressman Conyers was a progressive champion who fought for all of us. He was an early supporter of single-payer healthcare. I believe the bill was H.R. 676, which I was proud to cosponsor.

He fought to ensure that every American has access to quality, affordable healthcare. He fought to protect our safety net so that folks who needed a helping hand, no matter their color, can keep a roof over their heads and food on the table.

He spoke out vocally against the Trump administration’s attacks on civil rights and human rights for people of color and the LGBTQ community. Indeed, though Congressman Conyers represented Detroit, he truly fought for all Americans and earned his affectionate name of “America’s Congressman.”

Also, John formed the Poor People’s Caucus in the House, where he encouraged Members to speak out for the poor and low-income folks.

In his memory, let us fight for the most vulnerable Americans. Like our friend, Congressman Elijah Cummings, who we recently lost as well, Congressman Conyers’ legacy and impact will live on, though he is no longer with us. His legacy should continue to inspire us to keep up the fight for justice and equality, which he dedicated his life to.

Mr. Speaker, so today, once again, I offer my condolences to Monica, to Congressman Conyers’ family and loved ones, and join them in celebrating his life and legacy. May he rest in peace, and may he rest in power.

COMMEMORATING OXI DAY

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is my privilege to be recognized to address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives. I rise to honor this week, to celebrate what actually took place on Monday, the 28th of October, Oxi Day, the 79th anniversary.

I wanted to address this because of the strong spirit of the Greek people, who rose up against the Axis Powers 79 years ago this week when a representative of Hitler’s Axis Powers, who happened to be the minister from the Italians, arrived at the residence of the Greek leader Metaxas and demanded that they surrender to their descendants of enslaved people from Africa.

Congressman Conyers, Chairman Conyers, he was masterful, drawing a connection between the historical injustices faced by African Americans and the present-day inequities experienced in our communities.

There, Metaxas looked him in the eye and said, boldly and strongly, “Oxi,” which is Greek for “no.” That is the most resounding “no” that I know of in history. Mr. Speaker, this most resounding “no” inspired the Greek people.

Within hours, the Italians and the Axis forces had started their invasion of Greece, and they were overconfident. They thought they would waltz in because they had all kinds of military firepower, and what they underestimated was the tenacity of the Greek fighters, their knowledge of the terrain, and defending their own soil.

They were defeated, and the Greeks chased the Italians back to Italy, which forced, then, Adolf Hitler to divert five divisions down through Greece and down through the Balkans into Greece to put down the—they called it a revolution or a resurrection. What it really was, was inspired people defending their country, and the cradle of democracy. As Hitler diverted the five divisions down to Greece, he was already planning the Operation Barbarossa.

I want the body to know, Mr. Speaker, that the original date for the invasion of Russia under Operation Barbarossa by Hitler that his Nazi forces put together was scheduled to be May 12, the following spring. This is late October, the last days of October. So when Hitler diverted his five divisions down to suppress what he said was the resurrection in the Balkans, which was the Greeks defending the cradle of freedom, that delayed his ability to invade Russia.

This tenacious battle on the part of the Greeks—now, I should also put it into context here, that no one expected such a small nation to derail the unstoppable Axis forces. They had watched as the Axis forces had gone through Czechoslovakia and Poland, and France, and down through the Balkans. It looked like those Axis forces were going to sweep over the world. It didn’t look like there...
was much hope for the United Kingdom and the British Empire across the channel.

When you think about the inevitable clash that was going to take place between the Nazis and the Russians, that would have determined which power ruled the world—coped with Japanese imperialism, America isolated as a lone island, sitting over here on this continent, in the Western Hemisphere, awfully tough to battle on both sides when you had the resources of the globe lined up against you.

The future of America may well have turned in that battle as well, Mr. Speaker.

I would point out that if Hitler had been able to launch Operation Barbarossa on May 12—he was delayed 5½ weeks. Those 5½ weeks would have given him time to take Stalingrad, to take Moscow, before the bitter Russian winter. That would have changed the entire course of the war.

That’s a fact twice for us, in Crete and then again on Oxi Day starting those 79 years ago this week. I am awfully proud of the spirit of the Greeks.

I would close, Mr. Speaker, with this quote from Winston Churchill in the aftermath of the Greek battles against the Nazis, which says: “Hence, we will not say that Greeks fight like heroes, but that heroes fight like Greeks.”

Let us honor them. We are a nation that is descended from the democracies that were formed in Greece. We modified it to a constitutional republic and did a little improvement on it, but we can use a lot of Greeks in this country. They understand freedom, and they are great fighters.

**COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF GINNY NICARTHY**

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Washington (Ms. Jayapal) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of longtime Seattle resident Ginny Nicarty. The Greeks did it to a constitutional republic and did a little improvement on it, but we can use a lot of Greeks in this country. They understand freedom, and they are great fighters.

Ginny was born in 1927 in San Francisco. She was the youngest of five. Her father once served as the mayor of Redwood City, California. Her mother worked as a switchboard operator.

Passionate about social justice as a young woman, and when she moved to Seattle in her 20s and became involved in her new city’s artistic and political scene. She first pursued a teaching certificate in the 1960s, going on to teach middle school in Seattle’s Central District.

She volunteered as a caseworker at a mental hospital, she decided to pursue a master’s degree in social work at the University of Washington and became a practicing therapist.

Born with the last name McCarthy, she changed her surname to Nicarty in the 1970s to use an Irish prefix that means “daughter of,” rather than “Mc,” which means “son of.” This was a time of youth and aging. She volunteered on behalf of countless groups advocating for women’s rights, criminal justice reform, and antiwar efforts.

She went on to publish several more books on abuse at home and in the workplace, as well as many articles addressing issues of disability, race, sexuality, and aging. She volunteered on behalf of countless groups advocating for women’s rights, criminal justice reform, and antiwar efforts.

We first met when I approached her to join the board of Chaya, an organization that supports South Asian survivors of domestic violence that I, too, was on the board of. Much later, Ginny gave me some of her writings that turned into a book of her travels around the world for peace and justice.

I was amazed at her curiosity, her love of life, even with all the traumas that she, herself, had been through. I was struck by the way that she listened to others and absolutely refused to stop living life to the fullest. She was fearless in questioning what she saw as unjust, and her commitment to racial equity was striking.

She was arrested multiple times for peaceful, civil disobedience actions, including at the age of 86, for speaking out for more fair and just immigration policies.

Ginny always found meaning in politics and social justice activism, and her legacy lives on through her books, her friendships, the tremendous work she did her entire life on behalf of survivors of violence, and her quest for justice for all.

Ginny saw the intersectionality of gender, race, and class very clearly.

We have arrived at one of those moments. That is why, last week, my colleagues and I demanded this majority end their secret impeachment proceedings and bring them into the light of day.

Impeachment of the President of the United States is, next to the declaration of war, this body’s most solemn, important authority. Impeachment begins the process of removing the duly-elected Executive of the United States, who was chosen, not by this House, but by the American people.

In the past, this body has always treated that authority with the solemnity and respect that it demands. Certainly, during the Clinton and Nixon impeachments, this House respected our obligation. In this House, under this majority, no longer.

In the secretive, closed proceedings in the basement of the Capitol, the majority party has monopolized all power, we have become the accusers and accused the right to participate, and offered the minority party little more than token rights, all outside the public eye. The American people, and even most elected Members of Congress, like myself, have been able to glean only whatever lies, leaks, and misinformation the majority disseminates.

During Watergate, this House specifically wrote in our rules that we cannot shut out the public, absent extraordinary circumstances, and for over 40 years our rules prohibited the exclusion of Members from attending hearings on investigations. Yet, this majority has put an end to those practices,
using secret depositions to get around the sunshine rules of this House. Everything is carefully, reprehensibly designed to obscure reality.

This is a watershed moment of monumental, historic significance. For the sake of our constitutional Republic, we must start over and do it the right way.

Unfortunately, today the Rules Committee will meet to mark up a resolution that does absolutely nothing to change that course.

Don’t listen to Democrat talking points. This resolution is political cover disguised as good will. This is not a vote to authorize impeachment but a vote to validate and continue the committee’s disgraceful, improperly-conducted proceedings.

This resolution permits the majority to continue holding proceedings in secret whenever the majority arbitrarily decides to do so; and, unlike previous impeachment proceedings, this majority’s privilege to offer the minority the right to issue subpoenas is a sham. In fact, the minority is only authorized to issue subpoenas if Adam Schiff and the Democrats on his committee agree with them, the exact same situation the minority currently faces in all but name.

It gives the President no right of due process and, instead, instructs the chair of the Rules Committee to determine, down the road, what the procedures will be for participation of the President of the United States and his counsel.

In the resolution presented by the majority, the President is given no right to see evidence, present evidence, call witnesses, have counsel present at all hearings and depositions, cross-examine witnesses, make objections relating to the examination of witnesses or the admissibility of testimony and evidence, or respond to evidence and testimony.

How can President Trump defend himself if he cannot see the evidence against him? Just as importantly, how can the American people make an informed judgment?

Under this resolution, the House would deputize Adam Schiff and Jerry Nadler, handpicked by Speaker Pelosi, to be prosecutor, judge, and jury. The majority chooses what is seen and unseen by the American people.

This is a Star Chamber proceeding reminiscent of some of the most egregious practices of tin-pot dictators.

Political coups are often shrouded in patriotic overtones. Look past the talking points and empty promises from Democrats. We must expose what this resolution really does and the calamitous consequences for due process and separation of powers it will unleash.

Silence in this matter is complicity. We must rally together to fight back for the sake of the country we hold dear. The fate of our Nation depends on it.

IN CELEBRATION OF FILIPINO AMERICAN HISTORY MONTH

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

Mr. CASE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize October as Filipino American History Month, a time for all Americans to celebrate the incredible past, present, and future of our fellow citizens whose heritage lies in the great country of the Philippines.

I am especially humbled to do so as the proud Representative of Hawaii’s First Congressional District, where live more Filipino Americans—close to 200,000—than in any of our 440 districts throughout our country. And with Hawaii’s Second Congressional District number two, at about 175,000, our Filip-Am community in Hawaii stands at about 375,000, one-quarter of all Hawaii residents and, by far, the largest percentage of any State or territory.

We observe Filipino American History Month because the first recorded arrival of Filipinos in the continental United States took place in 1857, when the Luzonos Indios came ashore from the Manila-built galleon Nuestra Senora de Esperanza in Morro Bay, California.

And in 1906, 113 years ago, the first 15 sakada, or contract laborers, arrived in Honolulu from the Philippines aboard the SS Doric, marking the first sustained immigration into our country and the humble beginnings of Filip-ams in Hawaii.

Today, our Filip-Am community numbers some 4 million throughout our country, now the second largest of our Asian American groups.

The story of Filipino Americans is the story of America. From humble beginnings, they have risen through hard work, sacrifice, commitment to advancing the next generations, and mutual support to achieve so much already.

Hawaii Fil-Ams, in particular, have been trailblazers:

Peter Aduja became the first Fil-Am elected to public office in the United States when he was elected to the Hawaii territorial House of Representatives in 1954.

Benjamin Menor became the first Fil-Am higher court judge as associate justice of the Hawaii State Supreme Court.

Ben Cayetano was the first Filipino American Governor of a U.S. State.

Major General Antonio Taguba was the second Filipino American promoted to general officer rank in our Army.

Eddie Flores, Jr., bought the first L&L Drive-In on Liliha Street in Honolulu in 1976, turning it into a national franchise.

Carolina Dixon Wong was the first Filipino American woman to obtain an M.D. degree.

Ines Cayaban was the first Filipino American graduate of the school of public health, nursing, and social work at the University of Hawaii. She received the prestigious Jefferson Award in 1986 for her service.

Francisco Flores “Corky” Trinidad, Jr., of Honolulu was an award-winning editorial cartoonist of the Honolulu Star-Bulletin, who became the first Filipino editorial cartoonist syndicated in the United States.

And a loyal veteran of the 1st Filipino Infantry Regiment that fought alongside our troops in the Philippines during World War II, Domingo Los Banos was Hawaii’s first Filipino American school principal.

I was recently honored to join the promotion ceremony in Honolulu of Roy Macareg from colonel to brigadier general in the Hawaii Army National Guard, the first Fil-Am to become a general officer in the history of Hawaii’s citizen soldier ranks.

In Hawaii, we also regularly honor the over 250,000 Filipinos who answered the call to protect and defend the United States and the Filipinos in the Pacific theater. In 2016, President Obama signed into law the Filipino Veterans of World War II Congressional Gold Medal Act to bestow Congress’ highest honor upon these worthy veterans.

We also, of course, celebrate, right here in Congress, our proud Fil-Ams who serve our country here, my colleagues Bobby Scott of Virginia and TJ Cox of California.

Each and all of these lives of achievement are but a very small sampling of a broader community that has achieved so much and contributed so much to the rich fabric of our country. And the story of Filipino Americans is still in its early chapters.

Why are Filipino Americans among our most successful communities? General Macareg spoke to some of that at his promotion ceremony when he credited his own success to the hard work and sacrifice for his siblings of his father, a laborer, and mother, a teacher, to the values they instilled, and to the constant nurturing and support of their broader community.

That well describes Filipino Americans overall, that and a full and constant embrace of the values, responsibilities, and opportunities of America, while honoring and treasuring the rich heritage of their ancestral homeland.

All of this is why I recently joined Congressman Cox in introducing H. Res. 621, a resolution to express support for the permanent designation of October as Filipino American History Month.

We urge our colleagues’ support to promote an ongoing appreciation of the contributions of Filipino Americans to our country and to the rich diversity of our Nation.

To Fil-Ams everywhere: “Thank you very much and kolonial”—“thank you very much and dios ti agrangina”—and congratulations. I truly look forward to partnering with you on your next proud chapters.
Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to support National Vet-
erans Small Business Week, which will take place from November 4 through November 8.

Our veterans are some of the most highly skilled workers in our Nation. They are the product of rigorous training, an ironclad commitment to teamwork, and an ability to succeed where others might fail. Veterans not only fight for and protect this country but are trained with the skills and leadership qualities that are needed to own and operate successful businesses.

Our veteran small business owners are job creators, entrepreneurs, and heroes, and I am proud to recognize the important role that veteran-owned small businesses play in our community, and we thank all of them, from a grateful Congress, for their service.

THE SUBSTANCE UNDERLYING THE IMPEACHMENT INQUIRY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. Jeffries) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, earlier today, President Trump urged his Republi-
can defenders in this House to focus on substance. That is exactly what House Democrats have been doing from the very beginning of this impeachment inquiry.

We will continue to proceed in a serious, solemn, and somber fashion. That is what the Constitution requires at this moment.

House Democrats will continue to follow the facts, apply the law, be guided by the Constitution, and present the truth to the American people.

President Trump said focus on substance.

What is the substance underlying this impeachment inquiry?

Well, Congress, on a bipartisan basis, allocated $391 million in military and economic aid to Ukraine at a time when Ukraine faces an attack by Russian-backed separatists.

Ukraine is in a vulnerable state. Ukraine is a friend; Russia is a foe. Ukraine is a democracy; Russia is a dictatorship.

The United States is probably the only thing standing between Vladimir Putin and Ukraine being completely overrun as part of Putin's fantasy to reconstruct what he views as the glory days of the Soviet Union.

We allocated that money because it is in the national security interest of the United States of America.

What happened to it?

In February, the Trump administration wrote to Congress and said the aid is on the way. But it never showed up.

And then in May, Trump's Depart-
ment of Defense wrote to Congress again and said the aid is on the way and all necessary preconditions to re-
lease the aid have been met, including the implementation of anticorruption protocols. That was a letter written by the Trump Department of Defense in May. That is the substance.

Twice Mitch McConnell during this summer called up the Trump administration and said, "Where's the aid?" Mr. McConnell couldn't get a good an-
swer.

And then on July 18, we know that the Office of Management and Budget in the White House held a meeting where it was made clear that the rea-
on the aid that had been held up is because of a directive from the President of the United States.

A week later, on July 25, the Presi-
dent made a phone call to the Ukrainian leader and pressured a foreign gov-
ernment to target an American citizen for political gain and solicit foreign inter-
erference in the 2020 election.

That undermines our national secu-
ritv. The American people have a right to know. Is that an abuse of power?

That is what the impeachment in-
quiry is all about, Mr. President. That is the substance. It doesn't look good.

No one is above the law.

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

ADDRESSING THE BROKEN REFUGEE SYSTEM

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

Mr. STIVERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to address our broken refugee system and its very real effect on fami-
lies in my hometown of Columbus, Ohio.

Our Nation has always been a beacon of hope and light for those who face vi-
cence, persecution, and oppression, but in recent years we have not been living up to that standard. And our failure has a severe impact on good, hardworking people that would make our Nation stronger. For example, Bashiya, who cur-
rently lives in Columbus, Ohio. Bashiya, in many ways, embodies what we know to be American. She is the wife of a man who served our military. She loves her family. She is hard-
working. And she has built a life for herself and her family in Ohio. In many ways her story is much like ours.

Unfortunately, one piece of her story is missing. Her husband, Hamad, lives on the other side of the world in Aus-
tralia. Hamad served alongside the U.S. Army as an interpreter in Iraq, and the repayment for his bravery was repeated and sustained threats against him, Bashiya, and their two young children. The danger they faced ultimately drove the young family apart.

The refugee process, and particularly the Special Immigrant Visa process that was designed to protect people like Hamad failed him. The application and vetting process was dragging on and on, and in the end, the continued threats convinced Hamad that he needed to flee for his life, so he fled to Aus-
tralia. That was in 2012.
Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Kerensa Wing, Ms. Wing from Forsyth County. Ms. Wing is the recipient of the National Association of Secondary School Principals Principal of the Year award. Ms. Wing has spent the entire career in service to my community back home. I only represent two counties. She lives in one, makes that her family’s home. She works in the other, having spent 30 years in the Gwinnett County school system. These pictures reflect her work in her last five years as principal at Collins Hill High School. She has also served at Shiloh High School as a teacher. She helped to open our brand-new Lanier High School, and then returned to Collins Hill.

Mr. Speaker, the passion that is at the center of her decision-making is that love of students, a teacher at heart. This work, as you know, is not a job done for a salary. It is not a work done for even national recognition. It is a work done out of a sense of opportunity to be transformative in the lives of the young people around us.

Whether you sit on the far left or the far right, Mr. Speaker, whatever your politics of the day are, if there is one thing that is worth celebrating, it is those men and women back home who make differences for the young people in our lives.

Principal Kerensa Wing is such a person, and it is with no small amount of pride that I congratulate her today.

There was a town, Mr. Speaker, with her family, and if only the House had been in session, I would have been here to congratulate her. We were back home working that week, so I missed that opportunity to be with her here in this Chamber. But I am not going to miss the opportunity today in this Chamber to tell her how much we appreciate her, how much her students appreciate her, and how much better both Forsyth County and Gwinnett County are that she, with her talents, could work anywhere and live anywhere in the great United States of America, Mr. Speaker, and she has chosen our community to serve.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Principal Wing and congratulate her.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.
has inspired me and my wife and my family for many years, and I am honored to have brought him here to the Nation’s Capital where, yesterday, he addressed several dozen Members of Congress, as well as their staff members.

Bishop Barron was ordained as a priest in the Archdiocese of Chicago 33 years ago. In July 2015, Pope Francis appointed Bishop Barron to be the Auxiliary Bishop of the Archdiocese of Los Angeles. He is the founder of Word on Fire Catholic Ministries, an innovative new hub for spiritual and intellectual formation, where he produces daily meditations, weekly homilies, movies on pivotal players in Catholic history, reviews of movies, and debates with sometimes-controversial thought leaders of today’s culture.

Bishop Barron, as I said, is the second-most followed Catholic on social media, second only to the Pope. His regular YouTube videos have been viewed over 45 million times, and he has over 1.7 million followers on Facebook.

He is a number one Amazon bestselling author and has published 16 books. He has created the groundbreaking commentary “Catholicism,” which aired on PBS. He has eight other films and study programs.

He is a religious correspondent for NBC and has appeared on FOX News and CNN, as well as other stations. He has been invited to speak about religion at the headquarters of Facebook, Google, and Amazon, and, now, the United States Congress.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

THANKING RECONSTRUCTIONIST RABBINICAL ASSOCIATION

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I rise today in gratitude to thank the Reconstructionist Rabbinical Association for their endorsement of H.R. 2407, the Promoting Human Rights for Palestinian Children Living Under Military Occupation Act.

This endorsement by more than 300 respected rabbis sends a strong signal by people of all faiths that every child deserves to be treated with dignity and respect, and that includes Palestinian children. No longer can we ignore the countless cases of mistreatment and abuse of Palestinian children by the Israeli military.

As a nation, we should no longer condone or ignore the suffering of these children with the support of our tax dollars.

So, again, I thank leaders of all faiths, but especially these rabbis for their commitment to human rights and the rights of children and for standing up and saying no more abuse of Palestinian children.

RECOGNIZING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. CLINE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Domestic Violence Awareness Month to acknowledge the strength of survivors and to call for an end to the abuse experienced by more than 2 million Americans each year.

Throughout my career, I have fought to end the cycle of domestic violence. My contributions in the House of Delegates in Virginia have helped make the State have some of the toughest laws for domestic abusers. During that time, I patroned legislation requiring domestic abusers to undergo counseling and a court-mandated treatment program. I also worked across the aisle to make strangulation a felony in Virginia’s criminal code and make sure that abusers charged with such a crime would have the presumption against bail.

Congress must strive to protect victims and survivors, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to pass commonsense reforms that ensure safety and security of those who suffer abuse.

ADDRESS RISING COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Mr. CICILLINE. Madam Speaker, since January, House Democrats have gotten to work, passing legislation that brings down healthcare costs and protects the benefits of the Affordable Care Act.

We have gone on to court to fight against the Trump administration’s efforts to gut protections for folks with preexisting conditions. We have already sent a package of legislation to the Senate that will drive down the price of prescription drugs. We are still waiting on Mr. Trump to take up these bills, but we are not stopping there.

In the coming weeks, we will also bring to the floor the Elijah Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act, H.R. 3, the single most significant piece of legislation to reduce drug costs, that empowers patients and consumers against the powerful pharmaceutical cartels in this country.

This legislation levels the playing field of working people in this country, a country that pays more for prescription drugs than anywhere else in the world.

Our constituents want a government that works for the people of this country. It is time for my Republican colleagues and Leader McConnell to get the message: Stop standing in the way. Work with us so we can get the job done and pass this important legislation that will address this very serious issue, the rising cost of prescription drugs.

SPECIAL OPERATIONS SUCCESS

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

Mr. WILSON. Madam Speaker, the successful raid by the United States Special Forces resulting in the death of the murderous ISIS leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi is a significant victory for freedom.

Americans commend the military and intelligence communities for their diligent work in tracking a murderous terrorist who committed atrocities, leading to his cowardly suicide killing children in Syria.

I am thankful for the decisive leadership by President Donald Trump. Our commitment to deny ISIS a safe haven where they can launch attacks against American families sends a message that the U.S. and our allies stand ready and determined to succeed in the fight against terrorism.

National radio commentator Buck Sexton, on Monday, correctly praised these special operations success as "a big deal."

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism, just as, next week, we will cherish the 30th anniversary of Ronald Reagan’s liberation of Europe from communist socialism.

SUPPORTING IMAM TAHIR KUKIQI

(Mr. ROSE of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. ROSE. Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of Imam Tahir Kukiqi, a public servant and community leader who continues to be denied fair consideration in his immigration process.

This summer, Imam Tahir received notice that USCIS intends to deport him from the country he has called his home and raised his family for years. The loss of Imam Tahir would be a blow, not only to Staten Island, but to all of New York City and the United States. He has dedicated his life to uniting diverse communities in solidarity and common understanding.

He hosts interfaith dialogues with mosques, synagogues, churches, and temples all across New York State. He serves as the first Muslim chaplain to the New York City Police Department and has worked to build relationships between the Muslim community and law enforcement.

He has lived a life of public service and represents the best of what it
means to be an American. He has over-
come incredible diversity already.
Imam Tahir survived the war in
Kosovo and built a life for himself and
his son, Adem, right here in America.
He lost his wife and Adem's mother some
years ago, and now Citizenship and
Immigration Services has threat-
ened to take away Adem's father as
well.

Madam Speaker, I urge my col-
leagues not to sit idly by while this
wonderful man, this public servant, is
removed from our country. I urge them
to join me in insisting that USCIS give
Imam Tahir a fair hearing and grant
him authorization to remain in this
country.

God bless Imam Tahir, and God bless
the United States of America.

RECOGNIZING GARDNER MINSHEW
(Mr. GUEST asked and was given per-
mission to address the House for 1
minute and to revise and extend his re-
marks.)
Mr. GUEST. Madam Speaker, long
before he captured the attention of
football fans with his exemplary play
and iconic 1970s style, Gardner
Minshew inspired my hometown in
Mississippi.

I remember sitting in the stands,
watching Gardner Minshew's first
game when, as a freshman, he took
over for the injured starting Brandon
High School quarterback. I was among
many who watched the young man
grow and mature into a leader, both on
and off the field.

After four amazing seasons, Gardner
left Brandon and found his way to Pull-
man, Washington, to play for Wash-
ington State University. At Wash-
ington State, Gardner showed
composure in the face of adversity,
overcame all doubts, led the Cougars to
an 11-win season, and won the Johnny
Unitas award as the Nation's top senior
quarterback.

Gardner has taken this same men-
tality to the NFL, where he now faces
a similar challenge. Just like his first
start in high school, when Gardner was
asked to step up and play at the next
level, Gardner was recently called on
to lead the Jacksonville Jaguars.
Again, Gardner overcame all doubts,
and he has continued to excel, just as
he did when I watched him on Friday
nights a few short years ago.

Madam Speaker, we know Gardner
will keep representing our State and
township well. Good luck, and go
Jags.

SHOULD ABUSE OF POWER BE
ALLOWED
(Mr. KENNEDY asked and was given per-
mission to address the House for 1
minute and to revise and extend his re-
marks.)
Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Speaker, "At
the bedrock of our politics will be a
total allegiance to the United States of
America, and through our loyalty to
our country, we will rediscover our loy-
alty to each other." That was what
President Trump promised us on the
day he was inaugurated.

Over the past few months, our Presi-
dent has broken that promise. He has
lied. He has corrupted. He has ob-
structed.

Our President threatened the secu-
ritiy of an ally under attack unless they
were willing to investigate a fellow
American citizen, a political opponent,
to benefit his reelection campaign. And
he used your taxpayer dollars to do it.
His Chief of Staff has confirmed it.
The Ambassador of Ukraine confirmed
it. A Purple Heart recipient confirmed it.
The President admitted it himself.

So now, we have to decide if the lies,
the corruption, the coverups, and the
abuse of power should be allowed by
this President or any man or woman
who will hold office after him. That
choice should be clear.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Mem-
bers are reminded to refrain from en-
gaging in personalities toward the
President.

HONORING AMERICAN HERO STAN
CVAR
(Mr. STAUBER asked and was given per-
mission to address the House for 1
minute and to revise and extend his re-
marks.)
Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, Vet-
erans Day is right around the corner.
In anticipation of this important holi-
day, I rise to recognize a veteran from
my district whose service and patriot-
ism has our whole community rallying
around him.

Stan Cvar is a World War II Navy
veteran who always flies the American
flag outside his home in Hibbing, Min-
nesota. Unfortunately, back in Sep-
tember, someone stole Stan's American
flag from his property. Stan was dev-
astated, as the flag was not just a sym-
bol of the Nation he risked his life to
serve but a treasured gift from his son.

The fact that someone stole a cher-
ished American flag from a member of
the Greatest Generation was deeply up-
setting to many in the northland, my-
self included.

Next week, I will have the chance to
personally deliver a flag that was flown
over the United States Capitol to Stan
and his family. It will be an honor to
meet this American hero and offer him
a token of our gratitude.

Madam Speaker, as Veterans Day ap-
proaches, let us all remember that
after everything our veterans have done
for us, we must always ensure that we are standing up for them.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICING IS A
TOP HEALTH PRIORITY
(Mr. McADAMS asked and was given per-
mission to address the House for 1
minute.)
Mr. McADAMS. Madam Speaker, across America, seniors and families are struggling to afford the prescription drugs they need to stay healthy.

One of my constituents, Janet, a sen-
ior from Las Vegas, shared with me her
challenges in obtaining her medica-
tions. The blood thinners and chole-
sterol medications she is prescribed are
so expensive that, if it weren't for sam-
ple from her cardiologist, she wouldn't
be able to obtain them at all.

Madam Speaker, seniors like Janet
should not have to beg for free samples
for access to the medicine they need.
That is why I introduced the SPIKE
Act, to increase transparency; the Cap-
ping Drug Costs for Seniors Act, to cap
at $2,000 prescription drug expenses for
seniors under Medicare part D; and
why I support H.R. 3, the Elijah Cum-
mings Lower Drug Costs Now Act.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my col-
leagues in this body to come together,
and let's pass H.R. 3 together.

RECOGNIZING VOLUNTEERS AND
PUBLIC SERVANTS ACROSS NORTH
TEXAS
(Mr. TAYLOR asked and was given per-
mission to address the House for 1
minute and to revise and extend his re-
marks.)
Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I rise
today to recognize the efforts of count-
less volunteers and public servants
across north Texas who helped ease the
burden of last week's tornadoes.

When natural disaster strikes, fami-
lies suffer. It takes a strong commu-
ity to bring hope out of the wreckage.
Communities with solid foundations
do more than just rebuild homes, busi-
nesses, and schools. They help relieve
heartache that follows catastrophic loss.

Countless faith-based and nonprofit
organizations, including the Network
of Community Ministries, the Ameri-
can Red Cross of North Texas, and
Texas Baptist Men, have risen to meet
the needs of our community. Alongside
partners such as Atmos Energy and
Oncor Electric, they have started the
arduous process of rebuilding our com-
munities.

Likewise, city leaders, like those in
Richardson and Dallas, have banded to-
gether to show support and provide val-
uable resources, proving once more
that we are always stronger together.

Madam Speaker, I ask my colleagues
in the House of Representatives to join
me in thanking volunteers and leaders
throughout our region, not only for
helping to bring relief to those who
have been displaced from their homes
and schools, but also for providing hope.
public's top health priority for Congress.

Most Americans say that prescription drugs have made their lives better, but for so many the cost is unreasonable and unaffordable.

Insulin, which keeps more than 7 million Americans alive, is an extreme example. We have had insulin for nearly 100 years, yet our constituents, Utah mothers whose kids have type I diabetes, tell me that skyrocketing costs have put this lifesaving medicine nearly out of reach.

My hometown newspaper recently carried a story about volunteers criss-crossing Utah to pick up leftover insulin—because a family had extra or a diabetic family member died—and delivering that medicine where it is needed. They call it “Diabetic Christmas,” a sad commentary on just how badly our system is failing our patients.

We need actions to offer relief that bring down costs so that people don't have to celebrate Diabetic Christmas in order to stay alive and stay healthy.

This week, we passed a bill with unanimous support that makes drug pricing more transparent and makes it easier for seniors on Medicare drug plans to understand their benefits and their costs. It is a good step forward, but we have more work to do.

VETERANS DAY

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Madam Speaker, in a few days, our Nation will celebrate Veterans Day, a time to pause, give thanks, and honor the brave men and women who have served our country.

Those men and women who have worn the uniform of our Nation, who have sacrificed so much for us, deserve more than lip service in return. We owe them action. That means keeping the promises we have made to our veterans to provide skills and offer opportunities as these men and women transition to civilian life; to provide a lifetime of healthcare that they have earned and were guaranteed; to support access to mental health services, including to those with other than honorable discharges who may have been improperly dismissed from the service due to undiagnosed brain injuries or PTSD.

To that end, I am proud of the bipartisan legislation I introduced to reauthorize the Boots to Business entrepreneurship and career program for veterans, previously passed in the House, and I urge my colleagues in the Senate to similarly support this and other important programs.

This Veterans Day, and every day, I hope we will all do more to remember the privileges we enjoy as Americans and honor those who served us as a small token of our thanks.

SCHOOL INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. RUZ. Madam Speaker, earlier this month, James Madison Elementary School in Indio, California, closed after more than a dozen were found in the columns and the walls supporting the building, compromising the school’s infrastructure and putting students, teachers, and staff at risk.

This is symptomatic of outdated and weak infrastructure in schools throughout our Nation. Thankfully, the Desert Sands Unified School District board closed the school and transferred students to another facility.

The cost of our schools’ outdated infrastructure is adding up. We need big and bold investments in school infrastructure to keep our students safe, prevent school closures, and help our students compete.

That is why I cosponsored and urge a vote on the Rebuilding America’s Schools Act of 2019, to invest $100 billion in schools’ much-needed physical and digital infrastructure.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to cosponsor H.R. 865, the Rebuilding America’s Schools Act of 2019, and prioritize students’ well-being, safety, and education.

LOWER THE COST OF PRESCRIPTION DRUGS

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

Mr. WELCH. Madam Speaker, very soon in this House, we will have a chance to do something that America needs done, America wants done, and we can do it together, and that is to lower the cost of prescription drugs in honor of our wonderful Elijah Cummins.

The United States is the only major country where the government of the people does not protect the people against price gouging by the pharmaceutical industry. We have got to change that.

Our drug bill will bring down prices over a half a trillion dollars. That will start to alleviate the pressure on premiums that is coming at the expense of raises for workers. The benefits of this approach will not just be for our Medicare and Medicaid programs—really important programs—but the lower prices will benefit employer-sponsored healthcare as well.

So, if you are taking medication that is insulin, or if you are taking medication in an EpiPen, you are going to get a lower price. But, even if you are fortunate that you don’t need the medication, your premiums are going to go down.

Madam Speaker, let’s come together and pass this reduction in horrible medical expenses.

SPOTLIGHTING THE NEEDS OF RURAL AMERICA

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

Mr. DELGADO. Madam Speaker, I rise today to put a spotlight on rural America and urge Congress to pass my bill, the Rebuild Rural America Act.

In my district, the eighth most rural in the country, we are still fighting for broadband access and consistent cell service.

With so much of the private market focusing on population density in order to achieve high returns on capital investment, many of our less populated communities are left to their own devices.

Here, at the Federal level, where the public good is contemplated, we must ensure that no community is boxed out of the future. That is why I introduced the Rebuild Rural America Act, which creates the rural future partnership fund and provides $50 billion for non-competitive, 5-year renewable block grants to certified rural regions to implement locally developed revitalization plans.

This bill helps communities that don’t have the resources to navigate the complex Federal grants process to secure Federal funding for important projects, and it would move the Federal Government away from being complicated, siloed, and top-down into a more responsive and effective partner for our rural communities.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass the Rebuild Rural America Act.

RECOGNIZING U.S. RECOGNITION OF THE ARME DERICAN GENOCIDE

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

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Madam Speaker, as a proud member of the Congressional Armenian Caucus, I rise in recognition of yesterday’s historic passage of H. Res. 296 to affirm the United States' recognition of the Armenian genocide.

Madam Speaker, I am proud to represent many people of Armenian descent who live in northern New Jersey. In Bergen County, we hold an annual ceremony on April 24 to remember the day in 1915 when hundreds of Armenian intellectuals were rounded up and ultimately murdered at the beginning of the Armenian genocide.

The massacre of 1.5 million Armenians, as well as Greeks, Assyrians, Chaldeans, Syriacs, Arameans, Maronities, and other Christians, by the Ottoman Empire constituted the 20th century’s first genocide.

As a Jewish American, I need to recognize genocide is deeply personal for me. My relatives lost their entire family during the Nazi attempt to exterminate European Jewry.
I know that it is never the wrong time to bear witness and tell the truth. The United States should never be complicit in denying genocide. As a proud member of the bipartisan Armenian Caucus, co-chaired by my friend, Chairman Frank Pallone, I will continue working hard in Congress for justice on behalf of New Jersey and the Fifth Congressional District’s great Armenian American community.

GRAND CANYON CENTENNIAL PROTECTION ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 1373.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to rule XIX, 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. 1373.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

The Speaker appoints the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) to the Committee of the Whole.

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. 1373) to protect, for current and future generations, the watershed, ecosystem, and cultural heritage of the Grand Canyon region in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, with Ms. SÁNCHEZ 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 shall not exceed 3 hours equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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

Madam Chair, I want to start today with a story.

Near the south rim of the Grand Canyon site Canyon Mine, a breccia pipe uranium mine in the middle of the Kaibab National Forest, only a few miles from the boundary of the Grand Canyon National Park.

This mine opened in 1986 after assurances that its operations would have minimal impact and that they wouldn’t impact groundwater.

Mind you, since it opened three decades ago, uranium production has never occurred at the site. Uranium ore has never come out of the mine.

What has come out of the mine is over 20 million gallons of groundwater, polluted with uranium and arsenic from the ore body. The water has flowed into the mine ever since the mine operations placed a groundwater aquifer in 2016.

Again, the mine operator had assured regulators its mine shaft would be dry. The situation is so dire that the mine operator regularly resorts to spraying this uranium-contaminated water into the air to speed evaporation. On windy days, this spray has been known to travel off the site and into the surrounding areas and environment.

Meanwhile, the mine shaft continues to fill with contaminated water. There are really only a few places that water might go if it escapes the mine shaft: down toward other aquifers, including those that feed the water to the Supai Village and Havasupai, and up the gullies that flow into the Grand Canyon and, eventually, to the Colorado River itself.

Supai village has been the home of the Havasupai people for more than 1,000 years. They have made this canyon their home. Their history is there. Their homes are there. Their lives are there. Yet this mine puts all that at risk.

Again, no ore production has occurred at this site, but it has already degraded millions of gallons of clean water and put lives and culture at risk. And that contamination risk will only get worse once mining commences and the water is exposed to more and more uranium ore.

This isn’t a unique example. The Pine Nut mine on the North Rim of the Grand Canyon was thought closed and capped for two decades, but in 2009 the mine was discovered to have unexpectedly filled with over two million gallons of radioactively contaminated water.

Uranium mines across the southwest pollute our water, endanger our communities and our health, and despite assurances, hundreds of these sites are still waiting to be cleaned up, particularly those mines that impact Tribal communities.

Madam Chair, for Arizonans, for the Havasupai, and for countless others across the southwest, the mineral withdrawal made permanent by H.R. 1373 is not theoretical and it is not trivial. I rise today to ask for this House’s support for protecting clean water, protecting the health of our communities, and protecting the public lands and environment on which we all rely.

The bill before us today permanently extends an existing temporary moratorium on new mining claims on public lands surrounding the Grand Canyon National Park, to prevent another canyon or Pine Nut mine from threatening our communities and our livelihoods.

This bill needs to act on this proposal because these critical protections are under threat from the Trump administration.

Under the guise of energy dominance and fabricated arguments about national security, they have continually pushed for these lands to be open to exploitation on behalf of a few wealthy mining interests. The idea that we need to mine around the Grand Canyon—mind you, the Grand Canyon—to meet our energy needs is patently false. There is ample data to allow it, national security and nuclear non-proliferation experts have routinely raised the alarm that this fearmongering about supplies is based on fantasy. It is time to stop rehashing the same worn out arguments. We shouldn’t be mining for uranium around the Grand Canyon, period.

This is an effort I have been involved in for over a decade, and I hope we can move forward today. I urge my colleagues to help me protect access to clean water and a healthy environment for the people of Arizona by supporting H.R. 1373, the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act.

I rise in opposition to H.R. 1373, the so-called Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act. It is an antimining attack on the mineral resource base across the southwest.

This legislation imposes a massive land grab of more than one million acres, permanently banning mining and other multiple-use activities in an area nearly the size of Delaware. The withdrawal is also, I would like to point out, very far outside the Grand Canyon. The actual Grand Canyon, of course, is already subject to a multitude of Federal protections.

Around one-third of the proposed withdrawal area is in my district. The rest is in Representative O’HALLERAN’s district. And none of the lands in this bill are in the sponsor of this bill, Representative GRIJALVA’s, district.

This bill would have direct negative impacts on six counties in Arizona and Utah, with an estimated two to 4,000 jobs lost and $29 billion in foregone overall economic activity. The withdrawal area also contains 4,204 acres belonging to the Department of the Interior’s Bureau of Land Management for the benefit of Arizona’s school children. This withdrawal will mean hundreds of millions of dollars in lost revenue for local communities and for our schools. I think every single school district is hurting for money in Arizona.

Further, the majority of the active and historic mining claims are in my district, and the main point of this bill is to lock up those lands for mineral development.

I said that this is an attack on northern Arizona, and that is true, but that is not all. This bill is a specific, targeted attempt to prevent access to the...
highest grade and largest quantity of uranium reserves in the country. In doing so, this legislation has serious defense and energy security implications for the entire Nation.

Uranium is a uniquely valuable element of renewable energy and also an irreplaceable application in defense and medicine. And yet, domestic uranium production in 2018 was 33 percent lower than in 2017. This year those numbers are likely to be even worse. Our domestic industry is disappearing. Uranium mining is done, it will be completely gone in just a few years. Look at what has happened with our timber industry in Arizona. We have completely wiped out the mechanism, and now we are victims of catastrophic wildfires.

During consideration of this bill in committee, my colleagues across the aisle claimed that we source most of our uranium from allies like Canada and Australia. But they neglected to mention that Canadian mining, which provided 15 percent of the global uranium supply, closed just last year. An Australian mine is scheduled to stop operations in 2021 after 40 years of mining.

But why is this? Why is our domestic industry struggling to stay in business and the uranium supply from our friends in Canada and Australia shrinking? Well, the largest uranium producer in the world is Kazakhstan, and together with Russia and Uzbekistan, these countries have been deliberately trying to "corner" the global market. Yes, I said it. Corner the global market. They are pushing the price of uranium down to artificially low levels and driving competitors in the United States and elsewhere out of business. In fact, China is joining in it too, buying up mines in Namibia.

We currently import about 97 percent of our uranium from foreign sources. As of 2018, the majority of our uranium imports now come from hostile nations like Russia. This is not always the case, but the problem has gotten worse and worse over time, especially in recent years. I think all of us here today should consider that very alarming.

Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have cited concerns about water quality as a reason to prevent mining in the withdrawal area. But, in fact, uranium mining occurred in the 1980s. These mines were reclamed so well that you can't tell where they have even existed. There was no damage done to the Grand Canyon watershed. In fact, they may have improved the watershed. And due to the small footprint of a typical breccia pipe operation, usually less than 40 acres, even if every mining claim in the area became a mine, only a small fraction of the withdrawal area would be affected.

Keep in mind that this is an area where mining and other multiple-use activities can coexist. In fact, a thoroughly-negotiated compromise to do just that was created by the Arizona Wilderness Act of 1984, supported by the entire Arizona and Utah delegations. 387,000 acres of land was added to the National Wilderness Preservation System in exchange for 540 acres to be available for multiple use, including mining.

Unfortunately, some of the environmental groups involved in that compromise have forgotten why it was made. Attempts to withdraw this area have received very strong opposition from my constituents and residents of northern Arizona. There is no question that H.R. 1373 will hurt local revenues, kill jobs, and undermine American energy security. It is opposed by the people of my district, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposition.

Madam Chairwoman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I recognize my colleague from Arizona—

Mr. O’HALLERAN. Madam Chair, I rise today to speak in support of the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act, legislation that would ban uranium mining in and near the Grand Canyon.

I am proud to represent Arizona’s First Congressional District, which is home to the Grand Canyon. Our canyon is a national and cultural significance to Native American Tribes and Nations throughout the region, as well as home to the Havasupai Tribe.

The Grand Canyon brings in over 6 million visitors each year. In 2018, these visitors spent $1.2 billion in the local economy and supported over 12,000 jobs. The Grand Canyon is also home to the Colorado River, the water supply for an enormous portion of the southwest region.

Potential contamination of the water by uranium mining would have a ripple effect that would devastate the 40 million people that rely on the Colorado River and local aquifers. Unfortunately, areas in and near the canyon are plagued by the toxic legacy of uranium mining to this day.

Currently, there are over 500 abandoned uranium mines in the Navajo Nation alone. They have been there for 80 years. The Federal Government has an obligation to clean them up, as did the mining companies that abandoned them.

Cancer diagnoses in the region are extremely high and are directly linked to uranium mining activity dating back to the 1950s.

Today, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to pass the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act. This commonsense bill protects our canyon, the health of northern Arizonans, the water supply, and the economic growth of our State’s economy by banning uranium mining in and near the Grand Canyon.

Additionally, I want to note that this withdrawal of uranium mining does not jeopardize our energy market or our national security by forcing us to seek foreign sources. We are actually seeking foreign sources now because our cost is not competitive with world prices.

According to Federal data, both New Mexico and Wyoming have three times the amount of uranium reserves as Arizona, Colorado, and Utah have combined. Our uranium imports are lower than they have been in 15 years, and Canada, our ally, is our largest supplier along with Australia, another ally.

I am proud to stand today in support of the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act, because the Grand Canyon is too precious to lose. I implore my colleagues to vote in support of this legislation.

The Arizona land trust is for the schools. This land may not be used for uranium mining, but it could be used for anything else to be able to address the issues of funding schools in Arizona. And, again, the mine that the chairman mentioned has a reason to be closed.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairwoman, I want to explain. This is a cross-section of geological formations. These yellow areas are called the breccia pipes. What ends up happening is these yellow pipes actually direct water. Uranium is water soluble. This is the Grand Canyon down here. This is where the springs come through. So what ends up happening is it dissolves into water, and it comes into the subsurface water. So it seems like to me, what we would want to do is get rid of that so there was not a perpetual leaching into the subsurface water. Geology tells us a lot.

Madam Chairwoman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from California.

Mr. McCINTOCK. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Potential damage from uranium mining would have a ripple effect that would devastate the 40 million people that rely on the Colorado River and local aquifers. Unfortunately, areas in and near the canyon are plagued by the toxic legacy of uranium mining to this day.

Currently, there are over 500 abandoned uranium mines in the Navajo Nation alone. They have been there for 80 years. The Federal Government has an obligation to clean them up, as did the mining companies that abandoned them.

Cancer diagnoses in the region are extremely high and are directly linked to uranium mining activity dating back to the 1950s.

Today, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to pass the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act. This commonsense bill protects our canyon, the health of northern Arizonans, the water supply, and the economic growth of our State’s economy by banning uranium mining in and near the Grand Canyon.

Additionally, I want to note that this withdrawal of uranium mining does not jeopardize our energy market or our national security by forcing us to seek foreign sources. We are actually seeking foreign sources now because our cost is not competitive with world prices.

According to Federal data, both New Mexico and Wyoming have three times the amount of uranium reserves as Arizona, Colorado, and Utah have combined. Our uranium imports are lower than they have been in 15 years, and Canada, our ally, is our largest supplier along with Australia, another ally.

I am proud to stand today in support of the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act, because the Grand Canyon is too precious to lose. I implore my colleagues to vote in support of this legislation.

The Arizona land trust is for the schools. This land may not be used for uranium mining, but it could be used for anything else to be able to address the issues of funding schools in Arizona. And, again, the mine that the chairman mentioned has a reason to be closed.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chairwoman, I want to explain. This is a cross-section of geological formations. These yellow areas are called the breccia pipes. What ends up happening is these yellow pipes actually direct water. Uranium is water soluble. This is the Grand Canyon down here. This is where the springs come through. So what ends up happening is it dissolves into water, and it comes into the subsurface water. So it seems like to me, what we would want to do is get rid of that so there was not a perpetual leaching into the subsurface water. Geology tells us a lot.

Madam Chairwoman, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from California.
Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1373, the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act.

I have lived in Arizona my entire life, from Mohave County came to Washington to plead with the Democrats not to pass their so-called Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act. It is a Federal land grab that would lock up approximately 1 million acres of public land in northern Arizona and permanently ban mineral development.

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

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

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) has expired.

Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1373, the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair. I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Chair, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 1373, the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act.

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

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair. I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Madam Chair, I have hiked down the Grand Canyon with my family, camped on the banks of the Colorado River. It is not a place where we should have uranium mining.

There are many Native American Tribes who live in that area and who consider that a sacred site. For hundreds of years, their ancestors visited the Grand Canyon. They continue to worship there and have ceremonial sites in the Grand Canyon.

We just cannot allow this kind of contamination to continue. The problem with uranium mining is that the retroactive disposal of uranium is very, very difficult to clean from the land.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Madam Chair, this is a very serious issue. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 1373.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair. I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair. I yield myself such time as I might consume.

We are going to go back to learning about geology. Once again, we have these forecasts, and you can see them on this location. This policy is progressive. It progressively increases outside bureaucratic control over more Federal land.

The policy and the world view that supports this reminds me of the story of the greedy farmer. He said he didn’t want all the land; he just wanted the land that bordered his land. Policy like this doesn’t claim the land; it just wants to put the land in protection that borders the land that is in protection. Someday, there won’t be any land left if we continue implementing policies like this.

Mr. GOSAR has already pointed out, the land up for debate is in his and Mr. O’HALLERAN’s districts, not Mr. GRIJALVA’s, and closing its development would result in hundreds of millions of dollars of lost revenue for local schools and communities.

One of the common arguments against mineral development is that it disrupts wildlife habitats and water supplies, but we have seen this disproved time and time again. A strong economy and environmental stewardship can coexist.

The Arizona Geological Survey published a report outlining uranium mining in this part of Arizona, showing how mining here would not contaminate the Colorado River, the Grand Canyon, or any of the surrounding watersheds.

We have also seen how areas that were mined in the past have been successfully reclaimed. As modern mining techniques and technology continue improving, this process will only become more efficient and advanced.

Finally, we cannot have a discussion about barring natural resource development on public lands without addressing the far and wide-ranging geopolitical repercussions. Our domestic uranium industry is currently supplying less than 1 percent of the uranium necessary to fuel U.S. nuclear reactors. Despite a vast domestic supply of uranium, much of it is inaccessible due to laws like H.R. 1373.

This means the U.S. is forced to outsource its uranium supply from countries like Russia, Uzbekistan, and ever-tapering uranium production within the United States, one of the largest in the world.
Chinese-owned mines in Namibia. With geopolitical tensions constantly increasing, it is foolish for us to continue relying so heavily on countries that have proven themselves to be unfriendly to the U.S.

If we permanently ban mineral development on another vast expanse of land, we are overtly threatening American energy and economic security, and I believe we are promoting less environmental stewardship around the globe.

I have seen this story play out over and over again. My Democratic colleagues claim to be concerned about environmental safety and security, but their only solution is to lock up millions of acres and throw away the key. I ask: Wouldn’t our time be better spent finding smart energy solutions that are sustainable and environmentally friendly and that provide American jobs?

If we want the U.S. to continue leading the world in long-term energy solutions, this must be our approach.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. STANTON), my colleague.

Mr. STANTON. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman, Mr. GRIJALVA, for yielding, and for his leadership as the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, and as the senior member of our Arizona delegation. Today, I rise in support of H.R. 1373, the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act.

When people think of Arizona, they most often conjure up images of the Grand Canyon. It is our State’s greatest treasure and one of the most iconic natural wonders on Earth.

It took nearly 2 billion years for the Colorado River and its tributaries to cut through layer after layer of rock to form the canyon. The spectacular scene is something best experienced in person, and it is one of the most visited national parks in our country.

The park is a key economic driver for northern Arizona’s economy. Last year, the Grand Canyon welcomed 6.3 million visitors, bringing almost $1 billion of value to our local economies.

President Teddy Roosevelt, who designated the Grand Canyon a national monument in 1908, said: ‘‘Leave it as it is. You cannot improve upon it. The ages have been at work on it, and man can only mar it.’’

We could not agree more. As we celebrate the park’s centennial this year, we must take the necessary action to preserve this natural landscape for future generations to experience.

The bill before us today, which makes permanent a ban on new uranium mining permits on nearly 1 million acres around the canyon, is that necessary action. It is a vital step to protect this delicate ecosystem, the significant number of species that call it home, as well as the Colorado River watershed on which millions of people rely for water.

This legislation has strong support from leaders and industries across our State, from our Tribal nations to cities and counties, to recreation and environmental organizations.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to join us in supporting the Grand Canyon and supporting this important bill.

Mr. GOYAS. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I might consume. Madam Chair, it is great that the gentleman brings this up. So once again, let’s go back to our geological timeframe.

This water cuts through. This is the Grand Canyon. This is the shelf that you go over at the beautiful, majestic aspect of the river.

Look at what we have cut across, these breccia pipes. Once again, this is exposure. It is water-soluble, air-soluble. It goes back into the watershed.

Once again, we are talking about up here, where mitigation should be very, very important.

Madam Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER). He has been a stalwart person in regard to the mining industry; that it is a way of life in northern Minnesota.

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Chair, I rise today with my colleagues in opposition to this harmful legislation.

Today, the other side of the aisle isخطotyping to the wealthy and elite environmental lobby by ignoring science and facts and catering to the needs of rural communities. This heavy-handed Federal approach ignores potential revenues generated from State trust lands that would flow to schools and our local communities.

I feel like we are living in the movie ‘‘Groundhog Day’’ sometimes. Time and time again, locals who live on these lands, who work in the area, who raise their families there, who represent these districts are supportive of these projects. Those who often know nothing about the local projects, the economy, or the environment are the ones who are inserting themselves in opposition.

This illustrates the vast divide between the realities for local communities and the visions of environmentalists. What these visions tend to ignore is that the choice is a binary one. We either get these minerals needed for our everyday life, renewable energy, and national security from right here in the United States, or we import them from places like Russia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Chinese-owned mines in Africa.

Do these countries have the same standards in place as we do to protect the environment? Madam Chair, the answer is no.

Do these foreign mines hire workers with high-wage salaries? Madam Chair, the answer is no.

Are these mines required to comply with a regulatory agency like the Mine Safety and Health Administration? Madam Chair, the answer is no.

Do Russia and China have our best national security interests in mind? Madam Chair, the answer is no.

Therefore, this legislation is baffling. Our enemies abroad could not have written a better bill to benefit their economies and national security goals while simultaneously damaging ours.

Instead of arbitrarily deciding that mining is wrong, Madam Chair, let’s look at the facts. One, it is unsustainable and irresponsible to continue our reliance on foreign adversaries for our minerals. Two, mining and a pristine environment are not mutually exclusive.

Madam Chair, I encourage anybody in this body to come to northern Minnesota and view our reclaimed mines, which are home to the cleanest drinking water in the State of Minnesota.

Or, how about visiting the Hermit Mine in Arizona. This was a functional uranium mine in the 1960s. It is now fully reclaimed with a pristine landscape.

We need these minerals. Let’s stand up against antiscience scare tactics and vote against this bill and in support of good jobs, renewable energy, and national security for our country.

Mr. GOYAS. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 12 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD), a member of the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. HORSFORD. Madam Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 1373, the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act.

This bill ensures that uranium mining will not irreversibly contaminate the sensitive habitats and clean water of the Colorado River watershed, which provides drinking water to nearly 30 million Americans, including some of my constituents in Nevada.

While uranium and other hard rock mining can help foster economic activity, as it has done in my home State of Nevada, it can also threaten community health. In my district, I have seen the impacts that uranium contamination can have on local communities in the town of Yerington and the Yerington Paiute Tribe.

For decades, uranium contamination has persistently been present in this area, endangering the health of my constituents and forcing families to stop drinking from their taps, literally having to rely on bottled water. Sadly, cleanup of this site and others like it often takes much longer than it should, leaving families to choose between leaving their homes or living amongst health hazards.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to work on this bill to support this legislation in a bipartisan tradition and to vote to protect the Grand Canyon region and Colorado River watershed from the damaging impacts of uranium mining.

Mr. GOYAS. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.
Madam Chair, once again, let’s look at mitigation. The previous speaker on our side, Mr. STAUBER from Minnesota, actually talked about it.

Well, here is an active mine site called the Pigeon Mine. This is what it looks like. It is a footprint of less than 40 acres; right around 30 acres. And this is it, newly minted right as it was done for reclamation. In 2 years, you are not going to be able to find anything here.

Once again, look at what we are dealing with here. This is an exposed breccia pipe, any rain, any snow, any air will actually dissolve this and put it in the air—not just uranium, but arsenic as well. These are eroded away.

Once again, geology teaches you everything you need to know. Once again, all these breccia pipes are built here.

Here is the Grand Canyon. We are not doing anything here. But look at the exposure here for the uranium leaching into the subsurface and into the Colorado River—not just that, but arsenic as well.

Look at what we are mining up on here, protecting and clearing that out. And you can see that their mitigation is exemplary.

Eighty years ago, we abandoned a bunch of mines, but a lot of Federal Government was to blame about that.

We also heard the dissertation in regards to the park could generate all sorts of other revenue. Well, the last time I looked, the park wasn’t generating; they were going in the negative. In fact, the backlog on maintenance is over $12 billion.

The government doesn’t run these very, very well, and this is a great opportunity for multiple use. It actually cleans the water, improves the drainage into the subsurface water, and gets to a problem with a solution that works and has been trusted.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Ms. McCOLLUM).

Ms. McCOLLUM. Madam Chair, the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act is an important bill to protect one of America’s most iconic national parks and elevate the voices of Tribal communities.

Tribal leaders from across the Southwestern US have called on Congress to permanently protect this region from uranium mining. These communities have seen firsthand the devastating impact uranium extraction could have on their lives, on their health, and the health of their children.

For example, the Havasupai Tribe live in the bottom of the Grand Canyon. Uranium contamination of the aquifers that sustain their land would destroy their drinking water, their farms, and kill their livestock. Even their ability to remain on their Tribal homeland is at risk.

It is time for Congress to listen to these Tribal leaders. It is time for Congress to stand up for future generations who are relying upon us for clean water, public lands, cultural heritage, and other priceless resources.

As a chair of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee, I am committed to shining a light on Americans about the value of conserving our public lands and protecting our air and our water. The Trump administration’s agenda puts at risk by prioritizing profits for mining companies over our public health and the health of our communities.

In my home State of Minnesota, the Trump administration’s push to mine at any cost jeopardizes the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, our Nation’s most visited wilderness area.

Congress needs to state clearly and emphatically that some places are just simply too important and too precious to exploit. Today, we take a stand to protect the lands and waters surrounding the Grand Canyon, one of the earliest and most iconic national parks.

Madam Chair, I support H.R. 1373, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

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

Madam Chair, once again, geology tells us everything we need to know. Once again, the gentlewoman actually talked about the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. Once again, I feel sorry for the public being misused and used like pawns by the other side about the misnomer.

Once again, the Grand Canyon—this is the Grand Canyon. There is nothing going on right here. Oh, I forgot. Water runs down, dissolves uranium and arsenic, and puts it into the water.

What we are talking about is mitigation on this plateau. This is outside the Grand Canyon experience. This is what is so important is that this is helping out the health and the strength of the purity of water. That is the key here.

Not only that, but the last time I knew, Arizona fights over water because we have to drink whiskey. We want clean water here, so we are enabling, actually, clean water here.

Once again, there are dozens of fights for the conversation we are having today. The American people are being used like pawns. They don’t know what is right. Go back to geology. The geology sets you free.

You have seen the mitigation. Yes, 80 years ago, there wasn’t great mitigation. That was a big part of the U.S. Government and its oversight. But now, there is great opportunity for this to happen. We are not talking about the Grand Canyon. It is outside on the plateau.

Once again, as these are exposed through erosion, you have contamination of subsurface water. It seems to me like we should actually clean it up.

The other thing I keep hearing about is we have got plenty of supplies. Well, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle are so narrow-sided that they forgot about: How did China actually grow to own the world market of rare earths? I mean, think about that. In order to have a cell phone, you have got to have these critical minerals and rare earths.

In the trade debate, what did China threaten us with? Withholding rare earths. Why do we have some of our leading battery technology over in China? Because we didn’t have supply chains here.

The other side talks about globalization. Well, let’s talk about globalization. Nobody—let me repeat—nobody in the world does mining like the U.S. No one does it under the same protections, and the same protections for the workers—nobody.

And if we are talking about globalization, which always keeps coming out of the other side’s mouth, well, then we ought to be bringing all this home so that we are the entrepreneur, we are the one forcing this issue, and we are the one who controls our own destiny.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield 1 1⁄2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY).

Mr. KENNEDY. Madam Chair, I thank the chairman for his leadership on this bill and his unwavering commitment to both his home State and our environment.

Madam Chair, this legislation isn’t just about protecting our land and natural resources for generations to come. It isn’t just about ensuring the water rights for the Havasupai Tribe and indigenous people our country has long abused and ignored.

It is not just about the tourism industry that could crumble and threaten the local economies that depend on it.

It isn’t even just about the health of our environment, our air, our water, and our children.

It is about the choices that we make and the priorities that we share. It is about finally choosing people over profits.

It is about finally choosing the long-term health of our planet and our children over the short-term reward of stripping our resources and leaving devastation and destruction behind.

By passing the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act, we will show the people of Arizona, and countless other Americans who have been sidelined by powerful special interests, that they are still heard, that they are still seen, and that they will not be dismissed by their government.

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

Madam Chair, once again, the gentleman made my point perfectly for me: This is about people.

There is mitigation. We are holding people accountable. They are empowering the people now we are controlling the energy cycle. We are not indentured to another country like China or Russia.
We are looking at the long series, making sure that we control our own destiny. That was the American experience. And we are accountable. That is key.

So when you look at mitigation like this, you can’t dispute it. You are not entitled to your own facts. The facts are what they are.

So there is a way forward and a way forward to do this right, and it is being presented right here. The answer is not “no.” It is about what it takes to get to “yes.” This bill is totally wrong for that very format.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 6½ minutes remaining.

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

Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD a list of organizations that are opposed to this bill; a Statement of Administration Policy threatening to veto this bill if it were even to get through from the Uranium Producers of America in strong opposition to the bill; an article from The Epoch Times, dated September of 2019, entitled to your own facts. The facts that very format.

MEMBER BISHOP: On behalf of the Uranium Producers of America (UPA), I write to express our strong opposition to H.R. 1373, the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act.

The permanent mineral withdrawal imposed by H.R. 1373 unnecessarily eliminates access to significant known deposits of uranium, rare earth elements, and other critical minerals.

UPA is a national trade association representing the domestic uranium mining and conversion industries. UPA members conduct uranium exploration, development, and mining operations in Arizona, Colorado, Nebraska, New Mexico, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, and Wyoming.

UPA members operate valuable, high-grade uranium deposits that provide quality, high-paying jobs, tax revenue, and produce clean energy for the citizens of the United States. UPA’s mission is to promote the viability of the nation’s uranium industry, while being good stewards of the environments in which we work and live.

H.R. 1373’s permanent withdrawal of one million acres of federal land from mineral development ignores the comprehensive suite of statutes and local environmental regulations that apply to the mining process, from exploration and production to reclamation and closure. H.R. 1373 disregards the well-documented mine reclamation in the withdrawal area and the fact that all federal lands within Grand Canyon National Park were already withdrawn from the Mining Law when the park was created.

Moreover, the U.S. Geological Survey estimates that there are significant undiscovered uranium resources in the withdrawal area, but the mineral assessment required as part of the current moratorium has not yet begun. This means H.R. 1373 would permanently strand resources without an informed understanding of the economic value of the deposits and the national security impact of their permanent withdrawal.

Ensuring responsible access to uranium deposits on federal land is a crucial component of ensuring the long-term viability of the domestic uranium industry, the survival of which is vital to energy and national security.

Despite the existence of vast deposits, domestic producers forecast 2019 production to plummet below one percent of what is required to reduce our country’s commercial nuclear reactors, which is not enough uranium to power even one of our nation’s 98 reactors. These reactors produce approximately 20 percent of America’s commercial nuclear fleet, representing the world’s largest commercial nuclear fleet and supplying more than half of the carbon-free power in the United States. In addition, international agreements require domestically-sourced uranium to meet our defense requirements, including our nuclear weapons and the nuclear-powered Navy.

H.R. 1373 is particularly objectionable at a time the United States is at risk of losing its competitive advantage by becoming completely reliant on imported uranium. Uranium imports from state-backed entities have created an uneven global playing field including our nuclear weapons and the nuclear-powered Navy.

We urge you to vote against H.R. 1373 and instead prioritize policies to revive and protect the domestic uranium mining, nuclear fuel production, and the provision of clean energy in the United States.

Sincerely,

JON J. INDALL, Counsel for UPA.

(From the Epoch Times, September 8, 2019)

US Needs Alternatives to China’s Rare Earth Monopoly

By James Gorrie

As the trade war goes on, China threatens to deprive the US of critical elements its economy and its military cannot do without.

Many consider China’s vast portfolio of U.S. Treasuries as their not-so-secret weapon in the ongoing trade war. And it some ways, that is certainly true. China could decide to liquidate much or all of its U.S. bond holdings in response to rising tariff, and use other tactics, like currency devaluation.

But what the United States would expose itself to is a more potent weapon, one that China has been preparing for over a decade: China’s rare earth resources.

An increasing share of uranium imports into the United States are coming from government or state-controlled entities based in nations that are not aligned with U.S. interests. While free market companies are forced to adapt to market conditions, state-backed entities within the Russian sphere of influence (RSOI) have ignored the market, increased their total supply, and added further downward pressure to prices.

China has the world’s largest known deposits of rare earth elements, and other critical minerals. The Chinese are smarter than that.

China holds a near global monopoly on the supply—or more accurately, the processing capacity—of rare earth elements (REE).

Should China decide to impose an embargo against the sale of REEs to the United States, the American economy and the U.S. military would be scrambling to replace them, at least in the short run. That’s not overstating this situation, by the way. As Foreign Policy magazine recently observed, “Beijing could slam every comer of the American economy, from oil refineries to wind turbines to jet engines, by banning exports of crucial minerals.” The list of REE critical products includes smartphones, special alloys, navigation systems, and much more.

China, of course, is well aware of this. In fact, China’s state-run media have been promoting an embargo, or leveraging the threat of one, in response to the U.S. tariffs on Chinese products, and specifically, the American blackouts. China’s biggest telecom equipment manufacturer and a leader in 5G networks. Since all media in China is controlled by the Chinese government, don’t be surprised if this message is being sent to U.S. trade negotiators directly from the CCP.
CHINA MADE THIS PLAY BEFORE

If China does stop selling REEs to the United States, it wouldn’t be the first time they’ve played that card. In 2006, China began limiting its exports of REEs, reducing them by 80 percent in 2010. The reduction caused the prices of non-China-sourced REEs to skyrocket. China also took advantage of its market dominance and stopped selling to Japan in retaliation for a maritime incident.

After the United States, along with Japan and Europe, prevailed against China in a WTO fight in 2015, China dramatically dropped its REE prices and drove the only active REE processing plant in the United States, Molycorp, into bankruptcy. At that time China controlled 95 percent of the world’s rare earth metals.

HOW DID WE GET HERE?

But how has the U.S. allowed itself to be put in such a bind? Wouldn’t it make sense to have secured an American or at least a friendly source of these REEs on which so much of our military preparedness and our economy are reliant? Shouldn’t that have been a priority decades ago?

Actually, it was. But that changed in 1980. when rare earth mineral mining and processing came under the purview of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and the international Atomic Energy Agency. Regulatory guidelines became increasingly restrictive, driving up costs, steadily decreasing U.S. production. By the early 1990s, the U.S. was no longer producing REEs.

RARE EARTH ELEMENTS AREN’T SO RARE AFTER ALL

Fortunately, REEs aren’t rare at all. In fact, they’re actually quite plentiful around the world, even in the United States. The 17 elements that are categorized as REEs have magnetic and conductive aspects and are typically unearthed as a result of mining operations, but most are present in only small amounts. There are few, if any, specific “rare earth elements” in nature, but most are present in only small amounts that are covered with what they call a siltite cap. But once they are exposed—and you can see this under the Grand Canyon experience—you walk over these breccia pipes. You walk over them. They are exposed naturally.

Don’t you think it is wise to remove these? It is a good concentration. It keeps the supply chain in.

And just for the record, we are not mining REEs. When it comes to processing REEs, we are walking all over it.

A REE SHORTAGE CRISIS?

But the costs of allowing China to gain the upper hand in the world’s supply of REEs are now becoming clear. If China does in fact restrict REE sales to the United States in the near future, it would certainly impact both the consumer product markets and the military.

The key question is, how long would it take to bridge the supply gap and find alternatives? The key factor is America’s nuclear power-plant fleet. The world’s only major rare-earth producer outside of China. It has partnered with Texas-based Blue Line to establish the United States’ only REE production facility, even after the United States still lacks any REE processing capacity, representing a critical and ongoing vulnerability in its military capabilities. But the news isn’t all bad. The Mountain Pass mine in California is currently being prepared to ramp up REE processing operations by 2020. Coincidentally, Mountain Pass is 90 percent owned by Molycorp, which had invested over $1.5 billion in the processing project, before being forced out of business by China in 2015. The critical role REEs play in both military and consumer products is impossible to overstate.

The U.S. economy is dependent on a steady and dependable supply. If America is to be successful in its bid to roll back China’s power and influence over the rest of the world, ensuring its own supply of strategic REEs is not just a necessity; it’s an imperative

Mr. GOSAR. Once again, let’s go back. Let’s look at the geology. The geology tells us everything that we need to know.

We need to understand the minerals. The minerals are water soluble. The minerals are condensed pipes, vertically. What is happening is that, as water runs—and this is a lot of sedimentary rock. That is why the environment is so deep. That is why it is deep. We have to look over these breccia pipes, like we have talked about, they are exposed naturally. Prior to that, they are covered with what they call a siltite cap. But once they are exposed—and you can see this under the Grand Canyon experience—you walk over these breccia pipes. You walk over them. They are exposed naturally.

Don’t you think it is wise to remove these? It is a good concentration. It keeps the supply chain in.

And just for the record, we are not mining REEs. When it comes to processing REEs, we are walking all over it.

That is what is wrong here.

Last, but not least, we also have to make sure that multiple-use is put down forward. We are stewards of that—we, as Congress.

Public lands were taken aside by the Federal Government from the States in a joint tenancy, that they would be vested properly for the best use, the best investment, and the best return.

The last time I have been watching, we have been actually denigrating that.

When is enough enough? Arizona has more national monuments than any other State in the country.

Congress then told the people that we will give payment in lieu of taxes. We have had to beg for every penny that we get. When is the contract is about, yes, you can do all this. You can clean up mine sites that were left before.

And don’t get me started on the Ben- nett Freeze, by the way. The Federal Government put an arbitrary line, that you can’t do anything under that Bennett Freeze line. Wow, that is wonderful. Thank the Federal Government for that. That is amazing, and particularly a lot of the mine shafts that have been exposed from that very era.

Once again, this is about common sense, facts. We have disputed everything that they have talked about.

This is a natural formation. It is millions of years old. As that water runs down, as that air runs down, we contaminant it with low levels of uranium. Wouldn’t it be better if we actually got rid of that and actually got better and more clean water, clean of uranium and arsenic?

That is an important process here.

That is where we are actually helping people out. People benefit from it.

Once again, here is a breccia pipe ex- posed, not by man but by nature. You are walking all over it.

Once again, you see this alluvial fan where water runs. What do you think it is running over? What do you think it is dripping down through? What do you think is dissolving out?

Madam Chair, this isn’t rocket science, but it is not an emotional one either. It is an articulated, scientific argument.

Once again, the mitigation, I could take somebody up here and nobody could find this mine site now. This is immediate resolution on it. But what is different about this than 80 years ago is that we are holding people accountable. The government failed at that before. We have seen this type of mitigation over and over again.

In the Resolution Copper mine down in southern Arizona, we have seen an investment of almost $1 billion by the mining company to mitigate a pre-existing area, which is beautiful. It is absolutely beautiful. I want people to go see it. I want them to try the water. It is pristine. It is cleaner than they found it.

That is good stewardship. That is utilizing the things that were given to us to make this country and technology grow. That is the opportunity that we have.

Arbitrarily just taking things off back and forth, that is not the right way to do.

Talking about the indigenous people there, well, it is sad when we use them as pawns, when we have a press conference and they don’t even know what they are coming to the press conference for. That is sad.

America needs to wake up. This has nothing to do with the Grand Canyon.

This has everything to do with monopolization and removing part of the segment that we promised future generations for. That is what we have done. That is what the other side wants to do.

There is a way forward, responsibly, clean, and proper.

Madam Chair, I would like to have all of my colleagues vote against this measure. Once again, the President issued a SAP that he will not sign the bill, and it will die in the Senate.

Once again, this is a messaging bill. It is sad that we are bombarding everyone with bad facts. Spend time looking at the facts. Geology, the rocks, set you free. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Since we are engaging in a little bit of a geology course, I would like to point out, at the Kanab North Uranium Mine that has already been closed, within 400 feet of the mine site where the fence is, after 20 years, levels are as high as 10 times above the naturally occurring level for contamination. This has been open and exposed for 20 years. The mine ceased operations in the 1990s.
I use that to say that, as far as I understand, the House of Representatives is a national legislature, and as a national legislature, we have responsibilities to deal with issues, regardless of whether it is in my particular district or in my colleague, Mr. GOSAR’s particular territory.

Over the course of the last couple of days, we have heard our Republican colleagues call this bill a number of things: a tired, old retread; a national security threat; a Federal land grab; an attack on science; and even an idle waste of time. I want to assure this Chamber and the American people that protecting the Grand Canyon is none of these characterizations.

The truth is, this bill is a critical safeguard for the Grand Canyon, one of the most iconic landscapes in the world, and the vital Colorado River watershed that supplies drinking water for communities throughout the Southwest.

Forty million people depend on that source. We just passed, overwhelmingly, the drought contingency plan for five States, including Arizona, because of the imminent threat of drought and the need to protect that river and that watershed source.

Most importantly, this bill is in response to Tribal communities that have experienced firsthand the toxic legacy of uranium mining. When I first got involved in this effort over a decade ago, it was because of narrow special interests. It was because the Navajo Nation, the Havasupai Tribe, the Hualapai Tribe, the Hopi Tribe, and other impacted communities were calling for an end to the contamination associated with uranium mining.

These communities have lived on the land since time immemorial. Their interests go beyond the handful of jobs associated with the boom and bust cycle of the mining industry.

Historically, communities in the Southwest have borne the brunt of uranium mining’s impact, with some estimates placing over 1,000 abandoned uranium mines and four mills on the Navajo Nation alone.

In 2008, health officials discovered that nearly 30 water sources in the Navajo Nation contained unsafe levels of uranium, and 27 percent of the residents tested positive for high levels of uranium.

The Navajos are not alone. In fact, the Havasupai, who live in the Grand Canyon and depend on the aquifer beneath the Colorado Plateau, are dealing with contaminated groundwater associated with the active discharge by the Canyon Mine. This is why several Havasupai Tribal leaders and members traveled to Washington, D.C., to be present for this vote.

This bill is about protecting these communities. It is about providing lasting protection for a sacred landscape.

The consequences of uranium mining are not some imagined or unproven threat. We are forcing communities to contemplate the viability of their ancestral homes.

The United States has an obligation to protect Tribal communities and ensure that they prosper. We have a moral obligation to protect our most sacred and treasured public lands. We shouldn’t need to be motivated to remind us to do the right thing.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to stand with the Havasupai and other affiliated Tribes to protect the Grand Canyon for future generations.

A “yes” vote today on the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act is, overall, a declaration that there are places and communities in which extraction and destruction of a landscape, a paralyzing people’s health and their welfare and generational advancement, that those places should be left alone.

The Grand Canyon should be left alone. It is, after all, the Grand Canyon. I urge even adoption of H.R. 1277, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I include in the RECORD this document.

It is titled “Why I Changed My Mind About Nuclear Power.”

It details very clearly and wisely why nuclear power and its supply chains are very important.

(From Environmental Progress, September 12, 2019)

WHY I CHANGED MY MIND ABOUT NUCLEAR POWER: TRANSCRIPT OF MICHAEL SHELLENBERGER’S TEDX BERLIN 2017—NOVEMBER 21, 2017

(By Michael Shellenberger)

Like a lot of kids born in the early 1970s, I had the good fortune to be raised by hippies. One of my childhood heroes was Stewart Brand. Stewart is not only one of the first modern environmentalists of the 1960s and 70s. As a young boy, one of my favorite memories is playing cooperative games that Stewart Brand invented as an antidote to the Vietnam War.

I’m from a long line of Christian Pacificists known as Mennonites. Every August, as kids, we would be dragged to an open government’s atomic bombing of Japan by lighting candles and sending them on paper boats at Bitterroot Park.

After high school, throughout college, and afterwards, I brought delegations of people to Central America to promote diplomacy and peace and to support local farmer cooperatives in Guatemala and Nicaragua.

Over time, as I’ve travelled around the world and visited small farming communities on every continent, I’ve come to appreciate that most young people don’t want to be stuck in the village. They don’t want to spend their whole lives chopping and hauling wood. They want to go to the city for opportunity—at least most of them do—for education and for work.

What I’ve realized is that process of urbanization of moving to the city is actually very positive for nature. It allows the natural environment to come back. It allows for the central African Mountain Gorilla, an important ecosystem in Africa, to preserve the habitat they need to survive and thrive.

In that process you have to go vertical, and so even in places like Hong Kong you can see there that business can spare the natural environment around the city.

Of course, it takes a huge amount of energy to go up, and so the big question of our time is how do you get plentiful, reliable electricity without destroying the climate? Stewart Brand said it was possible, and I quickly got involved in advocating for renewable energy. In the early part of this century I helped to start a labor union and a green alliance called the Apollo Alliance and we pushed for a big investment in clean energy: solar, wind, electric cars. The investment idea was eventually picked up by President Obama and during his time in office we invested about $150 billion to make solar, wind and electric cars much cheaper than they were.

It seemed to be having a lot of success but we were starting to have some challenges. Some of them you’re familiar with. Solar and wind generate electricity in Germany just 10 to 30 percent of the time, and so we’re dependent on the weather for electricity.

There were other problems we were noticing, sometimes. These energy sources generate too much power and while you hear a lot of hype about batteries we don’t have sufficient storage even in California, where we have a lot of investment in solar and a lot of Silicon Valley types putting a lot of investment in battery and other storage technologies.

While we were struggling with these problems Stewart Brand came out in 2006 and said we should rethink nuclear power. This was a shock to the system for me and my friends. Stewart was one of the first big advocates of solar energy anywhere during the early 70s. He advised Governor Jerry Brown of California.

But he said, look, we’ve been trying to do solar for a long time and yet we get less than a half of a percent of our electricity globally from solar, about two percent from wind, and the majority of our clean energy comes from nuclear and hydro.

And according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, nuclear produces four times less carbon emissions than solar does. That’s why they recommended in their recent report the more intensive use of renewables, nuclear and carbon capture and storage.

Let’s take a closer look at Germany. Germany gets the majority of its electricity and all of its transportation fuels from fossil fuel. Last year Germany generated 12 percent of its electricity from coal, 13 percent from nuclear, 12 percent from natural gas, 12 percent from wind, and six percent from solar.

We have a mind that thinks if something can go from 18 percent solar and wind to 100 percent solar and wind. To replace the entire transportation sector with electric cars you’d need to go from 18 percent renewables to something like 150 percent. Germany’s done a lot to invest in renewables and innovate with solar and wind, but that’s a pretty steep climb—even before you get to the question of storage.

Let’s look at last year, Germany installed four percent more solar panels but generated three percent less electricity.

Even when I’m in meetings with energy experts and I ask people if they can make a guess as to why they think that is, and you’d be bombarded by how many energy experts have no idea.

The reason is just that it wasn’t very sunny last year in Germany.

Well, that probably meant that it was windier, right? Because if it’s not as sunny then maybe there’s more wind and those things can balance each other.

In truth, Germany installed 11 percent more wind turbines in 2016 but got two percent less of its electricity from wind. Same story just not yet evident.

So then you might think, “Well, we just need to do a lot of solar and wind so that...”
when there’s not a lot of sunlight or wind we can get more electricity from those energy sources.”

That’s what Germany is trying to do. Its plan to increase the amount of wind and solar electricity it gets from solar by 50 percent by 2030, which would take you from 40 to 60 gigawatts.

But, if you have a year like 2016, you’ll still only be getting nine percent of your total electricity from solar. And this is the biggest solar country in the world. Germany is the powerhouse of renewables.

The obvious response is we’ll just put it all in batteries. We hear so much talk about batteries. You would think that we just have a huge amount of storage.

Environmental Progress took a look at our home state of California and we discovered that we have just 23 minutes of storage for the grid—and to get that 23 minutes you’d have to use every battery in every car and truck in the state. (Which, as you can imagine, is not super practical if you’re trying to get somewhere. And Germany might be a little different but not very different from California.)

Most people are aware that to make this transition to renewables, Germany has been spending a lot more on electricity. And German electricity prices rose about 50 percent over the last 10 years. Today, German electricity is about two times more expensive than electricity is in France.

You might think, look, that’s a small price to pay for carbon change. And I would agree with that. Paying a bit more for energy—at least for those of us in the rich world—is a decent thing to do to avert the risk of catastrophic global warming.

But when you compare French and German electricity, France gets 93 percent of its electricity from clean energy sources, mostly hydro and nuclear energy. Germany gets 34 percent. That’s an increase of 60 percent.

Here’s the shocking thing: German carbon emissions have gone up since 2009, and up over the last two years, and may go up again this year. And while German emissions have gone down since the 1990s, most of that is because, after reunification, Germany closed the inefficient coal plants from East Germany. Most of its emissions reductions are just going to be smoke gone.

Let’s look at last year. One of the ways you can reduce emissions quickly is by switching from coal to natural gas, which produces a lot less carbon dioxide. If gas switching would have resulted in lower emissions except for the fact that Germany took nuclear reactors offline. And when it did that, emissions went up again.

There’s still question about the future: if we do a lot of solar and wind, won’t it all work itself out?

One of the biggest challenges to solar and wind has come from somebody in Germany who is not a pro-nuclear person at all. He’s an energy analyst and economist named Leon Hirth. What he showed is that the problem I described earlier—where you have too much solar or wind and you don’t know what to do with it—reduces their economic value.

The value of wind drops 40 percent once it gets to just 15 percent.

One of the things you hear is that we can do a solar roof fast—just one day to put up the thing—which takes five or ten years to build. And so people think that if we do solar and wind we can go a lot faster.

But the speed of deployment was the subject of an important article in the journal Science last year, which was coauthored by the climate scientist James Hansen. They found that even when you combine solar and wind you just get a lot less energy than when you do nuclear. That goes for Germany as well as the United States. They just compared old age to the two technologies and it’s a stark comparison.

Well, I can tell you what you’re thinking, because it’s what I was thinking: it sounds like this is an argument against nuclear power. But what about Chernobyl? What about Fukushima? What about all the nuclear waste? Those are really reasonable questions to ask.

When I was starting to ask them, there were other people who were starting to change their minds. One of the ones I was most impressed by was George Monbiot, who was very influential, was Gerald Thomas.

Monbiot wrote a column shortly after Fukushima where he went through the scientific research on radiation and concluded, “The anti-nuclear movement to which I once belonged has misled the world about the impacts of radiation on human health.”

I write some pretty harsh things sometimes, but this was a pretty strong column. He was talking to a lot of scientists who study radiation.

One top British scientist who studies radiation is Gerry Thomas. She started something called the Chernobyl Tissue Bank out of a government lab. The lab’s been done by a totally independent professor of pathology at Imperial College in London.

I called her and said, “I’d like to present on the science behind this, but I’m not a radiation scientist, so can I just steal your slides? If you let me, I’ll put my picture on them.”

The first thing she points out is that most ionizing radiation—that’s the kind of radiation that is potentially harmful that comes from a nuclear accident.

What’s striking is that the total amount of radiation we’re exposed not just from Chernobyl and Fukushima but all of the atomic bomb testing in the sixties and seventies totals just 0.3 percent. Most of the radiation we’re exposed to is electricity and the buildings around us. When they flew counters now.

The United Nations has overseen these very large research efforts involving hundreds of scientists around the world who do this research. So the possibility of somebody fudging the data or covering something up is pretty low in that environment, because there are so many more scientists at different universities doing the research.

This was a pivotal moment for me. Chernobyl is the worst nuclear accident we’ve ever had—so it’s the worst accident we’ll ever have. I don’t need to make a statement that strong. But they literally had a nuclear reactor without a containment dome and it was on fire. It was just raining radiation down on everybody. It was a terrible accident.

But when they start counting bodies, what do you do? They found that even when you combine solar and wind you just get a lot less energy than when you do nuclear. That goes for Germany as well as the United States. They just compared old age to the two technologies and it’s a stark comparison.

One of the things you hear is that we can do a solar roof fast—just one day to put up the thing—which takes five or ten years to build. And so people think that if we do solar and wind we can go a lot faster.

But the speed of deployment was the subject of an important article in the journal Science last year, which was coauthored by the climate scientist James Hansen. They found that even when you combine solar and wind you just get a lot less energy than when you do nuclear. That goes for Germany as well as the United States. They just compared old age to the two technologies and it’s a stark comparison.

Well, I can tell you what you’re thinking, because it’s what I was thinking: it sounds like this is an argument against nuclear power. But what about Chernobyl? What about Fukushima? What about all the nuclear waste? Those are really reasonable questions to ask.

When I was starting to ask them, there were other people who were starting to change their minds. One of the ones I was most impressed by was George Monbiot, who was very influential, was Gerald Thomas.

Monbiot wrote a column shortly after Fukushima where he went through the scientific research on radiation and concluded, “The anti-nuclear movement to which I once belonged has misled the world about the impacts of radiation on human health.”

I write some pretty harsh things sometimes, but this was a pretty strong column. He was talking to a lot of scientists who study radiation.

One top British scientist who studies radiation is Gerry Thomas. She started something called the Chernobyl Tissue Bank out of a government lab. The lab’s been done by a totally independent professor of pathology at Imperial College in London.

I called her and said, “I’d like to present on the science behind this, but I’m not a radiation scientist, so can I just steal your slides? If you let me, I’ll put my picture on them.”

The first thing she points out is that most ionizing radiation—that’s the kind of radiation that is potentially harmful that comes from a nuclear accident.

What’s striking is that the total amount of radiation we’re exposed not just from Chernobyl and Fukushima but all of the atomic bomb testing in the sixties and seventies totals just 0.3 percent. Most of the radiation we’re exposed to is electricity and the buildings around us. When they flew counters now.

The United Nations has overseen these very large research efforts involving hundreds of scientists around the world who do this research. So the possibility of somebody fudging the data or covering something up is pretty low in that environment, because there are so many more scientists at different universities doing the research.

This was a pivotal moment for me. Chernobyl is the worst nuclear accident we’ve ever had—so it’s the worst accident we’ll ever have. I don’t need to make a statement that strong. But they literally had a nuclear reactor without a containment dome and it was on fire. It was just raining radiation down on everybody. It was a terrible accident.

But when they start counting bodies, what do you do? They found that even when you combine solar and wind you just get a lot less energy than when you do nuclear. That goes for Germany as well as the United States. They just compared old age to the two technologies and it’s a stark comparison.
and the evidence against particulate matter only gets stronger. That's why every major journal that looks at it concludes that nuclear is the safest way to make reliable electricity.

All of this leads to an uncomfortable conclusion—one that the climate scientist James Hansen came to recently: nuclear power saved 1.6 million lives. That's not something you hear very much about.

What about the waste? This is the waste from a nuclear plant in the United States. The thing about nuclear waste is that it's the only waste from electricity production that isn't safely contained anywhere. All of the other waste forms go into the environment including from coal, natural gas and—here's another uncomfortable conclusion—solar panels.

There's a trend to recycle solar panels outside of the EU. That means that all of our solar in California will join the waste stream. And that waste contains heavy toxic metals like chromium, cadmium, and lead.

So how much toxic solar waste is there? Well, to get a sense for that, look at how much coal and nuclear waste is required to produce energy from solar and wind compared to nuclear. As a result, solar actually produces 200 to 300 times more toxic waste than nuclear.

What about weapons? If there were any chance that more nuclear energy increased the risk of nuclear war, I would be against it. I believe that diplomacy is almost always the right solution.

People say what about North Korea? Korea proves the point. In order to get nuclear power—and it's been this way for 50 years—you have to agree not to get a weapon. That's the deal.

South Korea wanted nuclear power. They agreed not to get a weapon. They don't have a weapon.

North Korea wanted nuclear power. I think they should have gotten it. We didn't let them have it, for a variety of reasons. They got a bomb. They are testing missiles that can hit Japan and soon will be able to hit California.

So if you're looking for evidence that nuclear energy leads to bombs you can't find it in Korea or anywhere else.

Where does that leave us? With some more uncomfortable facts. Like if Germany hadn't closed its nuclear plants, it's emissions would be 43 percent lower than they are today. What about climate change, that's something you at least have to wrestle with—especially in light of the facts I've presented on the health impacts of different energy sources.

I'd like to close with a quote from someone else who changed his mind about nuclear power, and somebody else who wrote a huge childhood hero for me, and that's Sting:

"If we're going to tackle global warming, nuclear power is the only way to generate massive amounts of power."

Thank you for listening.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The motion is agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. MCCOLLUM) having assumed the chair, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having considered and amended the bill (H.R. 1373) to protect, for current and future generations, the watershed, ecosystem, and cultural heritage of the Grand Canyon region in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 25 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. Torres of California) at 2 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.

GRAND CANYON CENTENNIAL PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 656 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 1373.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Cuellar) kindly take the chair.

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 1373) to protect, for current and future generations, the watershed, ecosystem, and cultural heritage of the Grand Canyon region in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, with Mr. Cuellar (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting Chair (Mr. Cuellar) kindly take the chair.

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

It shall be in order in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendments under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 1373

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 "Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act."

SEC. 2. WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND IN THE STATE OF ARIZONA.

(a) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this Act, the term "Map" means the map prepared by the Bureau of Land Management entitled "Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act" and dated July 11, 2019.
of jobs and $29 billion in economic activity.

We should not entertain any withdrawal without confirmation that this bill will not adversely affect jobs, particularly for Native Americans, minorities, and women.

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

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is not a good faith effort to protect Native communities, minorities, or women. It is simply a “gotcha” amendment intended to kill the bill.

It is truly insulting that our colleagues across the aisle would try and use Native communities as pawns to kill this proposal, knowing full well that Native people have too often had to bear the brunt of uranium’s toxic impacts.

On the Navajo Nation, there are hundreds of abandoned uranium mines waiting to be cleaned up. These toxic sites pollute water and damage public health. A recent study found dozens of contaminated water sources on the Navajo Nation, and nearly one-quarter of the residents had elevated uranium levels in their health screenings.

The Havasupai fear this same danger for their community. They live downstream of the Canyon Mine and of other proposed mines, and they worry that they, too, will be forced to bear that toxic burden.

That is why the Havasupai, the Navajo Nation, the National Congress of American Indians, and the Inter Tribal Association of Arizona, along with other regional Tribes, all support a permanent withdrawal.

These indigenous voices are not props at a press conference. They are not qualt or docile. They are smart and passionate advocates for their people, for the situation now, and, more importantly, for future generations to come. They deserve our respect. Anything less, I think, crosses a line.

Republicans aren’t lifting these Native voices. They are ignoring Native voices and threatening the continued health of Native communities to score some cheap political points.

This amendment won’t help Native communities. It will kill the very protections they are asking this Congress to enact.

Mining is not, and will never again be, the future of job creation in that part of Arizona, and that is especially true for women and minority communities.

During the extensive, multiyear analysis and public comment process that went into the original withdrawal, the administration reviewed job opportunities in the region. They found that mining could likely support 296 direct jobs—296 jobs. This is in contrast to nearly 12,000 jobs directly supported by Grand Canyon National Park, all of which rely on a healthy, uranium-free Grand Canyon.

If we are serious about job growth in this part of Arizona, we need to be talking about how we can better support our outdoor recreation and tourism sectors—what would help all the communities in that area.

Mining, in particular, is not a field known for its diversity. In 2018, less than 14 percent of all workers in mining, quarrying, and extraction were women, and less than 13 percent were minorities.

Meanwhile, the outdoor rec industry is making a major push to diversify, developing outreach programs and pipelines to bring people of color and women into that space.

There really isn’t much of a comparison here.

Mr. Chairman, if you still aren’t sure if this amendment was made in good faith, I would point out the original sponsor’s voting record.

The original sponsor voted against the Violence Against Women Act, in which an amendment therein contained a particular focus on missing and murdered indigenous women throughout this country.

She voted against the Equality Act. She voted against the Carcieri fix, one of the most important votes in this Chamber to protect Tribal sovereignty.

The Democratic Caucus has offered numerous opportunities to champion the causes of Native Americans, women, and people of color. The original sponsor and many of her colleagues have declined those opportunities.

I am more than happy to work with any of my colleagues to uplift traditionally underrepresented voices, but this amendment is not a legitimate attempt to do so. It is simply an attempt to weaponize the communities that our party has worked so hard to protect.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “no” vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, once again, my points have been made.

This is a good amendment because what it does is it looks at the overall application to make sure that we are not blindsiding our Native Americans.

There is hardly consensus whatsoever. We heard from numerous groups over and over again that they do not agree with this bill.

In fact, when the gentleman from Arizona on the other side actually had a press conference, they gathered leaders, and the leaders had no idea what they were there for the press conference with.

Once again, as I asked previously what mine would the gentleman from
Arizona on the other side actually endorse, the answer was crickets.

That tells you who he is playing for. It is not for Native Americans.

Maybe it is the Sierra Club. Maybe it is The Wilderness Society. And I wonder if they get any of their payments from China and Russia. I wonder if there is a collaboration here.

Once again this is a great amendment. It talks about empowering people with jobs, holding their dignity, and directing the aspects of their life. That is what is invigorating about America. Victimization does none of that. I ask all my colleagues to vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part C of House Report 116–264.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

SEC. 3. APPLICATION.

The withdrawal under section 2 of this Act shall not apply to any Federal land depicted on the Map as “Federal Mineral Estate to be Withdrawn” located in the 4th Congressional District of Arizona, as configured on the date of enactment of this Act.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, 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 yield myself such time as I may consume.

What this amendment basically does is, it takes my district out of this withdrawal. Seventy percent of the active mine sites and proposed mine sites are in my district, and we want to make sure that we are not victimized, that we are taken out of this withdrawal area.

This body actually had rules that they tried to follow that they didn’t usurp Members’ districts, they worked with those Members’ districts. And with that, I would ask that we endorse that and withdraw my district from this withdrawal.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.
 tourisms; Now, therefore, be it
without promised economic benefits from
severe economic harm to local communities
detrimental to our local economy and cause
capable of supplying defense and energy
have abundant in-ground uranium resources,
demonstrably improved and safe;
tive American and local populations and are
ing the Cold War era uranium boom of the
ntion techniques are vastly superior to those
Park itself;
tivities outside the Grand Canyon National
in mining claim payments and fees to local
governments in Arizona and Utah, and over
$30 billion over a 42 year life span, helping to
in mining claim payments and fees to local
of more uranium mining near the Arizona
major economic potential with the opening
southwest has historically been a major eco-
ations area, totaling 300,000 acres of designated BLM and 800,000
Acres of National Forest Wilderness areas
while releasing lands with high potential for
mineral extraction and livestock grazing and
recreational purposes;
Whereas, the uranium industry in the
southeast has historically been a major eco-
nomic driver for Mohave County, the
Gila County in our neighboring State of Utah could see
major economic potential with the opening of
more uranium mining near the Arizona Strip. This area can bring in
over $40 million annually in payroll, $9.5 million in mining claim payments and fees to local
governments in Arizona and Utah, and over
$30 billion over a 42 year life span, helping to
finance local schools, roads, hospitals, and
other infrastructure;
Whereas, Congressman Raúl Grijalva has
introduced H.R. 1373, titled the Grand Can-
yon Centennial Protection Act that aims to
make permanent the 2012 uranium mining ban along with including a mining ban on any land in the
Arizona Strip area acquired by the United States after enactment of the bill;
Whereas, H.R. 1373 is very misguided with its
title. Since the 1984 Compromise there has been
no mining allowed within BLM Wilder-
ness areas or within the Grand Canyon
National Park itself;
Whereas, the Government’s own Draft En-
vironmental Impact Statement stated that
there is no evidence to show that mining ac-
tivities outside the Grand Canyon National
Park will pose a risk to areas within the Col-
rado River drainage or inside the National
Park itself;
Whereas, Modern mining industry reclama-
tion techniques are vastly superior to those
used by the United States government during
the Cold War era uranium boom of the
1950 and 1960s, which did bring harm to Na-
tive American and local populations and are
demonstrably improved and safe;
Whereas, Arizona and neighboring Utah have abundant in-ground uranium resources, considered
as incredible underground uranium infrastruc-
ture, and large numbers of qualified workers
capable of supplying defense and energy
needs to the United States;
Whereas, the permanent ban of uranium mining in the Arizona Strip area would be
detrimental to our local economy and cause
severe economic harm to local communities
without promised economic benefits from
tourism; Now, therefore, be it
Resolved, by the Mohave County Board of
Supervisors and Gila County, enemy to the
opposes H.R 1373 and any attempt to make
permanent the 2012 Uranium Mining Ban in the Arizona Strip area of Mohave County.
Adopted on this 17th day of June, 2019
By the Mohave County Board of Supervisors: HILDY ANGUI
Chairman;
ATTEST:
GINNY ANDERSON,
Clerk of the Board.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, let’s go back through this. You know, we have heard
all about the health implications, but rocks set you free.
Once again, we look at these breccia pipes that are outlined in this yellow
sheet that shows the most con-
centrated parts of this. What ends up
happening is you see them dissolve in
water and in air.
And so when you look at the Grand Canyon, you are seeing this seepage
that comes into the Grand Canyon watershed naturally. What we are actu-
adly doing is cleaning this up. Wouldn’t that be amazing, amazing that we are
actually interceding on the best behav-
ior and the best acknowledgements of
people around there? Amazing.
And I would hardly call this a problem.
In fact, immediate restoration of
these lands is impeccable. Yes, we have
this negative connotation about what
the past has done. But this is where
history and our new technology actu-
adly intercede, where we are actually
intervening on this, making and improving
the landscape. That is amaz-
ning. That is absolutely amazing.
Once again, this is untouched. Man
is not here. This is what nature has
done all along. Once again, you have an
exposed breccia pipe. You have a ravine
that carries water that sheets off. Once
again, by taking that out, taking that
breccia pipe out, it facilitates perme-
ation down into lower aquifers repen-
trating those water flows that we have actu-
al have. It is amazing what the
rocks do. They set you free.
And my district has said, listen, ex-
clude us from this overreach by the
Federal Government. The Federal Gov-
ernment has hardly been a champion in
goodness to Native Americans and people
in this area. We rule by fiat and scare
people.
Once again, this is a good bill. We
want to be excluded from this with-
drawal. I would hope that
everybody would listen to the people from
my dist-
Mr. Chairman, I ask for everybody to
vote for this amendment, and I yield
back the balance of my time.
Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I
yield myself the balance of my time in
opposition to the amendment.
As I said earlier, I think we keep for-
getting the essence of what we are
talking about here today. And the es-
setlement of environmental policy that is recognized nationally, not only
as an environmental icon, but the de-
pendency that 40 million people have
on the water of the Grand Canyon. And
while we want to minimize this, the re-
ality is that the history tells us and
current research and health studies tell us of the im-
 pact that Native communities have
suffered because of uranium contami-
nation in their water, in their air, and
in their land. Those are reasons enough
to put aside a very special place and
preserve this as an environmental
icon, but the depen-
dency is that recognized nationally, not only
as an environmental icon, but the de-
dendency that 40 million people have
on the water of the Grand Canyon. And
while we want to minimize this, the re-
ality is that the history tells us and
current research and health studies tell us of the im-
 pact that Native communities have
suffered because of uranium contami-
nation in their water, in their air, and
in their land. Those are reasons enough
to put aside a very special place and
permanent impact on Native communi-
ties; Now, therefore, be it
AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR
The Acting CHAIR. The Acting CHAIR. The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to
clause 6 of rule XVIII, further pro-
ceeding on the amendment offered by the
genleman from Arizona will be postponed.

GINNY ANDERSON, Clerk of the Board.
This legislation would expand the withdrawal area and also expand the mineral withdrawal in the withdrawal area to include oil and gas leasing, geothermal leasing, and other mineral development in addition to mining.

Mr. Chairman, there are rare earths and other minerals in the region, including copper and uranium, in this area. There is also a great amount of geothermal potential. We should at least know all the minerals and resources potential in this million-acre area before we stupidly lock it up. This just requires mapping and surveying of the targeted areas for the withdrawal.

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

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, this amendment would allow Secretary Bernhardt to kill this proposal in pursuit of information we already have.

My colleagues across the aisle continually allude to the lack of information we have about this region, the lack of study, and the lack of science. They seem to ignore the extensive, multiyear study that preceded the current withdrawal.

That study looked at local economies. It reviewed the best available science. It took into account public comments. It considered how uranium mining might impact the Grand Canyon region.

In the end, the review produced a 1,500-page environmental impact report outlining, in detail, the rationales for different actions. Within the report, there was a detailed analysis considering other mineral resources in the region, the very study the gentleman is now trying to predicate the withdrawal on.

The study did, indeed, find there were a handful of other mineral resources in the region, but the study also made clear that these elements were secondary to uranium and that they occurred in quantities insufficient to drive mine development. This is why, when you look at mineral claims in the withdrawal area, they are almost all for uranium.

We know uranium is the primary resource here, and we know the major threat that uranium poses to clean water, to public health, and to the Grand Canyon itself.

Uranium mines have polluted ground water and destroyed many communities across the Southwest. The landscape is littered with abandoned mine sites.

We only need to consider Kanab Creek Uranium Mine. It sits on the edge of the Grand Canyon and has been offline for years, yet virtually no remediation has been done. You can see the site is still covered in waste rock, uranium ore tailings, and pond sludge. This toxic waste is exposed to the environment, escaping beyond the mine, infiltrating the soil, and elevating local uranium levels.

This mine is only one of hundreds of closed mines awaiting remediation. Industry likes to pretend like practices have changed, but they provide no assurances that they will do anything but despoil the land and leave taxpayers with the cost.

Despite protests from the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), we know what these resources are, and we know what the threats are to this region.

We don't need a study to tell us that we shouldn't be mining in the Grand Canyon, and we certainly should not let misinformation and rhetoric points kill this bill.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this, take a Geiger counter, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, this is a typical backdoor pipe, and you are seeing the collapsing of the geological formations. What is interesting about that is that it concentrates different minerals there, not just uranium. Copper, vanadium, there are a number of things that have all of a sudden become very critical in our technology sector.

That is an important application here, and we want to make sure that we are studying that properly.

Now, if we are talking about the reclamation process, well, here we go. Yes, 80 years ago, we didn't claim mines right. We didn't ask them to be bonded. We didn't go back and investigate them for mitigation.

This is what American mining actually does. It takes what they need; it returns it. And I would be very interested in having a Geiger counter to check this versus this when it started. I wonder if there is an improvement.

Deja vu? It is. So, once again, the arguments are bland. They are fraudulent. In this aspect, we show mitigation.

What can we do when we have a mine site like this is we can actually leverage them and say: Listen, in order to do this, we need you to mitigate some of these other mining sites.

It has been something that our side has proposed nonstop, but the other side refuses to let that happen because, they claim, that it is not going to be up to standard. That tells you people are scared of their own laws.

This looks pretty good to me. When I look at the mitigation aspects and what is here and available, that is for the common cause for the American people. It is an investment. You are not doing someone a disservice unless you know exactly what you have for today and the future.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to vote for this amendment. It is smart. It is critical and, from that standpoint, empowering everybody to vote "yes" on the amendment.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, in closing, and in opposition to the amendment, in July, the President formed a nuclear working group, the Nuclear Fuel Working Group, essentially to deal with the questions coming from the uranium mining industry, in particular, Energy Fuels and Ur-Energy.

The issue there was an attempt to try to defend the indefensible in trying to open up the Grand Canyon once more, looking at lifting the moratorium on uranium mining in the region, basing the legislation before us is based on acts that the administration has taken at this point.

One should note that Secretary Bernhardt represented Ur-Energy USA from 2009 to 2012. My point is that enough advocates exist for the mining industry as we stand.

What we are asking, in defeat of this amendment, is that the public interest has some advocates, and that Members of this body can take care of the public interest and not the profit interests that seem to be driving any decisions around mining and particularly uranium mining.

The public interest is the public health, the Grand Canyon, the water supply for 40 million people, and the Tribes and indigenous people and communities that exist there that have been for decades upon decades coming to this Congress, coming to their leadership, asking for support and relief. This bill begins to provide both.

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

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

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

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. TONKO) having assumed the chair, Mr. CUELLAR, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole on the State of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 1373) to protect, for current and future generations, the watershed, ecosystem, and cultural heritage of the Grand Canyon region in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.
may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to insert extraneous material on H.R. 2181.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New Mexico? There is no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 656 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. 2181.

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

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. 2181) to provide for the withdrawal and protection of certain Federal land in the State of New Mexico, with Mr. CUELLAR in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill. The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is on the first reading.

General debate shall be confined to the bill and amendments specified in section 3 of House Resolution 656 and shall not exceed 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

The gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. HAALAND) and the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

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

Mr. Chair, Du hino-meh. Idza dyu-que-da. Swiwin Hanu. My name is DEBRA HAALAND. I am from the Turquoise Clan and an enrolled member of the Laguna Pueblo. I wish to acknowledge that we are on Indian land, and I humbly ask to speak on this important bill.

Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act.

First, Mr. Chair, I would like to thank my colleagues, Assistant Speaker BEN RAY LujAN, Senator TOM UDALL, and Senator MARTIN HEINRICH for their tireless work on this important legislation.

This proposal, sponsored by my good friend and fellow New Mexico Representative, Mr. LujAN, would protect the cultural resources at Chaco Culture National Historical Park, as well as New Mexico’s clean air, from the impact of oil and gas extraction.

This bill would withdraw land in a 10-mile buffer zone around Chaco Culture National Historical Park to protect that site and the region’s undiscovered resources from the impacts of further oil and gas extraction.

Chaco Canyon and the greater Chaco region have been home to my people for centuries. As a 5th generation New Mexican and a descendant of the indigenous inhabitants of what is now the Southwest United States, I can say that there are few places more exceptional than the Chaco region. Over hundreds of years, my ancestors engineered and constructed massive multi-story structures at Chaco Canyon that became the ceremonial, administrative, and economic center of the region.

It is a certified International Dark Sky Park, where visitors can gaze at the same dark sky with myriad stars that my ancestors did over 1,000 years ago.

These sites and the objects they contain tell the history of my people and connect us to our past.

The Indian Pueblos and the Navajo Nation still have intimate connections with the greater Chaco region, recognizing the area as a spiritual place to be honored and respected.

This Congressional Resources Committee has heard from the leaders of four Pueblo nations, the All Pueblo Council of Governors, elected leaders of the Navajo Nation, the National Congress of American Indians, senior officials in Tribal and Pueblo governments, and a plethora of Americans, all of whom support H.R. 2181.

The entire New Mexico Congressional Delegation and the Governor of our State support H.R. 2181.

This bill enjoys broad support on the ground and bipartisan support here in this Chamber because protecting indigenous cultural resources, protecting Chaco Canyon, should not be a partisan issue.

This proposal is about respecting our history and protecting our culture. We owe it to Tribal communities, to the people of New Mexico, and to people around the world to permanently protect the Chaco region.

Earlier this year, I traveled to the Chaco Culture National Historical Park with several of my colleagues. While in New Mexico, we had the opportunity to use infrared cameras to watch plumes of methane and pollution spewing from oil and gas operations, creating a toxic cloud the size of Delaware that hangs over the skies of northwestern New Mexico.

Ninety percent of the Federal lands in this region are already open to oil and gas extraction, and New Mexicans are all too familiar with the toxic impacts it has on clean air, clean water, their health, and the health of their children.

When you are out there watching the methane plumes and experiencing the dust, the noise, the light pollution and their impacts, it is easy to see why oil and gas extraction does not belong next to a sacred ancestral site of the Pueblo people.

If you don’t believe me, you can ask Interior Secretary Bernhardt. When he visited Chaco Canyon earlier this year with Senator MARTIN HEINRICH, he definitely was struck by the significance of the park because he committed to a 1-year moratorium on drilling around Chaco Canyon to allow Congress to act on proposals like the one before us today.

I thank the Secretary for his efforts, but 1 year is not enough protection for a site that holds centuries of history and culture. That is why I ask you all to support Chaco Canyon today, to support the Pueblo people, the Navajo Nation, and the people of New Mexico by voting in favor of H.R. 2181.

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

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

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2181. Mr. Chairman, this is yet another piece of legislation advanced by my colleagues on behalf of the radical environmental movement. This bill will unilaterally lock up oil and gas development on 316,000 acres of federally owned land in New Mexico.

The Department of the Interior is in the process of drafting a resource management plan for this area, but this process is still under review and the resource management plan has yet to be released. This bill would permanently ban all energy development in the area before we know all the facts and before a science-based environmental review is completed.

Decisions made in Washington regarding how to manage federally owned land have implications beyond the borders of the acreage in question. Those who own land or operate businesses near federally owned parcels are oftentimes significantly impacted by poor management decisions made by the Federal bureaucrats who do not live there or understand the needs of the rural Western communities.

Similarly, my colleagues claim that this bill will do no harm to those who own lands and mineral rights in the surrounding area, but this bill could mean millions in lost revenue for those who own lands along the proposed withdrawal boundary.

While it is technically true that the acreage off limits to development under this bill is federally owned, there are lands located throughout the withdrawal area that are privately owned by the members of the Navajo Nation. Take a look at this map, anything you see in this purple area—particularly in this area is what we are talking about—is owned by the Navajo allottees. So when you are looking at the expansion of this park, it impinges access to that.

Now, as you see, the Navajo-owned lands and minerals are scattered throughout and are located outside the withdrawal area. But if these lands are unavailable for development, they become restricted and further cut off from access points and from development opportunities. If the neighboring land can never be developed, as required under this bill, the economic
value of these private minerals is diminished and the Navajo owners will have a harder time attracting investments on their land.

Once again, you see the skirting all the way through this area, particularly in this band alongside there, so access is critical.

We heard testimony to this fact in the Natural Resources Committee this summer. Ms. Delora Hesuse testified in opposition to this bill, stating: "Our voices as allotted landowners are being silenced by environmentalists claiming to speak for all of us. These lands were given to our great-great-grandparents in exchange for citizenship, and we have rights as citizens and landowners to develop our lands for oil and gas as we see fit."

She continued: "If BLM lands are withdrawn around our allotments, that means oil and gas companies cannot access our lands, because they won't be able to access the Federal lands." Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD her testimony.

DELORA HESUSE, NAVAZO INDIAN ALLOTTEE, NAGEEZYI CHAPTER

TESTIMONY BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES, SUBCOMMITTEE ON NATIONAL PARKS, FORESTS AND PUBLIC LANDS

LEGISLATIVE HEARING ON H.R. 2186 CHACO CULTURAL HERITAGE AREA PROTECTION ACT—JUNE 5, 2019

Chairwoman Haaland, Ranking Member Young, and members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to bring voice to those Navajo tribal members who are being forgotten with this bill—Indian allottees.

I am Delora Hesuse, a citizen of the Navajo Nation, Nageezi Chapter. My chapter is in the Greater Chaco region and near the Chaco Culture National Historic Park. My grandmother was a Councilwoman for the Nageezi chapter for eight years, and my father was a Navajo Nation Council Delegate for the Nageezi chapter for many years.

Many people do not understand our Native American heritage and the fact that many individual Navajo Nation members such as I own private mineral rights under the Navajo Nation. I have the right to develop, produce and profit from those minerals. A Navajo allotment is a parcel of land granted to a Navajo person that is under the ownership and control of the allottee.

I am disappointed that the Department of Interior, which is supposed to manage our mineral rights in the benefit of my family and all other allottees, has stopped leasing for a full year. This action delays income to us allottees in the short term, but more importantly, sends a strong signal to oil and gas companies that generate the income on our behalf that investment in the area is risky and uncertain in the long term.

I have been participating actively in the Resource Management Planning (RMP) process which is under pressure from environmental groups to ensure responsible oil and natural gas development in the area. I continue to feel that the Interior Department and members of Congress are ignoring the voices of the allottees and listening only to environmental groups like Diné Care and other outside groups that want to keep oil and natural gas from being developed at all.

Besides not being realistic, it would deprive my family of income to sustain our way of life. Navajo families must be heard equally along with the environmental special interest groups. In fact, with the Interior Department's trust responsibility, our voices should carry much more weight than that of outside special interests, but that is not the case with this bill.

The bill would put off limits my mineral rights and the mineral rights of thousands of allottees. While the bill claims not to affect my mineral rights, in fact, many allottee lands are surrounded by federal lands that would be off-limits under this bill. If BLM lands are withdrawn around our allotments, that means oil and gas companies cannot access our lands, because they won't be able to access the federal lands if BLM lands are withdrawn.

Furthermore, since the oil and gas is accessed using horizontal drilling, putting the federal lands and minerals off limits will mean my minerals are also off limits. Because of the checkboard pattern of lands, where allottee lands are often surrounded by BLM lands, particularly in the northeast demonstration area, I cannot access all minerals along the lateral of a horizontal well, they will not access any.

Companies are discouraged from developing the minerals on my behalf because it just doesn't make sense economically or technologically to pinpoint my small amount of minerals stranded amongst federal minerals. What may be small to them, however, is not small to me. Companies will be discouraged from developing in all areas of the buffer at all, even on allottee lands.

I too care deeply about the Chaco cultural heritage. After all, I'm a Navajo who lives in the Greater Chaco region. But the Chaco Culture National Historic Park already protects the Great Houses. Artifacts that may be outside the park are protected through the National Park Service Act. Any development of my minerals and the minerals of other allottees is done in strict accordance with the act, to make sure they are protected. Not only do we insist upon it, but that is the law of the land.

I urge the committee not to pass this bill. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

Mr. GOSAR. Further, two chapters of the Navajo Nation representing a combined 6,000 residents passed resolutions in opposition to this bill because it would jeopardize development and potentially "infringe on their royalty payments."

Mr. Chairman, I also include those in the RECORD.

RESOLUTION OF HUERFANO CHAPTER

RESOLUTION # HCR-989-19

Supporting the Navajo Allotment Owners in Opposition of "The Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018" and Further Requesting U.S. Senators Tom Udall and Martin Heinrich to meet with Navajo Allotment Owners in Northwest New Mexico to Explain the Proposed Senate Bill 2007.

Whereas:

1. Huerfano Chapter is a certified governmental entity of the Navajo Nation with the right to issue a resolution to their tribe?

2. Huerfano Chapter has a population of 3000 plus residents, both registered voters and nonregistered community members. The chapter is one of the largest land based chapters comprised of 553,528 acres in Eastern Agency, Navajo Nation and has nine sub-committees including Adobe, Blanco, Bisti, Carson, Gallegos, Jacquez, Hogback, Huerfano, and Otis; and

3. The Navajo Allotment owners met on Jun 12, 2018 at Nageezi Chapter where over eighty-five (85) attended to voice their opinions on the proposed "Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act" or Senate Bill 2007; and

4. Navajo Allotment Land Owners expressed their concerns that the "Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018" might infringe on their royalty payments they are presently benefitting from oil and gas development on their allotments; and

5. Navajo Allotment owners are concerned that self-serving special interest organizations are violating the rights of Navajo Allotment Land Owners, that such publicized demonstrations and meetings by those special interest and outside groups have overtaken the impacted people of the Chaco area. These demonstrations and meetings by these special interest organizations give Navajo families benefit for their daily lives; and

6. Navajo Allotment Land Owners do not share opinions of environmentalists voicing their objectives on natural resources development. These are over publicized objectives by the environmentalists that have drowned out and overshadowed Navajo Allotment Land Owners’ Rights and Interests; and

7. Navajo Allotment Land Owners are truly the impacted people of the Chaco area. These lands were patented and allotted to the Navajo owners in New Mexico and handed down through many generations. These lands were given in exchange for land taken by the U.S. Government in exchange for citizenships. As Navajo allotment land owners, they have the right to lease, develop, or excavate their lands; Now therefore be it
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Resolved: That: 1. The Huerfano Chapter hereby supports and recognizes the opposition by the Navajo Allotment Land Owners of the “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018” or Senate Bill 2907; and 2. Nageezi Chapter hereby further supports and requests U.S. Senator Udall and U.S. Senator Martin Heinrich to attend a meeting with Navajo Allotment Land Owners of the “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018” to explain the reasons of the proposed “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018” or Senate Bill 2907; and 7. Navajo Allotment Land Owners are truly the impacted people of the Chaco area. These lands were patented and allotted to the Navajo People in New Mexico and handed down through many generations. These lands were given in exchange for land taken by the U.S. Government in the process that is already underway. We need to thoroughly weigh the benefits and concerns, and we need to consider all those who are impacted. Not doing so could have significant consequences for the Navajo allottees and for the State of New Mexico’s budget and priorities for its citizens. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJAN).

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) in the previous debate, had some incredible charts that he was displaying. In it, he proclaimed: The rocks shall set you free. I was born and raised, and my faith taught me, that the truth shall set you free, Mr. Chairman. I was also taught that people are entitled to their own opinions, Mr. Chairman, but not their own facts.

If my colleague from Arizona participated in those hearings, as he said he did, he heard the witnesses from the Bureau of Land Management, the witness from the Bureau of Land Management in this direct question about the rights of Navajo allottees being taken away.

Some of my Republican colleagues will argue that protecting Chaco will impact the Navajo allottees’ right to develop valid rights. This is blatantly false.

Let the silence sit in. It is false. The Bureau of Land Management testified before Congress and said that this legislation “would not affect Tribal interests or allottees.”

Mr. Chairman, it is critically important that we have a conversation about
the importance of protecting Chaco. While we have taken steps to defend Chaco, Chaco is at risk of being hurt, of being desecrated, of being destroyed. That is why we have come together.

I would invite my colleague to join us and visit Chaco, where the Navajos visit with the allots- ees, the women who are there, the children who are in proximity of those fumes that my colleague, the chair- woman, DEB HAALAND from New Mex- ico, was able to describe, where you don’t just smell the methane; tech- nology shows you to smell those plumes move into people’s homes.

This legislation, Mr. Chairman, is very clear. It puts in place a practice by the Bureau of Land Management. It takes out of production Federal land.

The idea is to stop about telling our Navajo brothers and sisters who are allottees that this will hurt their access to those lands, that this will restrict access to those lands.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Chairman, just to be thorough, an amendment that I will offer later today will make it even more clear that this, in fact, is only about taking BLM land out of pro- duction.

Mr. Chairman, with all the work that we have left to do with us, this is a piece of legislation supported by the New Mexico delegation, something that, based on the amendment that my colleague from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) just offered, might understand. It is supported by the Represen- tative from the district, Congresswoman DEB HAALAND, one of the first two Na- tive American women elected to the Congress—and you heard the passion in her voice; she is carrying the weight of her ancestors on her shoulders as she debates the fight to protect this sacred land—Congresswoman TORRES SMALL, U.S. Senator MARTIN HEINRICH, U.S. Senator Tom UDALL, the Governor of the State of New Mexico, and the Com- missioner of Public Lands.

If you need a longer list of elected leaders from New Mexico who support this bill, I can make it available.

Let’s work together, Mr. Chairman.

And the last thing I will say is that I am very proud that this legislation will pass with bipartisan support. Pray on it. Think about where our loved ones have been laid to rest. We wouldn’t want those grave sites being desecrated. We don’t want this sacred site beholden to the BLM.

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

Mr. Chairman, I love the passion in the gentleman’s voice, but, once again, it is not me. It is the allottees who brought their voice forward, the Nav- ajo allottees. They have been at this time and time again, promises made by the Fed- eral Government and promises not kept.

So, once again, who would you rather believe, or allow for, or the BLM? Per- sonally, I would side with the allottees. When you look at the map, it tells you the story you need to know. If we are going to make an amendment, we should guarantee access through any of that application through this area, not just through the BLM, but all this area, because those are the resources of the State.

Mr. LUJÁN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSAR. I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJÁN. Has the gentleman read the bill?

Mr. GOSAR. Yes.

Mr. LUJÁN. If the gentleman read the bill, he would see that the text has made very clear this takes Bureau of Land Management land out, not allot- tee land; and if the gentleman would review the clarifying amendment, he would also see that, as well.

So don’t just take my word for it, look at the text and look at the advice of your staff.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, reclaim- ing my time, once again, it says it takes it off of mineral exposure, but it doesn’t give access.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. JOHNSON).

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague’s presentation, both short and concise, and he raises important points.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to H.R. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act, as well.

Mr. Chairman, this is a flawed bill. It is simply the recommendation by our colleagues on the other side of the aisle to prevent our country from taking the next steps in this era of American energy dominance.

What is important here is that Amer- ican energy dominance is a great strat- egy. It is a strategy that helps all Americans, those in this immediate area and around the country.

The legislation before us will, of course, permanently restrict oil and gas development in the area imme- diately surrounding the Chaco Culture National Historical Park.

Now, bear in mind, of course, as has been pointed out here, exploration is already restricted within the park; and, of course, that is rightfully so. But it is bad policy to create an arbi- trary buffer zone for a prohibition on development in the area around the park.

In this Congress, our friends on the other side of the aisle have made their priorities crystal clear regarding the management of our country’s re- sources. So far, they have placed mora- toriums on oil and gas production in the eastern Gulf of Mexico, in the Pa- cific and Atlantic planning areas, and in ANWR. Apparently, that is not enough. What we are hearing today is that now we need to ban production in the New Mexico areas, as well.

Mr. Chairman, at what point do we say enough is enough?

The evidence shows, time and again, that placing restrictions on energy de- velopment only increases prices for American consumers. And make no mistake, these increases have the largest impact on our most vulnerable communities.
Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to H.R. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2019. This unnecessary bill would permanently ban oil and gas development on about 316,000 acres of land in New Mexico. It would also incur $3 million in increased spending costs with no built-in mechanism to pay for it.

H.R. 2181’s proposed land grab would surround Chaco Culture National Historical Park. The park itself is already under Federal protections, including a prohibition on mineral development. This bill would add 10 extra miles of protected area around the perimeter of the park. This arbitrary addition could have long-term negative repercussions to the State of New Mexico.

H.R. 2181 would also impact the very Navajo Nation members it claims to protect. Many of them own lands and mineral rights in the area that have been passed down for generations, but this bill would make it virtually impossible for them to develop the energy resources to which they are rightfully entitled. The complex puzzle of interlocking Federal, State, Tribal, and private land in the disputed area would result in significant hurdles for the Navajo Nation, creating a de facto extraction ban.

In one of this year, a Navajo Nation representative who owns some of these mineral resources came to Capitol Hill to testify in front of the Natural Resources Committee on behalf of 131 Navajo Nation members about how detrimental H.R. 2181 would be to their land. This bill ignores the request of local landowners and continues the pattern of government overreach in the West.

H.R. 2181 also completely sidesteps the Department of the Interior’s resource management plan for the area. This plan is currently undergoing environmental review and will be publicly released at some point. To permanently ban all future energy developments before we know all of the facts and research conclusions is uncalled for.

I have stood here at this podium and spoken at length about American energy dominance and good environment because I believe they can go hand in hand. Every indicator we have shows that energy production is becoming cleaner, faster, and cheaper by the day. Refusing to allow safe energy development on Federal land isn’t environmentally friendly; it is just bad science and a thinly veiled power grab.

As foreign energy sources become increasingly unpredictable, it is imperative that we tap into our vast domestic energy potential in sustainable ways and that we don’t arbitrarily restrict future development.

Keep in mind that any leasing in these areas is subject to a host of Federal regulations and oversight already. Any development must comply with the National Historic Preservation Act and NEPA. These laws are in place to protect and preserve historically significant sites across our country.

Instead, we are debating areas completely outside the boundaries of the Chaco Culture area. My Democratic colleagues are rushing to pass this bill without hearing the concerns of local Navajo Nation members or waiting to read the Department of the Interior analysis of the area. These hasty conclusions are unnecessary, with potentially devastating effects on New Mexico’s revenue stream.

I urge my fellow Members to consider the negative implications of this bill and vote against H.R. 2181.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chair, I simply want to respond to my colleague that was just speaking.

This area is within those exterior boundaries of the archeological sites and findings and indigenous lands that we referred to as Chaco. I would like to remind my colleague to come out to New Mexico. I will take the gentleman out there. Congresswoman DEBRA HAALAND would love to host the gentlewoman.

My colleague from the other side of the aisle brought up this notion that this development is subject to Federal law.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman from New Mexico an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LUJÁN. If the gentleman would take a moment and go to the NOAA website, the gentleman would see that New Mexico has two methane clouds over it. It has the two worst methane emissions of anywhere in the country, even though we don’t have the most oil and gas production. I urge my colleagues to consider the negative implications of this bill and vote against H.R. 2181.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentleman from New Mexico an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. LUJÁN. If the gentleman would take a moment and go to the NOAA website, the gentleman would see that New Mexico has two methane clouds over it. It has the two worst methane emissions of anywhere in the country, even though we don’t have the most oil and gas production. I urge my colleagues to consider the negative implications of this bill and vote against H.R. 2181.

Mr. LUJÁN. If the gentleman would take a moment and go to the NOAA website, the gentleman would see that New Mexico has two methane clouds over it. It has the two worst methane emissions of anywhere in the country, even though we don’t have the most oil and gas production. I urge my colleagues to consider the negative implications of this bill and vote against H.R. 2181.

Mr. Chair, Members are bringing up this concept of methane capture. There is an easy solution.

Is the gentleman in favor of providing a pipeline, because what ends up happening, we can recover almost 100 percent of the methane emissions when we have a pipeline nearby, because then it becomes profitable and it becomes something that we can actually utilize.

Mr. LUJÁN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJÁN. Would it surprise the gentleman from Arizona that they are actually using duct tape to try to seal leaks from methane plumes in New Mexico? Does the gentleman think that is allowed?

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJÁN. Would it surprise the gentleman from Arizona that they are actually using duct tape to try to seal leaks from methane plumes in New Mexico? Does the gentleman think that is allowed?

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.
these technology nerds. I have been visiting with people who have revolutionized and have new ideas in regard to pipelines that would set this on fire. So if we are looking at technology, we ought to be looking at in the right way. It is beneficial. We are living longer, not like what we were at the turn of the 1900s, which was shorter.

My point is, if there is technology out there for pipelines that is very consistent with almost 100 percent capture, wouldn’t the gentleman entertain that?

I yield to the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chair, I think the gentleman and I may actually be able to find some common ground.

There are available technologies today—as the gentleman may know, being in tune with modern technology associated with oil and gas exploration—that can identify leaks, can prevent those leaks, and actually can eliminate intentional flaring, but first you have to find them and you have to seal those leaks.

Mr. Chair, if I would be happy to work with the gentleman to identify a funding stream so that we can identify every methane leak across America, seal every leak, and prevent intentional methane flaring.

I think there is some common ground we can work on, because this is all about compromise, and this may be an area that—the gentleman, Mr. GOSAR, someone I respect—we might be able to find some common ground.

We will take the gentleman out to New Mexico. We will put the gentleman’s eyes on that camera where the gentleman can see the plumes moving. And while they may try to fix it temporarily with duct tape—sometimes on the farm we do it with baling wire, as the gentleman knows—we should use real technology, eliminate those leaks, eliminate those plumes, and actually make it illegal to intentionally flare. Let’s find common ground on that.

Do the people who live in that area have for this bill?

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I rise to have my voice heard in support of H.R. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act.

This proposal that is sponsored by my friend, Mr. LUJÁN, with the support of the chairwoman of the Subcommittee on National Parks, Forests, and Public Lands, Representative HAALAND, also from New Mexico, is another important step towards recognizing and elevating the voices and the presence of Native communities in this Chamber.

As the chairwoman mentioned in her opening statement, our committee has heard from Puebloan and Tribal leaders throughout this Congress about how important it is to protect Chaco. These communities share Chaco with their ancestral homeland, protected from oil and gas drilling.

This is an important piece of legislation. It is an agreed-upon proposal that balances regional development with the needs to ensure that special places and, indeed, sacred places are off limits. It fits well into the work this Chamber is doing today and has been doing all Congress. We are listening to diverse voices, protecting the rights of Native communities and conserving our public lands for the benefit of current and future generations.

Mr. Chair, I hope our colleagues will join us in this important work by voting today to protect irrereplaceable sites that are important to Native communities and supported by folks on the ground and that are critical to the story of this Nation of ours.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. BISHOP), who is the ranking member of the full committee.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chairman, it is wonderful to be back down here on the floor again with all of you. I thank Mr. GRIJALVA for that. I would have been here earlier had the gentleman not scheduled a hearing on our committee at the same time as we are supposed to have all our committee bills here on the floor. But we hit both of those at any rate.

We have three bills on the floor here today—I’m really sorry I missed the first one—three bills that are so bad they make the umpire last night actually look good.

This particular one has one of those problems that still exists. If the State of New Mexico or New Mexico’s leaders want to give away the $1.17 billion they just got a check from last time from this development, that is okay with me. Actually, it probably means that more money is going to come to my State eventually from that pot. But it is not okay to forget that those people who really understand what they are talking about, those who live closely in the area, really need to have their voices heard, specifically.

I have to equate, once again, as has been brought up already, but I want to reemphasize, the two chapters in closest proximity that really have an impact here were both voted against this bill. They both sent resolutions against this bill. Those who actually have seen what it is like to deal with the Federal Government on that personal basis have sent resolutions against this bill.

This bill has the potential of disrupting 20,000 Native Americans—almost all Navajo—who are allottees in this particular area. Even though some may contend that the Federal Government said they will not be a problem, if we look at the history of dealing with the Federal Government, then, obviously, the concerns that the private sector has and those citizens who live in this area for this bill are pretty obvious. There is historical precedence on when that should take place, and until there is some kind of verification of that, then we ought to be very careful in which way we decide to go in this particular order.

Let me also say one other thing here, because this is a frustration I have with the entire process. As we know, bad procedure creates bad policy. But the bill that we have just discussed deals with a park that has a huge maintenance backlog. Even though changing the mining procedures around the park will have nothing to do with the water, it certainly doesn’t solve the maintenance backlog. This bill will end up with withdrawals from the Bureau of Land Management lands which, once again, have a huge maintenance backlog. So I am going to say, once again, to our friends on the other side, if you really want to talk about parks in Arizona, BLM lands in New Mexico, and whatever those lands in Colorado are going to be, all on the same day, and we have that huge maintenance backlog, then for heaven’s sakes, bring that bill onto the floor. I realize how controversial it may be. There are only 328 cosponsors of the bill. I am sure that probably would be able to go on suspension.

But until we have actually addressed the maintenance backlog and not held this up as some kind of sad quid pro quo or sad element of trying to blackmail for something else or try to attach bad elements to it that will actually negate the impact of that bill, we are piddling around here. Bring that bill for the maintenance backlog to the floor. Let us have a vote. Let us move on to solve real problems instead of those that we are creating with these three bills that are going to be before us today.

Are they terrible bills?

Who knows?

Will they result in better quality in other Western States that have public lands?

Who knows?

Are some of the Native Americans who live in that area very sceptical of it?

Obviously.

Is there a history of the inability of working these things out?

Obviously.

Should they have worked out the details with the BLM before we actually introduced this bill?

Yes, obviously.

But, once again, Mr. Chairman, we have three bills that make that play on
first base look really good in compari-
on.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I
yield 2 minutes to the gentilewoman from Colorado (Ms. DeGETTIE).

Ms. DeGETTIE. Mr. Chairman, as we
heard, Chaco Canyon is a UNESCO
World Heritage site, and the reason it
is listed this way is because it is a
place of magic and history. Anyone
who has slept there under the stars, as
I have with my colleagues on the other
side of the aisle to do, knows what a
special and unique place this is and why
it must be pro-
tected.

But there are many ways one can
damage an historic site. Obviously,
you can damage the very soil that it sits
on. But you can also damage the air
quality that the visitors to this site
find every year.

Oil and gas development produces
smog and gas flares that harm animals,
vegetation, and people who live nearby.

It also undermines the park’s pristine
night skies that attract thousands of
visitors every year. It emits methane
that leads to harmful ground-level
ozone pollution, and it is just not
worth destroying this precious treas-
ure.

I support reasonable oil and gas de-
development throughout the West in
My State of New Mexico. It is going to be a won-
derland of minerals. Sixty percent of the Navajo
people and to the Hopi people is lame.

It doesn’t matter if they are Native
American. We have had a number of
mining claims that have been stymied
because the Forest Service or the BLM
will not give them access, even though
they have allowed and stated that they
will not give them access, even though
the Forest Service or the BLM
will not give them access, even though
they have allowed and stated that they
would have access to that claim.

Once again, enough is enough.

Mr. GOYA. Mr. Chairman, I yield
to the gentleman yield.

Mr. GOYA. I yield to the gentleman
yield.

Mr. LUJÁN. Will the gentleman
yield?

Mr. GOYA. Mr. Chairman, I yield
to the gentleman yield.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, I appre-
ciate the gentleman yielding, because
one of the resolutions from the two
chapters was raised, and think it was
raised by the gentleman as well, so I
just wanted to make sure we had a
chance to review that.

So if that resolution is reviewed, if
the gentleman would look at paragraph
4, which is where the concern that was
brought up by the allottees to the very
distinguished and honorable chapter
leaders was raised, what it says is this:

‘Navajo allotment landowners
expressed their concerns that the ‘Chaco
Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act
of 2018’ might infringe on their royalty
payments they are presently benefit-
ting from oil and gas development on
their allotment lands. Navajo commu-

nities, including those on the reserva-
tion, has always been in a very de-
pressed economic state for many years
and such development of natural re-

sources gives Navajo families benefits
to their daily lives.

Once again, enough is enough.

Mr. GOYA. Mr. Chairman, reclaiming
my time. I thank the gentleman
for that. But, once again, trust is a
series of promises kept.

When has the Federal Government
held their trust up to the Tribal men or

When has the Federal Government
held their trust up to the Tribal men or
even allottees?

It doesn’t matter if they are Native
American. We have had a number of
mining claims that have been stymied
because the Forest Service or the BLM
will not give them access, even though
they have allowed and stated that they
would have access to that claim.

So, once again, it is a hollow prom-
ise; and, once again, I beseech individ-
uals until the government starts hon-
orizing promises, they are not entitled
to the hierarchy of trust. That is just it.

I trust people more than I do the gov-

ernment. A government that can give

Trust is a series of promises kept.

We want it? I’m not for that. I’m
for empowerment. I’m not for victim-
ization.

What have we seen? I don’t like. I
have seen that the promise to the Navajo
people and to the Hopi people is lame.

We are going to take these good-pay-
ing jobs in northern Arizona, and we
are going to give them welfare?

Does that lift a person’s spirit?

No, it doesn’t.

It doesn’t give them upward mobi-
ity. I thought that was the American
experience. It is sad that we are at this
point in time. I think we need to have

Mr. GOYA. Mr. Chairman, I yield
to the gentleman yield.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, I appre-
ciate the gentleman yield.

So if that resolution is reviewed, if
the gentleman would look at paragraph
4, which is where the concern that was
brought up by the allottees to the very
distinguished and honorable chapter
leaders was raised, what it says is this:

‘Navajo allotment landowners
expressed their concerns that the ‘Chaco
Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act
of 2018’ might infringe on their royalty
payments they are presently benefit-
ting from oil and gas development on
their allotment lands. Navajo commu-

nities, including those on the reserva-
tion, has always been in a very de-
pressed economic state for many years
and such development of natural re-

sources gives Navajo families benefits
to their daily lives.

Once again, enough is enough.

Mr. GOYA. Mr. Chairman, I yield
to the gentleman yield.

Mr. LUJÁN. Will the gentleman
yield?

Mr. GOYA. Mr. Chairman, I yield
to the gentleman yield.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, I appre-
ciate the gentleman yielding, because
one of the resolutions from the two
chapters was raised, and think it was
raised by the gentleman as well, so I
just wanted to make sure we had a
chance to review that.

So if that resolution is reviewed, if
the gentleman would look at paragraph
4, which is where the concern that was
brought up by the allottees to the very
distinguished and honorable chapter
leaders was raised, what it says is this:

‘Navajo allotment landowners
expressed their concerns that the ‘Chaco
Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act
of 2018’ might infringe on their royalty
payments they are presently benefit-
ting from oil and gas development on
their allotment lands. Navajo commu-

nities, including those on the reserva-
tion, has always been in a very de-
pressed economic state for many years
and such development of natural re-

resources gives Navajo families benefits
to their daily lives.

Once again, enough is enough.

Mr. GOYA. Mr. Chairman, I yield
to the gentleman yield.

Mr. LUJÁN. Will the gentleman
yield?
more dialogue on these bills. We need to have more discussions. Yes, the ranking member made the comment: good process, builds good policy, builds good politics. None of that exists right now. None of that exists.

Until we get back to the civil debate on the contrary won’t exist.

Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to vote against this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1530

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

Mr. Chair, H.R. 2181 is a broadly supported proposal to protect the cultural resources of Chaco Canyon, a national park in New Mexico. It has the support of the All Pueblo Council of Governors, the Navajo Nation, the entire New Mexico delegation, and the New Mexico Governor, not to mention any number of elected officials across our beautiful State.

This proposal has been worked on for a very long time. Over many hours, weeks, and years, many voices have been heard. If we are serious about lifting up Tribal voices and responding to the priorities of Native American communities, we need to listen to the Tribal leaders who are asking us to protect Chaco Canyon. The people of New Mexico know the impacts oil and gas development can have on clean air, clean water, and the health of our children.

Mr. Chair, 90 percent of the San Juan Basin is already available for oil and gas leasing. We can protect this sacred land because gas and oil doesn’t need to take up every single inch of our State. This proposal is about protecting a small sacred area for Tribal communities that have a connection to this special place and still use this area for ceremonies to pray and to worship. There may be dissenting voices, as there always are when we make changes to land management policy, but we must listen to the elected leaders who represent these places. Quite frankly, the majority of New Mexicans support this legislation on this issue.

The delegation, the Governor, and the elected Tribal leaders have spoken in a unified voice and asked us to protect Chaco Canyon. I thank Representative Lujan for his hard work.

I encourage my colleagues to vote ‘‘yes’’ on H.R. 2181, and I invite anyone to come, to listen, and visit this beautiful place and know for certain why it is that we are fighting so hard to protect it.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I include the following letters in the RECORD.

WESTERN CAUCUS, CHAIRMAN PAUL GOSAR

OPPOSITION TO H.R. 2181

So far H.R. 2181 is opposed by: American Exploration & Mining Association (Group Letter), Arizona Liberty (Group Letter), Arizona Mining Association (Group Letter), Arizona Rock Products Association (Group Letter), Citizens Against Locking Up Our Peoples’ Land (Letter), Coalition of Northern Arizona (Group Letter), Conservatives for Property Rights (Letter), Denver Lumber Company (Letter), eCore Energy Corp (Letter), Mohave County Supervisor Buster Johnson (Letter), New Mexico Business Coalition (Group Letter), Coalition of White Mountain Apache Tribal Members (Letter), New Mexico Cattle Growers Association (Letter), New Mexico Federal Land Council (Letter), New Mexico Wool Growers Association (Letter), Western Energy Alliance (Letter), Women’s Mining Coalition (Group Letter).

July 16, 2019.

Hon. RAUL GRIJALVA,
Chairman, House Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

Hon. RON BISHOP,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRIJALVA AND RANKING MEMBER BISHOP:

I write to you today to express my strong opposition to H.R. 2181, the ‘‘Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2019’’. This bill permanently bans oil, natural gas, coal and other minerals from federal leasing and future development on 316,000 acres in New Mexico while also permanently terminating leases in the area that have yet to go.

H.R. 2181 places our economic and energy security at risk by putting an area rich in oil and gas resources permanently off limits to production. This legislation will reduce general fund and education revenues in private property rights and negatively impact local economies. The area is known to hold large reserves of oil and gas resources. BLM recognized the potential in this area and proposed to include several parcels near Chaco Canyon in its oil and gas lease sale on March 28, 2019.

The so-called ‘‘buffer zone’’ imposed by this bill is completely unnecessary, as oil and gas production has taken place in this area for decades, with no damage to the national park. In fact, the expressed purpose of the park was to protect the culturally significant ruins and great houses of the Chaco people, and the boundaries of the park were drawn for that very goal.

H.R. 2181 will harm education. In fiscal year 2018, oil and natural gas production generated $2.2 billion for New Mexico’s general fund and accounted for one-third of all revenue exceeding more than $220 million of these funds flowed to k-12 schools, providing enough revenues enough to cover the salaries of nearly 11,500 teachers.

It was clear from the manner in which the committee treated this bill that the voices of tribal members were not adequately considered. In fact, no allottees were invited to speak at the site visit or at the subcommittee hearing in New Mexico discussing this legislation.

Delora Hesuse, a Navajo with private mineral rights in New Mexico, claims the concerns of Indian allottees have not been heard and that the proposed 316,000-acre ‘‘buffer’’ is a solution in search of a problem. According to Western Wire, Hesuse stated, ‘‘How come we don’t have a voice in this? . . . Environmentalists and others claiming to speak on our behalf have not even consulted us or asked our permission’’. Her fellow allottees were passed over for [opponents] and environmental activists and not included in the panel discussions at the field hearings. We oppose the buffer zone because it’s never been an issue. Everyone knew their boundaries. She said residents near Chaco have been receiving royalties since the 1970s and they don’t want that critical income to go away.

H.R. 2181 imposes an assault on Indian allottees and their mineral rights in the withdrawal area and tramples on property rights. This bill makes their assets worthless, taking away valuable royalty payments from these impoverished communities. To put this in perspective, in 2015 alone, the Federal Indian Minerals Office distributed $96 million to 20,835 allottees throughout the country.

Allottees in the Chaco region have consistently expressed opposition to this proposed withdrawal. Instead of listening to all local voices, the proponents of this bill have pandered to environmental groups who claim to represent all the relevant stakeholders on this matter, but clearly there are already numerous federal and state laws and regulations on the books that adequately protect the Chaco National Park. The oil and gas industry has both a legal and moral obligation to protect the cultural artifacts of the Chaco people, as well as avoiding impacts on newly discovered artifacts, which it has always done. American energy production will go on without mutuality exclusive goals. Chaco will continue to be protected while responsible oil and gas production occurs, benefitting education and reducing carbon emissions in the process.

Again, I oppose H.R. 2181 and urge its rejection.

Sincerely,

BUSTER D. JOHNSON,
Mohave County Supervisor, District III.

IPAA

INDEPENDENT PETROLEUM ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA October 25, 2019.

Hon. RAUL GRIJALVA,
Chairman, House Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

Hon. RON BISHOP,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRIJALVA AND RANKING MEMBER BISHOP:

The Independent Petroleum Association of America (IPAA) strongly opposes H.R. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act. IPAA did not object when Interior Secretary Bernhardt issued a one-year freeze on leasing in order to complete the ongoing Resource Management Plan (RMP) in the area. We believe it is important to have all the facts before making any land management decision involving public lands. However, despite the fact that the RMP has not yet been released, House Democratic leaders plan to bring H.R. 2181 to the floor for a vote in the coming weeks. This legislation is premature and locks-up land in the region before we have all the facts from the RMP. This bill would permanently ban federal oil and natural gas leasing on roughly 316,000 acres of land in New Mexico and terminate existing leases. It is bad policy to bring before we know the facts.

While the sponsors of this legislation claim it will not affect Native American allottee mineral rights, the reality is far different. H.R. 2181 will create significant access and operational complications for Tribal allottees along with any companies they partner with and will lead to a de facto mineral extraction ban on their lands.

As a June 5 letter to the Natural Resources Committee on the legislation, a witness with allottee land from the Navajo Nation, Nageezi chapter testified against the bill stating that H.R. 2181 would ‘‘put many of our mineral rights off limits and stop a much-needed source of income to feed, shelter, clothe and protect our families. ’’ The letter also submitted a petition signed by 131 Navajo allottees opposing this legislation, as well as two resolutions
from the Huéranos and Nageezí Navajo chapters, which are closest to this area, expressing support for the Navajo allotment landowners and recognizing their opposition to this bill.

IPPA has been content to let the Chaco Canyon RMP process proceed to its conclusion. However, we cannot support any efforts to incorporate the addition to the boundary of the RMP that is completed. The main purpose of establishing the Chaco Culture National Historical Area was to protect every area of historical significance. That goal has been accomplished. Extending the boundaries and adding acreage to the Heritage Area will not enhance protection of areas of historical significance. There are no areas outside the currently designated boundaries that qualify for protections. However, the park expansion would have economically devastating impacts on those who live closest to the area.

For these reasons, IPPA urges you to vote "NO" on H.R. 2381.

Sincerely,

DANIEL T. NAATZ,
Senior Vice President, Government Relations and Political Affairs, Independent Petroleum Association of America.

WESTERN ENERGY ALLIANCE

July 16, 2019.

Hon. RAUL GRIJALVA,
Chairman, House Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

Hon. RON BISHOP,
Ranking Member, House Committee on Natural Resources,
Washington, DC.

Dear Chairman Grijalva and Ranking Member Bishop: Western Energy Alliance strongly opposes H.R. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act. This bill permanently bans new federal oil and natural gas leasing and development on 316,000 acres in New Mexico while also terminating existing leases.

H.R. 2181 puts at risk the local economy and the livelihoods of thousands of Indian allottees in the area by making it very difficult if not impossible for them to develop the energy resources they own. While the bill purports to leave Indian allottees unaffected, the reality is that the interlocking nature of the federal and allottee estates means that companies will avoid developing the area. With today’s horizontal drilling of two-mile laterals it is not possible to avoid the federal mineral estate while still producing on pock- ets of allottee minerals. If the bill passes, companies will have no recourse but to avoid the federal estate which are closest to this area, expressing support for the United States of America in Congress assembled.

H.R. 2181 Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representa-tives of the United States of America in Congress assembled.

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE. This Act may be cited as the “Chaco Cul-tural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2019.”

SEC. 2. FINDINGS. Congress finds that—
(1) there are archeological, sacred, and his-torical resources located throughout the Greater Chaco region, which spans the States of New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and Colorado.
(2) the Chaco Culture National Historical Park, a unit of the National Park System and a United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization World Heritage Site, is known around the world—
(A) for multi-story buildings constructed by the Chacoan people that are still standing; and
(B) as the nerve center of a culture that spread throughout and dominated the Four Corners area during the 9th, 10th, and 11th centuries;

(3) the Chacoan people built hundreds of miles of roads and a network of villages, shrines, and communications sites, many of which are still visible;
(4) many Pueblos and Indian Tribes in the Four Corners area claim cultural affiliation with, and are descended from, the Chacoan people;
(5) the landscape around the Chaco Culture National Historical Park includes hundreds of internationally and nationally significant cultural resources, including prehistoric roads, communities, and shrines—
(A) many of which are related to the re-sources found in the Chaco Culture National Historical Park, including the resources rec-ognized by the amendment made by section 3 of the Chacoan Outliers Protection Act of 1995 (16 U.S.C. 4181 note; Public Law 104-11) providing for additional Chaco Culture Archeological Protection Sites;

(6) many Pueblos and Indian Tribes in the Four Corners area claim cultural affiliation with, and are descended from, the Chacoan people;
(7) the Greater Chaco landscape in the State of New Mexico extends beyond Chaco Culture National Historical Park and encompasses—
(A) local communities, including Pueblos and Indian Tribes;
(B) public land, which includes additional cultural resources and sacred sites;
(C) that is not subject to a valid cooperative or unit plan of development or operation certified by the Secretary to be necessary.

(2) FEDERAL LAND.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—The term “Federal land” means—
(i) any Federal land or interest in Federal land that is within the boundaries of the Chaco Culture Heritage Withdrawal Area, as provided on the Map; and
(ii) any land or interest in land located within the boundaries of the Chaco Cultural Heritage Withdrawal Area, as depicted on the Map, that is acquired by the Federal Government after the date of enactment of this Act.

(B) EXCLUSION.—The term “Federal land” does not include trust land (as defined in section 3765 of title 38, United States Code).

(C) THE “Map” means the map prepared by the Bureau of Land Management entitled “Chaco Cultural Heritage Withdrawal Area” and dated April 2, 2019.

(4) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.
(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws; (2) location, entry, and patent under mining laws; and (3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(b) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The Map shall be made available for inspection at each appropriate office of the Bureau of Land Management.

(c) CONVEYANCE OF FEDERAL LAND TO INDIAN TRIBES.—Notwithstanding subsection (a), the Secretary may convey the Federal land to, or exchange the Federal land with, an Indian Tribe in accordance with a resolution of the Tribe that is approved as of the date of enactment of this Act, as subsequently developed, amended, or revised in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) and any other applicable law.

SEC. 5. OIL AND GAS LEASE MANAGEMENT.

(a) TERMINATION OF NON-PRODUCING LEASES.—A covered lease—

(1) shall automatically terminate by operation of law pursuant to section 17(e) of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 226(e)) and subpart 3108 of title 43, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations); and

(2) may not be extended by the Secretary.

(b) WITHDRAWAL OF TERMINATED, RELINQUISHED, OR EXPIRED LEASES.—Any portion of the Federal land subject to a covered lease terminated under subsection (a) or otherwise or relinquished or acquired by the United States before the date of enactment of this Act is withdrawn from—

(1) all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws; (2) location, entry, and patent under mining laws; and (3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

SEC. 6. EFFECT.

Nothing in this Act—

(a) affects the mineral rights of an Indian Tribe or member of an Indian Tribe to trust land or allotment land; or

(b) precludes improvements to, or rights-of-way for water, power, or road development on, the Federal land to assist communities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the Federal land.

SEC. 7. 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 in accordance with the latest set forth in the report, 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, is in order except those printed in part E of House Report 116–264. Each such further amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report, equally divided and controlled by the proponent and 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. LUJÁN

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment No. 1 printed in part E of House Report 116–296.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chair, I have an interest of the communities across New Mexico that want to see the site protected and withdraw the Federal lands and minerals across Chaco Canyon. As you have seen and heard, 90 percent of the San Juan Basin is already open to drilling. Oil and gas rights are no longer under threat here.

I understand that concerns have been raised by allottees who worry this bill will impact their ability to develop their rights. But as I said earlier, the bill clearly protects them.

Now, I spoke to my colleagues. Any concerns, this amendment provides further clarifying language to ensure that those protections are very clear.

This proposal will not impact anyone’s ability to develop their valid rights, including Navajo allottees. This amendment makes it clear that the legislation only affects Federal Government land and minerals owned.

Let’s be clear: My legislation supports the interests of Tribes and their sovereignity. H.R. 2181 is well-supported by Native American communities. The proposal has received the support of the All Pueblo Council of Governors representing 20 Pueblos and the Navajo Nation.

Let’s be clear: It is the right thing to do. Let’s secure these sacred sites. Let’s secure them.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. Bishop), the ranking member of the Committee on Natural Resources.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I, too, am actually in support of the amendment. I think it is an improvement on the bill, but it does go far enough because it is still only amending the findings.

If you really want teeth with it, you have to amend the statutes whatsoever. So for that, it is an improvement, but it still does not solve the base problem if you are taking away rights on Federal property and you have private rights that abut it, that has an impact on those private rights at the same time.

Those are the types of things that need to be addressed because these are the people that could be losing tens of thousands of dollars because the action on the Federal land has an impact on the private land that abuts it at the same time. And that cannot be solved in a simple amendment.

However, the language that you put in here is a good effort to try and at least clarify what Congress hopes to be accomplishing. For that, I commend the gentleman for actually presenting this particular amendment. I am happy to be able to vote for it.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I think we need to devolve this back to the people of interest, the Native peoples, the people on private ownership to private owners.

Mr. Chair, I lay no opposition to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, just to close, I very much appreciate the attention that was brought to section 6 of the amendment, which very clearly states that nothing in this act, number one, affects the mineral rights of an Indian Tribe or member of an Indian Tribe to trust land or allotment land; or, secondly, precludes improvements to or rights-of-way for water, power, or road development under Federal lands to assist communities adjacent to or in the vicinity of the Federal land.

I very much respect my colleague and the former chair of the committee, Mr. Bishop, and Mr. Gosar, and I look forward to continuing to work with them.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in part E of House Report 116-264.

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:

Page 9, beginning on line 8, strike “TO INDIAN TRIBES”.

Page 9, line 11, insert “or a State trust land entity” after “Indian Tribe”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, 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, this amendment would allow Federal lands included in the withdrawal area to be conveyed or exchanged with State trust entities, as well as Native American Tribes.

Currently, over one-third of the land in New Mexico is owned by the Federal Government. The 316,000-acre withdrawal bill creates includes substantial parcels of Native American-owned private land and State trust lands.

State trust lands are an essential part of funding public services in the West, especially education. However, Federal overreach, such as this legislation, puts that funding at risk. Allowing the conveyance of certain lands in the withdrawal to State trusts and Native American Tribes will help to mitigate the effects of this withdrawal on essential public services and local infrastructure.

Allowing the conveyance of federally held land will also go a long way to addressing one of the critical problems with this legislation, which is access. Denying access to these lands to private landowners and Native American allottees is simply wrong. The growing Federal estate is not a good thing for the long-term future of the West.

Instead of locking up more land, like the majority is trying to do today, we should be focused on unlocking the potential of the West, empowering people to enjoy it.

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

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

The CHAIR. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, there is a little bit of irony on this amendment that, again, I can’t overlook, and we raised it a little bit earlier.

The previous debate, which was around protecting the Grand Canyon, included an argument from my colleague that there should be some support for the Member whose district that we were debating.

The gentleman from Arizona offered an amendment to an Arizona public lands bill that would have removed the lands in his district from the bill. Yet here we have a bill in New Mexico, in the Third Congressional District that I so proudly represent, which is supported by the Governor of the State of New Mexico and by the entire New Mexico delegation, and the gentleman from Arizona is still trying to make those changes—changes, I would offer, that don’t make a bit of difference when it comes to the substantive side of the bill.

This amendment would not improve the bill. In fact, it would make it harder for Tribal communities to protect the lands this bill was intended to preserve.

The gentleman claims that he wants to ensure the State has access to the lands in the withdrawal zone so that they can potentially earn revenue on these lands.

Well, there is something that has happened in the State of New Mexico over the last many years. In New Mexico, the State Land Office, which has jurisdiction over these lands, has placed a moratorium on these lands within the buffer zone because the State recognizes the importance of protecting Chaco Canyon.

It is important that Congress do the same. We need to recognize that the importance of these sacred homelands does not end at the boundaries of the Chaco Culture National Historical Park, a claim that was falsely made by my colleagues earlier today.

The entire greater Chaco region contains discovered and undiscovered cultural resources important to Pueblo communities, to Tribal communities, to our brothers and sisters who have a connection to this region. We need to create this protection zone to ensure that these resources are not disturbed or destroyed by future oil and gas exploration on Federal lands.

As my colleagues have noted, even Secretary Bernhardt agrees with this sentiment. That is the Secretary of the Interior under the Trump administration. That is why he and the administration worked with U.S. Senator for New Mexico Martínez to agree to a 1-year withdrawal around the Chaco region to allow Congress to act on these protections for these sites.

So I want to thank my colleagues for taking the initiative to act within the limited time that was given to us by the Secretary of the Interior.

This amendment ignores the importance of these resources, ignores the desires of the State, and would make it harder for Native communities to protect their lands.

Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleagues for the time today. I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment, but...
I hope to continue to work with my colleagues in the Congress so we can get to adoption of this important legislation with as strong a bipartisan vote as possible.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I am not from New Mexico, but I do have an interest in education because that was one of the standard operating procedures that we were promised on public land.

If I am not mistaken, the Tribes are beneficiaries, as well, of that educational fund. And so, when you start looking at this, depriving that fund of its due resources—I don’t know about New Mexico, but Arizona has got a problem paying for its educational system. It is not because we don’t have enough money; it is because we don’t have enough land. That is a problem.

I am here on behalf of the beneficiaries and the government promised. So, from that standpoint, I don’t see a dichotomy in the argument until we can understand, until we have a better facilitation of that exchange, once again, doing something expediently, as we had the discussion earlier about access to those resources. Once again, government hasn’t been the solution that it had claimed to be. We almost have to guide them hand and foot, pushing them to the right decision.

Mr. Chair, I still raise in favor of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question was taken; and the noes appeared to have it.

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

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) are postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3, printed in part E of House Report 116–264.

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:

SEC. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall take effect on the date that the Secretary of the Interior finds that the withdrawal under section 4 shall not impact the ability to develop or the economic value of the mineral rights held by Native Americans in the Chaco Cultural Heritage Withdrawal Area or the greater Chaco region.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. Chair, this amendment would ensure this bill would not take effect if the withdrawal in question is proven to affect development or economic value of Native American mineral rights on allotments.

Private property rights are a fundamental American ideal. The 316,000-acre withdrawal that this bill creates includes substantial parcels of privately held land, much of which is owned by Native American allottees.

The benefits of owning mineral rights are obvious, and the community supportive of the Navajo Nation and the All Pueblo Council of Governors, which represents 19 pueblos in New Mexico and 1 in Texas. These Tribal leaders want to see the Chaco landscape protected from oil and gas drilling. They don’t want to see cultural sites damaged by pump jacks or to have the pollution of extraction intrude on these sacred sites.

The restrictions in this proposal are not new. They have been informally in place for years under the Obama administration without any clear impact on any allottees.

We need to act now to formalize these protections because the Trump administration and their energy dominance agenda threatens these important resources. Lease sales have been offered around Chaco Canyon three times since March of 2018.

We must listen to the voices of Tribal communities and protect Chaco Canyon.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I would have loved to hear that argument in the discussion on ANWR. That would have been interesting to have.

When I look at this, it has become very evident, in my time here in Congress, to find programs that had no authorization by Congress that were enacted. Interesting. Interesting, once again, in a government that is not trusted.

Trust is a series of promises kept. Once again, this reiterates the private property ownership of these allottees to make sure that it is not impugned. I do not see the definition of that causing a quandary.

Once again, these are allottees who are deserving for us to require to make sure that they are held whole.

So, once again, I find it shortsighted in the application that the other side doesn’t want to accept this amendment.

Mr. Chair, I wish everyone would vote for this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment because it would allow Secretary Bernhardt to kill this bill, preventing protections for the important cultural sites at Chaco Canyon.

In response to this amendment, I would point you to the text of H.R. 2181. The bill text states: “Nothing in this Act affects the mineral rights of an Indian Tribe or member of an Indian Tribe or trust land or allotment land.” It could not be any clearer than that; yet we have had this debate in hearings, in markups, and even moments ago during debate and in amendments. I understand and appreciate the concerns of the Navajo allottees, and I appreciated when Ms. Hesuse came before our committee to share her concerns with us. It is important that we take these voices into consideration, which is why I appreciate Representative Luján’s effort to make explicitly clear that this bill will have no impact on the rights of allotted owners.

But, at the same time, we need to listen to the voices of Native communities and their elected leaders, who are calling on us to protect Chaco Canyon.

We have heard that already, but this bill receives the complete support of the Navajo Nation and the All Pueblo Council of Governors, which represents 19 pueblo in New Mexico and 1 in Arizona.

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. 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. ARRINGTON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part E of House Report 116–264.

Mr. AARRINGTON. 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, add the following:

SEC. 7. CONTINUING OPERATIONS.

Operators may continue new oil and gas developments in the exclusionary zone proposed by this Act if those operators have previously been in accordance with the provisions of law formerly known as the “National Historic Preservation Act” and have not violated the existing rules and regulations for the archeological sites and areas of sensitivity in the Chaco Canyon Historical Park.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Cuellar), a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. AARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, there is a Navajo saying that a rocky vineyard does not need a prayer but a pickax.

We don’t need protectionist prayers from elites in Washington who think they have all the answers; we need a pickax for prosperity and opportunity for folks living in rural America and the Navajo people in New Mexico.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today to offer an amendment to H.R. 2381, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act.

My amendment would prevent the proposed moratorium on future oil and gas development from going into effect in an area that already has adequate protections, protections that are there to ensure that these operations won’t have any adverse impact on historic and sacred lands in the Chaco Canyon Historical Park.

The reality is there are already a litany of State and Federal laws in place to ensure environmental protection and to prevent mineral development from affecting sensitive infrastructure and archaeological artifacts within this exclusion zone.

Energy companies have had a positive track record when it comes to working with the Federal Government to comply with these laws for necessary permits and approvals. And, since producers already meet the standards set in several comprehensive environmental laws, this proposed ban on new oil and gas development in this area, in my opinion, is unnecessary, is misguided, and is overreaching.

In fact, that minerals already prohibited within the Chaco Canyon Historic Park, keeping the culturally sensitive artifacts safe from any sort of potential disturbance caused by oil and gas development, this bill is nothing more than a buffer zone on top of an already existing buffer zone that has protected cultural artifacts effectively for 100 years, Mr. Chairman.

Unfortunately, if enacted, this bill would create significant access and extraction complications for the Navajos. This adverse impact would be a result of the checkerboard nature of the mineral rights and how Federal, State, Tribal, and private lands are intersecting.

Even though the area is proven to house abundant oil and gas reserves, the restrictions on accessing Federal land would make doing business in that area almost impossible, leading to a de facto extraction ban on the Navajo’s privately-owned mineral rights. The so-called buffer zone imposed by the bill is arbitrary and completely unnecessary, again, in my opinion.

The whole purpose of establishing the Chaco Culture National Historical Park was to protect every area of historic significance and, again, it has worked incredibly well. That goal has already been achieved. The protection is already ensured. Extending the boundaries and adding acreage to the heritage area will not enhance protection of areas of historical significance, but instead, will limit the potential of private landowners to steward and reap the rewards of their privately held land passed down to them from their ancestors.

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

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

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

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

I strongly oppose this amendment because it would negate the withdrawal. It would prevent us from protecting Chaco Canyon. The gentleman’s amendment would allow for new drilling to occur on lands within the withdrawal area, so long as certain standards are met. Essentially, this amendment would protect the status quo, a status quo set by the All Pueblo Council of Governors, the Navajo Nation, the entire New Mexico delegation, the governor, and even the administration.

When Secretary Bernhardt visited Chaco last spring, he agreed to a 1-year moratorium because he knew that new drilling posed a threat to these sacred resources. Now this amendment seeks to overturn those temporary protections offered by the Trump administration and to prevent permanent protections from being enacted. That cannot stand.

Furthermore, this amendment contains numerous drafting edits that would make it impossible to enact. It names the park site incorrectly. It refers to undefined terms. And its unclear wording would essentially allow anyone to drill in the withdrawal area. This is clearly not a good faith amendment, and it is clearly not an amendment intended to improve this proposal. It is simply an attempt to open these sacred lands with resources that extend beyond the park to extraction, because some of our colleagues cannot be satisfied until every acre of land in this country has an oil rig or an open pit mine.

Ninety percent of this region is already open to leasing. Oil and gas are not under attack in New Mexico. This bill simply attempts to protect an area important to the Tribal communities who have connections to this land that go back thousands of years before this country even existed.

We have to believe, as a House, that some places have value beyond what we can drill from the ground. And believe it or not, some things in this world are more important than money. Is there nothing that matters more than industry profits? These are sacred lands, lands that connect us to the past and lands that native communities are asking us to protect. The bones of my ancestors are buried there in its hallowed ground.

We need to listen to the voices of the people whose land it belongs to and who have had it since time immemorial. We need to lift up those voices and we need to protect Chaco Canyon.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

Private property rights are a cornerstone of our democracy and our free societies. That doesn’t just extend to folks in Texas. New Mexico, Oklahoma. It extends to all Americans and our Tribal brothers and sisters. One of them who testified at one of the hearings, who is a member of the Navajo Nation, said that this is a steadfast personal property right that sustains our livelihoods and our way of life. This is a much-needed source of income to feed, shelter, cloth, and protect our families.

Mr. Chairman, this is unnecessary. This is one of those times where Washington thinks it has the solution, where we sit in our ivory tower and dictate the terms to folks living in rural communities in New Mexico and throughout the country, folks that depend on these resources to sustain their livelihoods, and I just trust that the local community and the great State of New Mexico knows best how to manage their resources.

This is not disturbing any sacred land or historic artifacts. That is not what this is about. This is about a protectionist, activist view to ban drilling, in my opinion. And the State of New Mexico...
Mexico is incredibly dependent on the oil and gas revenues. Mr. Chairman. A third of their budget, Mr. Chairman, is reliant on oil and gas royalties.

I encourage my colleagues to support this amendment. I think it is critical to make sure that our colleagues know that Washington doesn’t have the solutions.

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

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN).

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, I listened closely to the words of my colleague on the other side of the aisle and, Mr. Chairman, he said something that matters very much to me as well. That New Mexico knows best, New Mexico knows best.

The governor of the State of New Mexico, the State land commissioner, the entire delegation supports this legislation. So I am hoping we will earn the vote of my colleague from the other side of the aisle on final adoption, so he can join with the good people of New Mexico and support the bill.

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

This legislation, H.R. 2181, is absolutely necessary to protect the land of my ancestors and the land of New Mexico, which is incredibly dependent on the oil and gas revenues that are offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRENTING).

The question was taken; and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRENTING) was rejected.
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A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 243, not voting 13, as follows:

[Vote list not provided]
The amendment was agreed to. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill. The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT
Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill? Mr. ARRINGTON. Yes, in its current form.

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

The Clerk reads as follows:

Mr. Arrington moves to recommit the bill H.R. 2181 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. 7. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall go into effect if the Secretory of the Interior, in consultation with the Governor of New Mexico, determines that the State of New Mexico will suffer a loss of revenue, including revenues used to fund schools, roads, fire and police protection and other public services, attributed to the permanent withdrawal under section 4 of this Act.

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

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, at the heart of America’s economic prosperity and unrivaled security is an abundant, affordable, and reliable supply of domestic energy. American energy independence is, undoubtedly, a matter of national security, but it is also critical to jobs and income in our rural economies.

In New Mexico alone, Mr. Speaker, oil and gas-related employment is critical to jobs and income in our rural economies. That is over $2 billion, half of which supports funding public education, health care, and other important public services.

Mr. Speaker, while this bill claims not to infringe on the private property rights of the Navajo people, the reality is that many of their lands are surrounded by Federal lands, making it virtually impossible to develop if this legislation were to pass.

H.R. 2181, let’s be clear, would eliminate key revenue sources used for public services. It would destroy jobs and economic activity there in New Mexico and, ultimately, threaten the livelihood of the Navajo people.

This, Mr. Speaker, in my opinion, would be an absolute travesty for the Navajo people because the poverty rate in the Navajo Nation is more than three times the national average, about 38 percent. The unemployment rate is more than five times the national average, 20-plus percent. Almost half of all Navajo children live in poverty.

Oil- and gas-related employment is critical to jobs and income in these isolated areas where the Navajo people live. Unconscionable, Mr. Speaker, that a handful of activists should be able to deprive the Navajo Nation of opportunities to find work, opportunities to lease their own mineral rights, and opportunities to lift themselves up out of poverty by reaping the benefits of their own land.

Mr. Speaker, there is an old Navajo saying: “A rocky vineyard does not need a prayer, but a pickax.”

The Navajo people don’t need more protectionists prayers from Washington elite and environmental activists. They need the pickax of prosperity and opportunity that comes from freedom, and the ability to manage their own private property rights and their own private mineral rights.

The Navajo people are a proud people, just like all Americans, and they just want an opportunity for a better life for themselves and their families.

Mr. Speaker, this is a classic case of a solution looking for a problem. I ask my colleagues to support this motion to recommit and vote “no” on H.R. 2181.

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

MS. HAALAND. Mr. Speaker, I claim the time in opposition to this motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is just another attempt to distract from the importance of this proposal, which is listening to Tribal voices by protecting the sacred sites of Chaco Canyon from oil and gas extraction.

The bill would not impact New Mexico revenue streams in the slightest. The State has already withdrawn State lands in Chaco and opted to protect our indigenous lands. They also recognize the value of our outdoor economy which requires a clean environment.

The State of New Mexico will not suffer this severe economic loss, the states are not suffering in a loss of revenue. That is revenue used to fund schools, roads, hospitals, and other important public services.
The bill would not impact the New Mexico revenue streams in the slightest. This country is the largest producer of oil and gas in the world. We produce over 12 million barrels of crude oil a day, sending 3 million of those to other countries.

Lack of access to oil and gas is not an issue in New Mexico, and this bill will in no way hinder the tremendous amount of energy extraction in the State. Between 2010 and 2018, oil production in New Mexico increased by nearly 400 percent, and the State is now the third largest producer in the Nation after Texas and North Dakota.

In the San Juan Basin where Chaco Canyon is located, 90 percent of public land is already open to development.

Must every inch of land be swallowed by oil and gas-sucking machinery? Thousands of sacred ancestral sites to the Pueblo people are sites where In-...
The yeas and nays were ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 245, nays 174, not voting 12, as follows: [Roll No. 597]

YEAS—245

[45x123]Golden

[45x129]Garcia (TX)

[45x136]Garcia (IL)

[45x169]Foster

[45x195]Finkenauer

[45x202]Evans

[45x215]Eshoo

[45x228]Escobar

[45x242]Engel

[45x255]Doyle, Michael

[45x261]Dingell

[45x267]Deutch

[45x274]Demings

[45x301]Crow

[45x372]Cox (CA)

[45x379]Courtney

[45x386]Costa

[45x399]Cooper

[45x418]Cole

[45x431]Clyburn

[45x438]Cleaver

[45x457]Clark (MA)

[45x477]Chu, Judy

[45x484]Castro (TX)

[45x490]Castor (FL)

[45x497]Case

[45x530]Carbajal

[45x536]Calvert

[45x562]Brownley (CA)

[45x569]Brown (MD)

[45x575]Brindisi

[45x616]Bishop (GA)

[45x655]Allred

[45x662]Aguilar

[45x669]Adams

[45x700]174, not voting 12, as follows:

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 185, noes 240, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 598]

ANNOUNCEMENT OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote), there are 2 minutes remaining.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 185, noes 240, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 598]
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment. The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 243, not voting 16, as follows:

[C] [R] [NV]

[Roll No. 599]

AYES—178

Abraham (IN)
Adler (IL)
Aderholt (GA)

Carter (TX)

Gonzalez-Colin (TX)

Hayes (FL)

Herculean (CA)

Brown (CA)

Hergenrother (NE)

Costa (CA)

Courtney (CT)

Coates (PA)

Crowley (NY)

Davidson (GA)

Cline (CA)

Collins (GA)

Comer (GA)

Cook (IN)

Cosby (PA)

Crawford (GA)

Cross (GA)

Cruz (TX)

Crowley (LA)

Davis (KS)

Davis (WV)

DeGette (CO)

DeLauro (CT)

DeSaulnier (CA)

DeSoto (MS)

Dent (IL)

DeVito (CT)

DeVoss (MD)

Dingell (MI)

Dodd (CT)

Dolan (CT)

Dorman (MD)

Douglas (GA)

Dreier (CA)

Dubin (NY)

Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)

Duncan (TX)

Duncan (AZ)

Duncan (KS)

Duncan (WV)

Dundie (WY)

Durr (TX)

Eggertson (OR)

Egel (CA)

Emerson (KS)

Emmer (MN)

Endicott (NY)

Engel (NY)

Eskdale (NC)

Espaillat (NY)

Espinoza (CA)

Fang (CA)

Farley (NY)

Farr (CA)

Farrar (NV)

Farrar (IA)

Farrar (NE)

Farrar (SD)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (OR)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)

Farrar (WV)

Farrar (WI)
Announcement by the Acting Chair

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. Gosar). The Acting CHAIR of the Committee rises.

Mr. Wittman moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Natural Resources, in full, with an amendment, pursuant to House Resolution 656, as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the provisions of the order of the House at 10:30 a.m., the bill is now before the Committee on Natural Resources.

The Acting CHAIR. The bill will be heard. The roll call will be taken. The Acting CHAIR of the Committee rises.

Mr. Wittman moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Natural Resources, in full, with an amendment, pursuant to House Resolution 656, as above recorded.

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Personal Explanation.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained in a meeting discussing the lack of diversity in media. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 599 and "nay" on rollcall No. 600.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BEYER). The question on the amendment of the committee is submitted.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rose.

Accordingly, the Committee rose, and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Kildee) having assumed the chair, Mr. BEYER, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 1373) to protect, for current and future generations, the watershed, ecosystem, and cultural heritage of the Grand Canyon region in the State of Arizona, and for other purposes, and, pursuant to House Resolution 656, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered. The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the bill that is the engrossment and third reading of the bill. The bill was ordered to engross and read a third time, and was so ordered.

Motion to Recommit.

Mr. Wittman moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Natural Resources.

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

The Clerk reads as follows: Mr. Wittman moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Natural Resources. The motion is agreed to.
At the end of the bill, add the following:

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall not be effective until the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Defense, issues a report concluding that the withdrawal under section 2 will not result in increased mineral imports from Russia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Chinese-owned mines in Namibia.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, uranium is essential to both our national security and energy security. It supplies many critical military technologies and fuels our domestic nuclear reactors, which provide 20 percent of our Nation’s electricity.

Early this summer, Secretary of Commerce Wilbur Ross issued findings that concluded “uranium is being imported into the United States in such quantities and under such circumstances as to threaten to impair the national security of the United States.”

Most recently, President Trump agreed, saying “that the United States uranium industry faces significant challenges in producing uranium domestically and that this is an issue of national security.”

This bill would have a negative impact on our national security and energy security, as it permits permanently prohibiting the mining of rare earths and critical minerals on over 1 million acres of public land, increasing our dependence on imported foreign sources of uranium.

My motion to recommit would delay the implementation of this legislation until the Secretary of the Interior issues a report concluding that this permanent, million-acre withdrawal of lands from mineral development will not increase U.S. imports of critical minerals like uranium from countries hostile to the United States’ interests—like former Soviet Union bloc countries or Namibia, where the Chinese have taken control of uranium mines.

Increasingly, our adversaries like China and Russia are competing for natural resources and using them as proxies to extend their political and strategic aims.

The U.S. is losing our domestic uranium production capacity and becoming more reliant on uranium imports from countries that are unfriendly to the United States, including Russia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Chinese-owned mines in Namibia.

In part, we have been able to rely on friendly countries for these resources. Unfortunately, uranium imports from Australia and Canada have been declining in recent years. Currently, only one Canadian mine remains operational, creating an increasingly fragile supply chain. As a result, we are becoming more dependent on China and Russia for critical natural resources.

I have dedicated my time on the Armed Services Committee to maintaining a strong defense industrial base in the face of increased near-peer competition from China and Russia. These adversaries are weaponizing natural resources like uranium to implement a dedicated strategy that pursues their geopolitical aims while undermining our own.

We should not allow our adversaries to dominate the mining, production, and markets of these critical resources. If we do, we weaken our position and are subject to increased economic and military pressure from Beijing and Moscow.

It would be shortsighted to permanently lock away the highest grade uranium deposits in this country. Instead of rushing headlong into permanently restricting 1 million acres of uranium-rich land, we absolutely must understand the true impacts of this legislation and the long-term, true impact on the national security of our country.

Mr. Speaker, we can do both. We can conserve our natural resources and make sure we protect our national security. To do anything less is an abandonment of our responsibilities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support our national security, support this motion to recommit, and vote against H.R. 1573.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Speaker, I understand the gentleman’s concerns, I really do. Hostile nations like Russia have shown their true face by interfering in our elections and continuing to attempt to influence the results of an American election.

But let’s be clear about the true intent of this motion. What the gentleman has put forward will kill this bill, opening a pathway for uranium mining in the Grand Canyon. Instead, they seem to think that the real threat to our national security is that Democrats aren’t willing to mine uranium in the Grand Canyon. And make no mistake, this is what they are supporting when they vote against this bill or this procedural motion. This is not theoretical.

The Grand Canyon, and I will say it again, the Grand Canyon is under threat from uranium mining, and my colleagues across the aisle are perfectly willing to let it happen. We don’t need to open up the Grand Canyon to uranium mining to meet our national security or energy needs. The region that is being designated for permanent withdrawal holds only 1 percent of known U.S. reserves of uranium.

Meanwhile, we get the majority of our uranium from domestic mining or from our closest allies, Australia and Canada. The Department of Defense has tested that we have enough uranium stockpiled to meet national security needs for decades to come. And we stockpile enough uranium to run reactors for years without importing a single pound.

I could rattled off the facts all day about how nonsensical this motion is and how ridiculous an argument our colleagues are making. I can share letters from national security experts breaking down their concerns about the impact of uranium mining on the Grand Canyon. I could even show you data from the Heritage Foundation, a known friend of our colleagues, showing the Republican arguments about uranium security, are, in Heritage’s words, “a hollow Russian doll.”

But at the end of the day, we can’t lose sight of what this is really about. Our colleagues want to see the Grand Canyon, one of the most American of American landscapes open to uranium mining. They want to block this bill. They want to stop this place from being permanently protected, so that a very few wealthy companies can open up mine shafts and pull uranium out of the Grand Canyon and leave the mess to the taxpayers to clean up.

We don’t need this uranium in the designated area. It is expensive to extract. It risks our clean water and threatens our Tribal communities.

At that point, the threat to Tribal communities is based in a legacy of antihistory, a legacy of illness, a legacy of high levels of contamination among Navajo people in the area in the Navajo Nation. It is based on lost land and soil-contaminated land, and it is based upon contaminated water. That is the legacy around the Grand Canyon to the people and the environment around there. It is a legacy that has united Indian Country in support of permanent protection, permanent protection of the Grand Canyon, and we should respect that voice. It is a voice that has been clear about the importance, not only of the Grand Canyon as a cultural resource, but the Grand Canyon as a resource of water for 40 million people in this country.

We don’t need this uranium. As I said, it is, frankly, hard for me to imagine a more cynical move than to continue to mine in the Grand Canyon. They are willing to use misinformation to ignore the people of Arizona and the United States and to threaten one of the most iconic landmarks just to open up a few acres for extraction.
Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was 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—ayes 236, noes 226, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 662]
HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW
Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Speaker will now announce the bill.

COLORADO OUTDOOR RECREATION AND ECONOMY ACT

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 823.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to H.R. 823, the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 823.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. Murphy) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

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. 823) to provide for the designation of certain wilderness areas, recreation management areas, and conservation areas in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, with Mrs. Murphy of Florida 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 the resolution of House Resolution 656 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 Colorado (Mr. Neguse) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Lamborn) each will control 30 minutes.

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.
The third title is the Thompson Divi-
vide Withdrawal and Protection Act, which
prevents new oil and gas development in one of Colorado’s most
treasured landscapes while also protect-
ing property rights. The Thompson Divide, through ranching and
outdoor recreation, contributes $30 million a year to the statewide econ-
omy. It is an area that is simply too valuable to drill for oil and gas.

This title also includes a pilot pro-
gram to capture of fugitive methane from both active and inactive
coal mines in portions of Pitkin, Delta, Gunnison, and Garfield Counties.

Madam Chair, this is a point that is
worth underscoring. This provision that I mentioned was developed at the
request of local elected leaders. Ulti-
mately, I am thankful for their thoughtful input to improve the bill.

The fourth and final title formally
establishes the boundary for the Curecanti National Recreation Area, cur-
currently a handful of National Park Service units without a
formal designation by an act of Con-
gress. This special place consists of
three reservoirs that are a designation for boating, fishing, hiking, and camp-
ing. It is a long-overdue formal des-
ignation that will allow the National Park Service to more effectively man-
age the area, and it also will help en-
sure that the Federal Government lives up to a longstanding commitment it
made to the State of Colorado to pro-
vide new fishing access for sportsmen in the Gunnison River basin.

Finally, I would like to call out an
important addition to this bill that
was included in the manager’s amend-
ment to honor the life of an out-
standing individual who was truly
loved by his family and friends, and he
served as a pillar of his community.
Sanford Morris Treat, Jr., who went by the
name “Sandy,” was a World War II
veteran who served in the 10th Moun-
tain Division and trained at Camp
Hale.

I had the honor of meeting Sandy be-
fore his passing earlier this year, and it
is due to his and his fellow veterans’
unwavering advocacy that Camp Hale
would be forever maintained as a Na-
tional Historic Landscape under the
CORE Act. Therefore, the manager’s
amendment includes language to des-
ignate the Sandy Treat Overlook as an
interpretive site overlooking Camp
Hale.

It is my hope that those who visit it
will be reminded of his service to our
country, his zest for life, and his pas-
sion for protecting the legacy of Camp
Hale.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues,
respectfully, to support the CORE Act,
ot only for those who came before us, but also to protect our treas-
ured places for generations to come.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of
my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may con-
sume.

Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to
H.R. 823, a bill that creates land re-
strictions for approximately 400,000 acres of new wilderness, permanent
mineral withdrawals, as well as recreation and conservation
areas.

While the goals of the public lands legis-
lation in this bill are certainly admirable and well-intended, and I have
great respect for the bill’s sponsor, my
friend and fellow Coloradan, Congress-
man NEWMAN.

I am proud to call Colorado home,
and I am honored to represent the
Fifth District of Colorado. I truly be-
lieve our State is the most beautiful in
the Union, and myself and the bill’s
sponsor and other Representatives from Colorado that you will hear from
during our debate would agree with me on that. We love our State, and we
are very proud of it.

As is the case for most Western
States, Colorado has a large amount of
public lands, with roughly one-third of the State under Federal management.
These rich and diverse public lands pro-
vide countless outdoor recreation op-
portunities, habitat for wildlife, and
significant economic benefits for our
rural communities and our State as a
whole.

Because of these diverse uses of our
public lands, it is vital that the land
management decisions we make find
balance and common ground. I regret
to say today that this bill before us
falls short on both counts.

To put the enormity of this bill into
perspective, Madam Chairman, this bill
affects a total acreage that is nine
times the size of Washington D.C. A
bill of this magnitude should not be
forced through along partisan party
lines, yet that is what we are facing
today.

Public lands decisions should be
made with local collaboration and input. They have real consequences for
communities on the ground who live near these public lands.

It is troubling to note that 65 percent
of the lands affected by the bill before
us are located in Congressman TIPTON’s
district. Not only was Mr. TIPTON not
meaningfully consulted on this legisla-
tion, but he was not even made aware of
it until the day that it was publicly
announced.

It is not against the law to write bills
affecting other people’s districts, but I
think that consensus and collaboration
require that they should be brought into
the loop and be part of the proc-
ess.

Subsequent efforts to engage on this
legislation and find compromise have
been largely ignored. That lack of en-
gagement sadly continues today.

Mr. TIPTON, for instance, offered 10
good faith amendments that raised spe-
cific concerns that his constituents
have brought to him concerning this bill. Only three of these were made in
order by the Democrat-controlled
Rules Committee.

Substantial stakeholder concerns about this bill have been raised by im-
pacted counties, recreation groups, for-
ery health advocates, as well as the
relevant Federal agencies.

One particularly worrying concern
has been raised by the National Guard
Bureau—about this bill’s impact on the Colorado Army National Guard’s High Altitude
Aviation Training Site, or HAATS, that
has yet to be resolved.

Proposed wilderness expansions in
Colorado around the Colorado Army
National Guard’s HAATS, or High Alt-
itude Aviation Training Site, are cre-
ating concerns about the future of the
site for aircraft training. Aircrews must
be deployed to combat zones in the
Middle East.

This HAATS site is a treasure. It is
the only place in the country where
high-altitude rotary-wing aircraft can
get the training in real-life conditions
that they will encounter overseas in
places like Afghanistan or training for
search and rescue in mountainous areas around the country or around the
world.

So this is a treasure. It is a unique
site that must be protected. And it is a
collection of sites. It is not just one
landing zone. It is a multitude of land-
ing zones.

While the sponsors of the CORE Act
have indicated that their goal is to pro-
tect HAATS, the only way to provide
certainty for HAATS is to codify the
existing Department of Defense guid-
ance. A bill that will be supported by
the administration.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of
my time.

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

Madam Chair, with great respect for
my colleague from Colorado Springs,
whom I certainly enjoy serving with.
Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, I rise
y myself such time as I may con-
sume.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, I rise
y myself such time as I may con-
sume.
Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Chair, I want to thank my colleague from Colorado and laud him for taking on the mantle of supporting the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act.

Our State has some of the most remarkable outdoor landscapes in the country. As a fourth-generation Coloradan, I understand how important our public lands are to our livelihoods, our health, and, yes, our identity.

Like many Coloradans, I have personal memories of camping and hiking with my family and using our public lands to teach my daughters about the importance of environmental stewardship and conservation. But preserving our public lands is not important just to those of us who enjoy exploring the outdoors; it is important to our State’s economy.

We can’t allow ourselves to sit back and assume that the places we cherish today will be there for future generations to experience as well. Every 30 seconds, our Nation loses the equivalent of a football field of natural area due to human activity.

Let me say that again. Every 30 seconds, our Nation loses a football field of natural area due to human activity. We are seeing this right now in our home State with the pressures of population growth.

That is why, for more than 20 years, I have been working with my colleagues in Congress, with local elected officials, and with citizens across the State to protect the very few remaining special areas that we have left. That is why I am so honored that we are now going to see the fruits of all of this action.

The legislation that we will vote on today will protect an additional 400,000 acres of public lands in our State, including 70,000 acres of wilderness. It is part of our commitment to preserve 1 million acres of public lands in our State, not just for wilderness, but also for multiple use, which is so critical for our State.

Together, the CORE Act and the Colorado Wilderness Act, which I am the prime sponsor of, will help boost Colorado’s multibillion-dollar outdoor recreation industry, which supports more than 220,000 jobs in our State. They will also help increase our Nation’s tourism industry, lift nearby property values, and improve residents’ overall quality of life.

Our constituents have been clear on this issue: they want to protect our public lands. As Congressman Neguse noted, a poll found that as many as 90 percent of Colorado’s residents believe that protecting our outdoor recreation economy is important to the future of our State.

Our State has changed. Our economy is dependent on the preservation of our special remaining wild places. I know many of us in the congressional delegation would agree. That is why we are so united in this effort. That is why we are eager to take on this fight.

Madam Chair, I urge all of my colleagues to give the people of our State what they want and to vote for this important legislation.

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

Madam Chair, I do agree with my colleague from Denver that the outdoor recreation industry in Colorado is a thriving and vital part of our State’s economy. We have such good material, such a good environment to work with that it is no wonder I would have to point out that, fortunately, the lands that are under consideration in this bill already have one form of protection or another due to being wilderness study areas or other types of federal land management, which was mentioned—one football field every 30 seconds—doesn’t apply to these lands. These lands are not in that category.

Ms. DEGETTE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LAMBORN. I yield to the gentlewoman from Colorado.

Ms. DEGETTE. I would just note—and the gentleman and I have actually discussed this—as we have been preparing the maps for my bill, which we are going to be seeing in the Natural Resources Committee in the next few weeks, we have seen, even in areas that are protected as wilderness study areas or other BLM Federal lands, we have seen a steady erosion by people who are over loving these lands, and that is why we need these protections.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, reiterating my time, I understand where the gentleman is coming from.

With that, I would say that instead of spending our finite resources on the philosophical area for time constraints over restricting lands that very few people can enter into as opposed to having lands as open as possible for as many people and many uses as possible, I think I am a balance that we have to strike—there has got to be a place for both—I think we need to keep our discussion for the next part of our debate on the local collaboration, or lack thereof.

Madam Chair, for that reason, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Tipton).

Mr. TIPTON. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chair, when it comes to public lands management, Colorado has a long history of balancing the interests of a broad range of stakeholders, including the needs and interests of citizens who may not be the most vocal on the issues. This is accomplished through proactive outreach to communities and engagement with citizens and local leaders who know their areas best.

This type of local engagement has proved to be effective on a variety of public lands efforts, such as Hermosa Creek and Chimney Rock in southwest Colorado. In both cases, there was an extensive and inclusive community outreach process with many months of bipartisan support, negotiations, and conversations with stakeholders from all sides of the debate.

The result was the House passing bipartisan measures to be able to protect these individual and valuable open spaces, both of which have become law. These efforts represent the recognition of historic multiple uses of the land as well as for the communities who live there.

For many decades, Colorado has responsibly developed natural resources on public lands, which has provided critical funding for emergency services, education, and infrastructure for rural communities that would otherwise be unable to have these services. While doing this, Colorado has also embraced the thriving outdoor economy and protected access to the public lands for historical uses, as well as for sportsmen and other recreational access.

We have prioritized conservation of delicate ecosystems and habitats, protected cultural and historic sites, and defended private property and water rights. There are certainly disagreements on the most effective ways to be able to carry out these ideas, but most of us agree that the most effective approach to be able to work through disagreements is by being able to listen to the local communities and those most affected by Federal decisions and finding a way to be able to
incorporate those ideas into balanced legislation.

Unfortunately, we have not seen this same type of outreach negotiation and local engagement with the CORE Act as a whole. Some stakeholders and communities in the Third Congressional District were not included. It is important that we do not discount the Third District voices who feel like they were excluded or that their concerns were disregarded.

Madam Chair, I have heard from numerous county commissioners who have not been involved in the legislative process for the CORE Act and have simply asked to have their concerns addressed by the House before a vote takes place. This is the same feedback I have repeatedly heard from stakeholders and local elected officials in the Third District following public meetings on these issues over the past few months.

I am not saying that there is not support for the CORE Act in the Third District, because there is. Many of our resort and mountain communities are strongly behind the bill, and it is just as important to them as it is to those in the western part of the state.

I am optimistic that we can find a balanced public lands bill that reflects all of these communities, but it can’t happen if one side is left out of the conversation from the beginning. More outreach needs to happen, negotiations need to take place, and compromise needs to be made.

The commissioners, other local elected officials, and stakeholders in the counties that have not yet been included in the experiences have knowledge and opinions that should be given due consideration when crafting public policy land bills that directly impact many of them and indirectly impacts all of them. We firmly are committed to giving all counties in the Third District the opportunity to be able to have their voices heard in this process.

During a House Natural Resources Committee on the CORE Act before the House Rules Committee this week, I introduced amendments that included reasonable and necessary additions to the bill based on direct feedback from Third District stakeholders and officials.

I provided my colleagues from Colorado who sponsored this legislation in both the House and the Senate with a similar list of items for inclusion beforehand. These suggestions include protections for existing water and grazing rights; codification of the U.S. Army High-Altitude Aviation Training Site’s flight guidelines over wilderness areas; allowing for current public land management activities to continue in recreation areas; and language to ensure that leaseholders in the Thompson Divide are fairly compensated for the value of their leases.

These amendments are not controversial. They are not partisan. They do not disrupt or alter the outcomes of the bill. What these amendments do is ensure that there is no ambiguity in the intent of the legislation, as stated by the bill’s sponsors and supporters. The ambiguity, which is what will result if these amendments are not accepted.

I have also offered two amendments to release wilderness study areas, at the request of counties in which they are located. Many of those areas have been deemed unsuitable for wilderness designation. That does not mean that they will not be protected public lands because they all have some measure of protection.

Madam Chairwoman, responsible management is not always the result of more restrictive designations. Instead, it can also mean giving local communities greater flexibility to be able to address local land challenges.

In recent testimony given before the House Natural Resources Committee, Montezuma County Commissioner Keenan Ertel made the argument for releasing wilderness study areas when they have been deemed unsuitable by the Federal land management agencies for wilderness protections. Seven years ago, the Menefee Mountain Wilderness Study Area was ravaged by fire. Years after the fire, noxious weeds consumed much of the landscape due to the stringent protections given in the area. These weed concerns continue to grow, as projected in this photo.

Local agencies are limited in their ability to be able to proactively manage these invasive species because of the stringent wilderness protections that remain in place.

If the Colorado delegation is truly vested in passing a statewide public lands bill that has broad local consensus, why aren’t we including the requests of these areas that have led to federal land management agencies’ refusal to allow for better management of these lands?

I have suggested to my bicameral Colorado colleagues, and even submitted an amendment, but it was not adopted. I continue to hear that local concerns have been addressed, yet we cannot assure Montezuma County residents that theirs have even been considered.

Along with allowing local communities greater ability to be able to protect their cherished open spaces from potential wildfires, it also includes buffer zones between wilderness and non-wilderness areas.

A look at the devastating wildfires in Colorado over the years shows us just how important this is. In 2013, the West Fork Complex fire, which burned over 100,000 acres in southwest Colorado, is a prime example of how forest fires have no regard for arbitrary lines, as shown on the map. Unfortunately, seen the aftermath of this fire and other fires, and they threaten the stability of roads and water quality and are greater erosion threats for many years to come.

I raised this concern with the sponsors of the bill, suggesting that we increase the offsets for the tracts running on the borders of the wilderness area from 50 to 150 feet. It is reasonable to ask, I believe we can eliminate unnecessary risks to our forests and protect them from future forest fires that have the potential to jump across boundary lines onto other public and private lands. Yet, this amendment was not allowed to move to the floor for consideration, nor were 8 out of the 10 amendments that I introduced.

Had there been greater outreach across the Third District, the CORE Act’s sponsors could have heard more examples like these that need to be addressed. This week alone, we received letters from Montezuma County, Dolores County, Rio Blanco County, Montrose County, Mesa County, all of which have various concerns about the CORE Act today. This letter is also accompanied by letters from individuals.

Madam Chairwoman, I applaud the CORE Act sponsor, my Colorado colleague, Mr. NEGUSE. He has a passion for being able to protect public lands in Colorado. It happens to be a passion we share.

However, Colorado’s Third District, where most of this bill will have an impact, not Mr. NEGUSE’s district—I would be remiss if I did not speak out on behalf of my constituents—have yet to have their voices heard in this process or their issues addressed.

I am optimistic that we could eventually get broad community consensus through the Third District on the CORE Act, but first, there is outreach that needs to be done, issues to be worked out, and compromises to be made.

There is no doubt that the CORE Act will pass the House tomorrow, that the Senate will follow this week, and that this is an opportunity to act in good conscience, given the concerns that we have heard out of the district that have not been addressed, I will have to reluctantly vote “no” on this current version of the bill.

It is my hope that the Senate will consider my amendments, that they will be included, that continued outreach occurs, and that we include the ideas of all western Colorado.

I stand willing and ready to be able to work with them.

Madam Chairwoman, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

There are just a few points before I yield some time to my distinguished colleague from the Sixth Congressional District.

I would first say, this reference to wilderness study areas and the notion that because, as my distinguished colleague from Colorad Springs mentioned, there are some wilderness study areas in certain areas, that, therefore, no further protections are needed, of course, as the gentleman from the
Mr. Tipton so that we can engage in a colloquy.

Mr. CROW. Madam Chairwoman, I rise today in support of the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act.

I would first like to thank my colleagues and the Colorado delegation, Congressman Joe Neguse, and Senator Michael Bennet, for their dedicated, hard work on this important bill.

Colorado is home to 4 national parks, 41 State Parks, 960 wildlife species, and 6,000 miles of rivers. From hiking, to camping and skiing with my family, including my two children, who I am proud to say are fifth-generation Coloradans, I know that among the most important aspects of the Colorado way of life are the beautiful places where we live, work, and play.

But we must act quickly to ensure that Colorado’s many national treasures are protected for our children, our grandchildren, and the generations to come.

The CORE Act will help us accomplish this by providing permanent protections for over 400,000 acres of Colorado’s public lands. It unites and builds on many prior efforts by protecting four iconic landscapes in one single, all-encompassing conservation bill for all of Colorado.

As an Army veteran, I am also thrilled to highlight the U.S. Army’s 10th Mountain Division, whose members trained at historic Camp Hale and later fought valiantly in World War II. At the peak of the war, Camp Hale housed as many as 14,000 soldiers. They were trained in skiing, snowshoeing, mountain climbing, cold-weather survival skills, and winter combat to prepare themselves for the Alpine warfare that awaited them in northern Italy.

In 1945, they broke through German mountain defenses, drawing forces away from other theaters and playing a critical role in World War II. Many of them came back afterward to help build Colorado’s outdoor recreation industry that we now know, love, and cherish today.

By passing this bill, we honor the 10th Mountain Division’s legacy and the sacrifices of those soldiers by designating over 28,000 acres of land that constitutes Camp Hale as the Nation’s first-ever National Historic Landscape.

This measure ensures that people of all ages can visit Camp Hale, lands, walk in the footsteps of those soldiers who trained there, and protect the site for future generations so that history and legacy will live on.

I am honored to work with my colleagues on this effort. The CORE Act is a once-in-a-generation protection of lands to hand to our kids and grandkids so that they can continue to love Colorado as much as we do.

I urge all Members to vote in favor of this bill.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chairwoman, I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. Tipton) to give him a moment to respond. It seemed like he had something to say.

Mr. Tipton. Madam Chair, I think the gentleman mentioned Montrose County. Is it going to be impacted by Curecanti?

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I appreciate Representative Tipton, my distinguished colleague, for mentioning that. I would say a few things.

First, of the nine counties that are impacted, as I mentioned, eight of them have expressed support for the provisions of the bill that impact them.

While I don’t have the letter from Montrose County that apparently came in—and I am happy to visit with the gentleman further about that letter—my understanding is that they expressed support still for the Curecanti title of the bill in their district.

I also would just say this: If the gentleman is willing to make a commitment that he will vote for this bill if the Montrose Board of County Commissioners supports the bill—is that the gentleman’s intent?

Mr. Tipton. Madam Chair, I have all the other issues that I have outlined, and I need those amendments to be able to do that. That does not make the bill bad, but it does make it an imperfect bill.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, reclaiming my time, the gentleman will have an opportunity to talk. I would just say this: We had this similar debate in the Rules Committee on Monday. Again, I am new to Washington, so perhaps this is just the way the process works, but this notion that amendments are offered and then a representation is made by the gentleman that even if every amendment passed, they would not support the bill, fundamentally, for me, this process is about good faith, negotiation, and discussion to get to a consensus.

I believe there are a number of amendments that the Representative, along with several others that have been proposed, that we are going to debate tonight. Some of those may, in fact, be amendments that we can agree to. But I would say to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that approach the discussion on those amendments with that same good faith, with understanding that they would hope to get to yes, because a similar discussion happened earlier this year with respect to the Garfield Board of County Commissioners.

Their nonsupport of the bill was justified and rationalized as a reason to oppose it. Of course, eventually, by working with those county commissioners, Senator Bennett’s office and myself were able to negotiate a compromise so that they could be in a position to support the title of the bill that impacted that county, so we could protect the treasured public lands in the Thompson Divide.

Again, I believe it is important to underscore that point, and I reserve the balance of my time.
Madam Chair, I would point out that Mr. Tipton offered 10 amendments in the Rules Committee, only three of which were adopted. There were seven amendments right there that were not even brought to the floor for debate. I think that that is unsatisfactory.

Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McClintock) who is the ranking member on the Subcommittee on Water, Oceans, and Wildlife on the Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. McClintock. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Madam Chairwoman, when I chaired the Public Lands Subcommittee, we set three overarching principles for the management of our public lands: to restore public access to the public lands, to restore good management to the public lands, and to restore the Federal Government as a good neighbor to those communities directly impacted by the public lands.

This bill appears to me to be the opposite of all of these principles. It closes off public use and access, it encourages a policy of neglect, and it thumbs our nose at the wishes of many of the people in the affected region.

H.R. 823 is a lopsided bill that offers a comparatively small, 28,000 acres, for motorized access versus roughly 400,000 acres of new wilderness enclosures. Seven percent of the land is provided for motorized access and 93 percent of the land is closed to that access. That means, Madam Chair, you can’t drive in to enjoy a family camping trip, and you can’t even bring bicycles.

It withdraws all these lands from any kind of resource development, which means that taxpayers will not have the benefit of revenues that these lands could provide. Much of the acreage designated for wilderness restrictions does not even meet the legal requirements under the Wilderness Act, and yet they are imposed in disregard of that law. So, so much for the public’s right to use the public lands.

As the growing menace of wildfires attests, 45 years of neglect of sound forest management due to the so-called environmental laws of the 1970s has abandoned our forests to themselves, and like any untended garden, an abandoned row and primrose will grow until it chokes itself to death, and it is then consumed by catastrophic wildfire. Modern forest management broke this cycle of morbid overgrowth followed by catastrophic wildfire. I can tell you, in a State with a significant wildfire risk, this bill would further reduce the acres that have been identified as suitable for active forest management by approximately 8,000 acres. So, so much for good management of the public lands.

The fact that there is significant local opposition, as expressed by many of the locally elected representatives of the communities affected by this legislation, as we have heard from Mr. Tipton. Rural county commissioners have warned that this bill will harm the economies of their local communities by removing multiple-use designations from these lands. In fact, when Republicans offered an amendment calling for consultation with the local communities that have been ignored by this legislation, that amendment was rejected on a party-line vote. So, so much for being a good neighbor to communities most affected by the Federal land.

Now, in the past, the Natural Resources Committee has prided itself on attempting to forge bipartisan consensus on its bills. Those days appear to be over. In fact, 65 percent of the lands affected by H.R. 823 aren’t even in the author’s district. They are in the district of Mr. Tipton, who has just expressed his significant concerns over this legislation, who was never consulted before the bill was introduced, and who was barred from engaging the bill’s sponsor during the committee’s consideration of the bill on April 2. In this kangaroo proceeding, the bill’s author acted as a witness, an advocate, and the chairman of the proceeding all at the same time.

Every Republican Member from Colorado opposes this bill, and the bill is reported to us on a straight party-line vote. It is obvious that the majority has no interest in balancing the concerns of wilderness enthusiasts, recreational user groups, and conservation groups, but instead feels entitled to impose its will over the pleas of the people most directly impacted. Fortunately, our system of government assures that such legislation, while it might pass one House, as I am sure it will tomorrow, but it will have no chance of becoming law—and rightly so.

Mr. Neguse. Madam Chair, again, I think it is important to underscore the facts. While I appreciate the gentleman from California making his case, his characterization of local support or lack thereof on this bill is simply not consistent with the facts, because, again, I have yet to hear of a single community that is directly impacted by the CORE Act that opposes the title of the CORE Act that impacts that community—not one, Madam Chair. I have been waiting. Coloradans are waiting.

Again, it is completely permissible to have a philosophical debate about whether or not to protect public lands. I happen to believe that these incredibly iconic places across our State ought to be protected. They ought to be preserved. My colleagues may disagree. That is their right. But it is important to stress the facts.

To that point, the last point I will make, and just yet another area that apparently needs to be clarified, is characterization that the CORE Act mandates widespread closures of trails or roads is false. This bill does not close any existing roads, jeep trails, off-highway vehicle trails, motorcycle trails, or groomed snowmobile trails, not one.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Colorado has 10 minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Lamborn. Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. Westerman), who has a master’s degree in forestry from Yale University.

Mr. Westerman. Madam Chair, as much as I appreciate my colleagues’ desire to do something good, I must rise in opposition today to H.R. 823.

As we all know, wilderness designations in theory implement natural management, meaning that man is to have a hands-off approach on the management of the forest. But this is a farce, because when catastrophic wildfires ignite, as they will under natural management, we often rush to put the fires out, which is just as much human management as thinning or other more recognized forestry management processes.

We need wilderness areas in our country, and we need to manage them as such if we want to be intellectually honest in claiming them as wilderness areas. This works like Yellowstone National Park where the predominant species is lodgepole pine that naturally burns to the ground approximately every century, like we saw when one-third of the park burned in the 1988.

The idea that we can preserve a forest is misguided. Forests are living organisms, and there is only one way to preserve a living organism: first you have to kill it. Take, for instance, a cucumber. If you want to make a pickle, the first thing you do to preserve a cucumber into a pickle is you boil it, you put it in vinegar, you put it in a jar, and you preserve it. If you want to preserve human tissue, you put the tissue in formaldehyde. There is a misnomer that we can preserve our forests because forests are living organisms.

We should be discussing instead conservation. We should want to conserve our forests, like Teddy Roosevelt and Gifford Pinchot proposed in the Teddy Roosevelt’s forest that’s currently in an unhealthy state. They are overstocked and infested with insects like the bark and pine beetle. I say that based on a report from the Colorado State Forest Service 2016 Forest Health Report.

It says that, for the seventh consecutive year, Colorado’s most widespread and destructive insect pest was the spruce beetle. This insect has now affected more than 1.8 million cumulative acres since 2000, with a total of 178,600 acres of active infestations occurring in high-level Engelmann spruce forests in 2018. A 4-year trend of tens of thousands of new acres infested annually indicates a continuing spread of
experience in his field. I appreciate him on the Natural Resources Committee, and I enjoy serving with him on that committee.

I would ask my distinguished colleague whether he would support the bill if I were to, say, amend the bill to give the Secretary unilateral power to do what the Secretary determines to be necessary for the control of fire and insects.

Would the gentleman be amenable to that?

Mr. WESTERMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NEGUSE. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WESTERMAN. I would be amenable if we did that, but then it wouldn’t be wilderness area.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I thank the distinguished colleague from Arkansas; and I will tell the gentleman that we don’t need to amend the bill because that language is in the bill, repeatedly in the bill because I share your concerns regarding wildfire, as do my distinguished colleagues from Colorado.

So we put great care to put into the bill language that restricts, the Secretary may carry out any activity that the Secretary determines to be necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases.”

So since we have that provision in the bill, I am hoping that the gentleman will join the bill, and I certainly hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle will do the same, because I think this bill strikes the right balance in terms of protecting these incredible public lands and doing so in a way that ensures that we are not at risk of a wildfire and mitigating as best as we can.

I would also tell the gentleman, of the 400,000 acres in the bill—and I look forward to bringing my colleague from Arkansas to Colorado to see these public lands—only 73,000 of them would be designated as wilderness in this bill, and many of those acres are actually above the tree line or otherwise unforested.

So, I think the language of the bill addresses the gentleman’s concerns, and I appreciate his raising them. I also very much appreciate his quoting a personal hero of mine, and I suspect a hero of many of the Members in this chamber, and that is Teddy Roosevelt, who, of course, was an esteemed conservationist in his time.

I will share a quote that I have found to be very compelling: “Here is your country. Cherish these natural wonders, cherish the natural resources, cherish the wilderness, and so on, as a sacred heritage, for your children and your children’s children.

“Do not let selfish men or greedy interests skin your country of its beauty, its riches or its romance.”

Madam Chair, it is important that we not lose sight of the bigger picture, which is that this bill is protecting iconic places like the Thompson Divide in Colorado from oil and gas development.

The ranchers, the citizens of that community, they have been waiting an awfully long time for the protections in this bill, which is why I am so proud to be able to carry the baton for them in the CORA Act.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, I am ready to close, if that is where the gentleman from Colorado stands, also.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I am ready to close as well.

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

Madam Chair, let me say that I am informed that Garfield and Montrose Counties, although they are comfortable with certain portions of the bill, are not willing to endorse the bill as is.

Also, I want to say that Colorado Springs Utilities in my district, representing about half a million people, and the Aurora Water District have raised concerns that the Camp Hale Preservation Historic Designation will negatively impact their existing and future water rights. These concerns have gone unaddressed.

I finish by stating what the administration, the Office of Management and Budget, says about this bill, which means, basically, that they have concerns that, if not addressed, will result in a veto of this bill, and it will not become law.

“The administration opposes H.R. 823, the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act. This bill would impose land restrictions on nearly 400,000 acres of land in Colorado and would reduce areas open for motorized recreation. The administration has pledged to expand access to America’s public lands and to increase hunting, fishing, and recreational opportunities nationwide; and enhance conservation stewardship. H.R. 823, however, would not achieve these goals in a balanced way, and the administration opposes it as it is currently drafted.”

It goes on to say, among other things, “Rural communities have raised concerns that the land-use restrictions included in H.R. 823 would have negative effects on local economics; and, as evidenced by the committee process, it appears that local sentiment has not been adequately taken into account when developing this bill. The administration, therefore, opposes H.R. 823 in its current form, but it is willing to work with the Congress to improve it if the bill is considered further.”

So if it were presented to the President in its current form, his advisers would recommend he veto it.

I also have the understanding that the Senate will not take up this bill either.

Maybe it is an interesting exercise that we are doing here, but it is not...
anything that is going to result in a law.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill, and let’s move on from here. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chair, it is important that we not divorce ourselves from the fate of this legislation. Whether it will become law or not is dependent on each and every one of us and where we stand on the bill.

While I have great respect for my colleagues from Colorado Springs, I think it is fitting that the closing that he offered cited President Trump and his threatened veto letter.

For me, and for the people I represent, for the citizens of my State, this bill is not about the President. It is not about any of us in this Chamber. It is about them and the public lands that they are so blessed to have in their respective communities.

I said this earlier—I will say it again—as a freshman lawmaker, I understand that I have not been in Congress long, but these pieces of legislation have been.

Public lands are at the heart of who we are as Coloradans. You heard the dean of our delegation talk about our recent poll where 73 percent of Coloradans consider themselves outdoor recreation enthusiasts. Whether they live in Gypsum Creek Golf Course, Glenwood Springs, Boulder, Fort Collins, Eagle County, Summit County, and everywhere in between, 73 percent say the ability to live in, recreate on, and enjoy public lands, like national forests, parks, and trails, is a significant reason why they live in the West.

Ninety percent believe that the outdoor recreation economy is important to the future of Colorado. It is why so many have labored on various components of this bill for so long—my predecessor, then-Congressman, now-Governor Jared Polis; former Senator Mark Udall; former Congressman John Salazar; and, of course, Senator Bennet today leading this companion legislation in the Senate; and the countless county commissioners, mayors, city councilors, town trustees, conservationists, and ranchers who have worked to build consensus on this bill, literally for a decade.

Many of us have traveled here just a few months ago when we had a robust debate in the Committee on Natural Resources, and we were able to mark up this bill and send it here to the floor. They deserve to have their voices heard.

My colleagues can say as often as they would like that there are local voices missing or ignored, but that does not make it true. We know that the communities impacted by this bill support it. That is a fact. There can be no debate about that.

We know that strong policy requires compromise, years of input, and, yes, vigorous debate. I am happy to participate in that debate, but the people of Colorado have made their voices clear on protecting these public lands.

I mentioned the stakeholder process that we have been engaged in, that the communities have been engaged in, that this bill has been engaged in for a decade, regardless of what party was in power or what election year. It was local communities and stakeholders coming to the table to craft the designations that you see on the map to protect these wonderful iconic places that you see to the right. They have been advocating for far too long not to see action from their elected officials.

Madam Chair, it is time that Congress listen to the people of Colorado and vote to protect the places that my home State hold so dear. It is time to hold ourselves accountable. It is time we pass the CORE Act.

Madam Chair, I urge swift adoption of H.R. 823, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

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

The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of House Report 116–264, shall be considered as adopted. The amendment shall be considered as an original bill for the purpose of further amendment under the 5-minute rule, and shall be considered read.

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

H.R. 823

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the “Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act”.
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SEC. 301. Purposes.
that comprises approximately 7,624 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Tenmile Wilderness’ on the map entitled ‘Tenmile Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be known as the ‘Tenmile Recreation Management Area’.

(20) EAGLES NEST WILDERNESS ADDITIONS. — Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest comprises approximately 9,670 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Freeman Creek Wilderness Addition’ and ‘Proposed Spraddle Creek Wilderness Addition’ on the map entitled ‘Eagles Nest Wilderness Additions Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be incorporated into, and managed as part of, the Eagles Nest Wilderness designated by Public Law 112–172 (870).

(b) APPLICABLE LAW.—Any reference in the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.) to the effective date of that Act shall be considered to be a reference to the date of enactment of this Act for purposes of administering a covered area.

(c) FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1132(d)(1)), the Secretary may use any motorized or mechanized equipment to protect the area designated as a potential wilderness area. A project shall be carried out in the Recreation Management Area for purposes of administering a covered area.

(d) GRAZING.—The grazing of livestock on a covered area that is established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are considered necessary by the Secretary, in consultation with—

(1) the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 102-77) as amended by subsection (d); and
(2) the guidelines set forth in Appendix A of the report of the Fire, Defense, and Indisputable Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (H. Rept. 101-405).

(e) COORDINATION.—For purposes of administering the Federal land designated as wilderness by paragraph (26) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 102-77) (as added by subsection (a)(2)), the Secretary shall, as determined appropriate by the Secretary, in consultation with—

(1) the purposes of the Recreation Management Area described in subsection (b); and
(2) the applicable laws.

(f) WATER.—The use or leasing of a facility constructed under paragraph (1) of this section.

(g) USES.—The acceptance, review, or implementation of a proposal or plan that is subject to the review, approval, or disapproval of the Secretary.

(h) APPLICABLE LAW.—Nothing in this section affects the construction, repair, reconstruction, replacement, operation, maintenance, or renovation within the Recreation Management Area of—

(A) water management infrastructure in existence on the date of enactment of this Act; or
(B) any infrastructures necessary for the development or exercise of water rights decreed before the date of enactment of this Act.

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (iii), the use of motorized vehicles in the Recreation Management Area shall be limited to the roads, vehicle classes, and periods authorized in the application vehicle use on the date of enactment of this Act.

(j) USES.—Except as provided in clause (iii), nothing in this section prohibits the Secretary from harvesting or selling a merchantable product that is a byproduct of an activity authorized under this section.

(k) LIMITATION.—Notwithstanding any other provision of law, the Secretary may authorize the use of motorized vehicles to carry out pre- or post-fire watershed protection projects;

(l) USES.—Nothing in clause (i) prevents the Secretary from harvesting or selling a merchantable product that is a byproduct of an activity authorized under this section.

(c) FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.—In accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the Secretary determines to be necessary for the control of fire, insects, and diseases, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(d) GRAZING.—The Secretary may determine, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the use or leasing of a facility constructed under paragraph (1) of this section.

(e) WATER.—Subject to valid existing rights and except as provided in subsection (d), the potential wilderness area designated by subsection (a) shall be managed in accordance with—

(1) the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.); and
(2) this section.

(f) PERMIT OR OTHER AUTHORIZATION.—Not later than 1 year after the date on which a determination of the Secretary to authorize livestock grazing or other use by livestock on the vacant allotments known as—

(A) the ‘Big Hole Allotment’; and
(B) the ‘Blue Ridge Allotment’;

(g) MODIFICATION OF ALLOTMENTS.—In publishing a determination pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary may modify or combine the vacant or other use by livestock on the vacant allotments known as—

(A) the ‘Big Hole Allotment’; and
(B) the ‘Blue Ridge Allotment’;

(h) USES.—In accordance with—

(1) the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);
(2) any other applicable laws (including regulations); and
(3) this section.

(i) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (iii), the use of motorized vehicles in the Recreation Management Area shall be limited to the roads, vehicle classes, and periods authorized in the application of vehicle use on the date of enactment of this Act.

(j) USES.—Except as provided in clause (iii), nothing in this section prohibits the Secretary from harvesting or selling a merchantable product that is a byproduct of an activity authorized under law or permit outside the boundaries of the Recreation Management Area.

(k) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in clause (iii), the use of motorized vehicles in the Recreation Management Area shall be limited to the roads, vehicle classes, and periods authorized in the application of vehicle use on the date of enactment of this Act.

(l) USES.—Except as provided in clause (iii), nothing in this section prohibits the Secretary from harvesting or selling a merchantable product that is a byproduct of an activity authorized under law or permit outside the boundaries of the Recreation Management Area.
(a) Designation.—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 8,267 acres of Federal land in the White River National Forest, as generally depicted as “Proposed Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area” on the map entitled “Proposed Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area Proposal” and dated June 24, 2019, are designated as the “Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area” (referred to in this section as the “Wildlife Conservation Area”).

(b) Purpose.—The purposes of the Wildlife Conservation Area are—

(1) to conserve and protect a wildlife migration corridor; and
(2) to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the wildlife, scenic, roadless, watershed, recreational, and ecological resources of the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(c) Management.—

(1) In general.—The Secretary shall manage the Wildlife Conservation Area—

(A) in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances the purposes described in subsection (b); and
(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);
(ii) any other applicable laws (including regulations); and
(iii) this section.

(2) Effect.—

(A) In general.—The Secretary shall only authorize the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport to carry out activities described in subsection (b). The Secretary shall not authorize the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport to carry out activities described in subsection (d) or (e); or

(B) New or temporary roads.—Except as provided in clause (i) and subsection (e), no new or temporary road shall be constructed within the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(3) Exceptions.—Nothing in clause (i) or (ii) prevents the Secretary from—

(A) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport for administrative purposes;

(B) constructing temporary roads or permitting the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport in the Wildlife Conservation Area to carry out activities described in subsection (d) or (e); or

(C) responding to an emergency.

(d) Commercial timber.—

(1) In general.—Subject to subsection (c), no project shall be carried out in the Wildlife Conservation Area for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber.

(2) Limitation.—Nothing in clause (i) prevents the Secretary from harvesting or selling a merchantable product that is a byproduct of an activity authorized under this section.

(e) Grazing.—

Nothing in this section or section 110(e) precludes the Secretary from authorizing, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), and policies followed by the Secretary in issuing and administering grazing permits or leases on land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, to carry out any activity, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), that the Secretary determines to be necessary to prevent, control, or mitigate fire, insects, or disease in the Wildlife Conservation Area, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(f) Regional transportation projects.—

Nothing in this section or section 110(e) precludes the Secretary from authorizing, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the use of a facility constructed under paragraph (1), the other purposes of the Historic Landscape.

(2) Purposes.—The purposes of the Historic Landscape are—

(A) to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the scenic, roadless, watershed, recreational, and ecological resources of the Historic Landscape;

(B) in accordance with—

(i) the Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);

(ii) any other applicable laws (including regulations); and

(iii) this section.

(C) bicycles.—The use of bicycles in the Historic Landscape shall be limited to designated roads and trails.

(D) Commercial timber.—

(i) In general.—Except as provided in clause (iii), the use of motorized vehicles in the Wildlife Conservation Area shall be limited to designated roads and trails.

(ii) New or temporary roads.—Except as provided in clause (i), no new or temporary road shall be constructed in the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(iii) Exception.—Nothing in clause (i) or (ii) prevents the Secretary from—

(A) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles for administrative purposes;

(B) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles to carry out activities described in subsection (d); or

(C) responding to an emergency.

(E) Bicycles.—The use of bicycles in the Wildlife Conservation Area shall be limited to designated roads and trails.

(F) Regional transportation projects.—

(1) In general.—Subject to subsection (c), no project shall be carried out in the Wildlife Conservation Area for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber.

(2) Limitation.—Nothing in clause (i) prevents the Secretary from authorizing, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), and policies followed by the Secretary in issuing and administering grazing permits or leases on land under the jurisdiction of the Secretary, to carry out any activity, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), that the Secretary determines to be necessary to prevent, control, or mitigate fire, insects, or disease in the Wildlife Conservation Area, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(G) Fire, insects, and diseases.—The Secretary may carry out any activity, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), that the Secretary determines to be necessary to prevent, control, or mitigate fire, insects, or disease in the Wildlife Conservation Area and the Historic Landscape, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(H) Regional transportation projects.—Nothing in this section or section 110(e) precludes the Secretary from authorizing, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the use of a facility constructed under paragraph (1), the Historic Landscape.

(I) Forest and Rangeland Renewable Resources Planning Act of 1974 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.); and

(J) the other purposes of the Historic Landscape.

(3) Except as provided in clause (i), no new or temporary road shall be constructed within the Historic Landscape.

(4) Exceptions.—Nothing in clause (i) or (ii) prevents the Secretary from—

(A) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport for administrative purposes;

(B) constructing temporary roads or permitting the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport in the Historic Landscape to carry out activities described in subsection (d) or (e); or

(C) responding to an emergency.

(j) In general.—The Secretary shall manage the Historic Landscape in accordance with—

(A) the purposes of the Historic Landscape described in subsection (b); and

(B) any other applicable laws (including regulations).

(k) Management Plan.—

(1) In general.—Not later than 5 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall prepare a management plan for the Historic Landscape.
subsection (e)(2), the removal of unexploded ordnance.

(3) EXPLOSIVE HAZARDS.—The Secretary shall provide to the Secretary of the Army a notification of any unexploded ordnance (as defined in section 101(e) of title 10, United States Code) that is discovered in the Historic Landscape.

(d) CAMP HALE RESTORATION AND ENHANCEMENT ACT—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a restoration and enhancement project in the Historic Landscape that includes the use and stewardship of—

(A) the program for environmental restoration of formerly used defense sites under section 2701 of title 10, United States Code;

(B) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.); or

(C) any other applicable provision of law (including regulations).

(2) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.—The Secretary and the Secretary of the Army shall enter into an agreement—

(A) to specify—

(i) the activities of the Secretary relating to the management of the Historic Landscape; and

(ii) the activities of the Secretary of the Army relating to the removal of unexploded ordnance in accordance with subsection (e) and other applicable laws (including regulations); and

(B) to require the Secretary to provide to the Secretary of the Army, by not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act and periodically thereafter, as appropriate, a management plan for the Historic Landscape for purposes of the removal activities described in subsection (e).

(3) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section—

(A) affects any water right in existence on or after the date of enactment of this Act, or

(B) affects any water right in existence on or after the date of enactment of this Act, or

(C) affects the construction or operation of infrastructure as is determined to be necessary by an individual or entity holding water rights to develop and place to beneficial use those rights, subject to applicable Federal, State, and local law (including regulations).

(D) constitutes an express or implied reservation by the United States of any reserved or appropriated water right;

(E) alters or limits—

(i) a water right under an interstate water compact; or

(ii) a water right held by the United States; or

(F) affects—

(i) a covered area; or

(ii) a wilderness area or potential wilderness area designated by section 102;

(iii) the Recreation Management Area, Wildlife Conservation Area, or Historic Landscape, as applicable, in which the land or interest in land is located.

(E) the construction or operation of such infrastructure as is determined to be necessary by an individual or entity holding water rights to develop and place to beneficial use those rights, subject to applicable Federal, State, and local law (including regulations).

(F) the construction or operation of such infrastructure as is determined to be necessary by an individual or entity holding water rights to develop and place to beneficial use those rights, subject to applicable Federal, State, and local law (including regulations).

2. FUNDING.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct any typographical errors in the maps and legal descriptions.

3. PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Each map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

4. ACQUISITION OF LAND.—In general.—The Secretary may acquire any land or interest in land within the boundaries of any area described in subsection (b)(1) National Forest, as modified, under subsection (a), shall be considered to be the boundaries of the White River National Forest as in existence on January 1, 1965.

SEC. 109. ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK POTENTIAL WILDERNESS ADJUSTMENT.

(a) PURPOSE.—The purpose of this section is to provide for the ongoing maintenance and use of portions of the Trail River Ranch and the associated property located within Rocky Mountain National Park in Grand County in the State of Colorado.

(b) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—The boundaries of the Trail River Ranch, as revised by the Secretary of the Interior, as in existence on January 1, 1965, shall be as follows:

(c) LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.—For purposes of section 2003 of title 54, United States Code, the boundaries of the White River National Forest, as modified, under subsection (a), shall be considered to be the boundaries of the White River National Forest as in existence on January 1, 1965.

SEC. 110. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.

(a) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—Nothing in this title affects the jurisdiction or responsibility of the State with respect to fish and wildlife in the State.

(b) NO BUFFER ZONES.—

(1) In general.—Nothing in this title or an amendment made by this title shall establish a protective perimeter or buffer zone around—

(A) a covered area;

(B) a wilderness area or potential wilderness area designated by section 102;

(C) the Recreation Management Area;

(D) a Wildlife Conservation Area; or

(E) the Historic Landscape.

(2) OUTSIDE ACTIVITIES.—The fact that a non-wilderness activity or use on land outside of a covered area can be considered as not affecting the covered area shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the covered area.

(c) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—As such area is established as a covered area by this Act, the Secretary shall file maps and legal descriptions of each area described in subsection (b)(1) with—

(A) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—Each map and legal description shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary may correct any typographical errors in the maps and legal descriptions.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Each map and legal description shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(4) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—In general.—The Secretary may acquire any land or interest in land within the boundaries of any area described in subsection (b)(1) National Forest, as modified, under subsection (a), shall be considered to be the boundaries of the wilderness area, Recreation Management Area, Wildlife Conservation Area, or Historic Landscape, as applicable, in which the land or interest in land is located.

(e) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act,
the areas described in subsection (b)(1) are withdrawn from—
(1) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;
(2) section, entry, and patent under mining laws; and
(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and related leasing laws.

(f) MILITARY OVERFLIGHTS.—Nothing in this title or an amendment made by this title restricts or precludes—
(1) any low-level overflight of military aircraft over any area subject to this title or an amendment made by this title, including military overflights that can be seen, heard, or detected within such area;
(2) flight testing or evaluation over an area described in paragraph (1); or
(3) any establishment of—
(A) any new unit of special use airspace over an area described in paragraph (1); or
(B) any military flight training or transportation over such an area.

TITLES—SAN JUAN MOUNTAINS

SEC. 201. DEFINITIONS.
In this title:
(1) COVERED LAND.—The term ‘‘covered land’’ means—
(A) land designated as wilderness under paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) (as added by section 202); and
(B) a Special Management Area.
(2) SECRETARY.—The term ‘‘Secretary’’ means the Secretary of the Interior.
(3) SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.—The term ‘‘Special Management Area’’ means each of—
(A) the Sheep Mountain Special Management Area designated by section 203(a)(1); and
(B) the Liberty Bell East Special Management Area designated by section 203(a)(2).

SEC. 202. ADDITIONS TO NATIONAL WILDERNESS PRESERVATION SYSTEM.
Section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) (as amended by section 102(a)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following:

‘‘(27) LIZARD HEAD WILDERNESS ADDITION.—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 3,141 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘‘Proposed Wilson, Sunshine, Black, Pace, and San Bernardino Mountain Area’’ (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77) and dated September 6, 2018, which is incorporated in, and shall be administered as part of, the Lizard Head Wilderness.

‘‘(28) MOUNT SNEFFELS WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.—
(A) LIBERTY BELL AND LAST DOLLAR ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal lands in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 7,235 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Additions to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness, Liberty Bell East Special Management Area’’ and dated September 6, 2018, which is incorporated in, and shall be administered as part of, the Mount Sneffels Wilderness.

(B) WHITEHORSE ADDITIONS.—Certain Federal lands in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 12,465 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘‘Proposed Whitehorse Additions to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness’’ and dated September 6, 2018, which is incorporated in, and shall be administered as part of, the Mount Sneffels Wilderness.

(C) McKENNA PEAK WILDERNESS.—Certain Federal lands in the State of Colorado comprising approximately 8,884 acres of Bureau of Land Management land, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘‘Proposed McKenna Peak Wilderness Area’’ and dated September 18, 2018, to be known as the ‘‘McKenna Peak Wilderness’’.

SEC. 203. SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREAS.
(a) DESIGNATION.—
(1) SHEEP MOUNTAIN SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.—The Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests in the State comprising approximately 21,663 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘‘Proposed Sheep Mountain Special Management Area’’ and dated September 19, 2018, is designated as the ‘‘Sheep Mountain Special Management Area’’.

(2) LIBERTY BELL EAST SPECIAL MANAGEMENT AREA.—The Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forest in the State comprising approximately 792 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘‘Proposed Liberty Bell East and Dollar Addition to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness, Liberty Bell East Special Management Area’’ and dated September 6, 2018, is designated as the ‘‘Liberty Bell East Special Management Area’’.

(b) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the Special Management Areas is to conserve and protect for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the geological, cultural, archeological, paleontological, natural, scientific, recreational, wilderness, wildlife, riparian, historic, educational, and scenic resources of the Special Management Areas.

(c) MANAGEMENT.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall manage the Special Management Areas in a manner that—
(A) conserves, protects, and enhances the resources and values of the Special Management Areas described in paragraph (3) of section 202.

(B) subject to paragraph (3), maintains or improves the wilderness character of the Special Management Areas and the suitability of the Special Management Areas for potential inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System;

(C) is in accordance with—
(i) the National Forest Management Act of 1976 (16 U.S.C. 1600 et seq.);
(ii) this title; and
(iii) any other applicable laws.

(2) PROHIBITIONS.—The following shall be prohibited in the Special Management Areas:
(A) Permanent roads.
(B) Except as necessary to meet the minimum requirements for the administration of the Federal land, to provide access for abandoned mine cleanup, and to protect public health and safety:
(i) the use of motor vehicles, motorized equipment, or mechanical transport (other than as provided in paragraph (3)); and
(ii) the establishment of temporary roads.

(C) AUTHORIZED ACTIVITIES.—
(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may allow any activities (including helicopter access for recreation and maintenance and the competitive running event permitted since 1992) that have been authorized by permit or license as of the date of enactment of this Act to continue within the Special Management Areas, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(B) PERMITTING.—The designation of the Special Management Areas by subsection (a) shall not affect the issuance of permits relating to the activities covered under subparagraph (A) after the date of enactment of this Act.

(C) CYCLES.—The Secretary may permit the use of bicycles in—
(i) the portion of the Sheep Mountain Special Management Area identified as ‘‘Ophir Valley Area’’ on the map entitled ‘‘Proposed Sheep Mountain Special Management Area’’ and dated September 19, 2018;

(ii) the portion of the Liberty Bell East Special Management Area identified as ‘‘Liberty Bell Corridor’’ on the map entitled ‘‘Proposed Liberty Bell and Last Dollar Additions to the Mt. Sneffels Wilderness, Liberty Bell East Special Management Area’’ and dated September 6, 2018.

(d) APPLICABLE LAW.—Water and water rights in the Special Management Areas shall be administered in accordance with section 8 of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (Public Law 103–76, 107 Stat. 762), except that, for purposes of this Act—
(1) any reference contained in that section to—
(A) the lands designated as wilderness by section 3 of Public Law 103–77; or
(B) any reference to ‘‘the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act’’ shall be considered to be a reference to ‘‘the Special Management Areas’’; and
(2) any reference to the Act that section to—
(A) the lands designated as wilderness by this Act; or
(B) any reference to ‘‘the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act’’ shall be considered to be a reference to ‘‘the Special Management Areas’’.

SEC. 204. RELEASE OF WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.
(a) DOMINGUEZ CANYON WILDERNESS STUDY AREA.—Subtitle E of title II of Public Law 111–11 is amended—
(1) by redesignating section 204B (16 U.S.C. 460zz–7) as section 204B; and
(2) by inserting after section 204B (16 U.S.C. 460zz–7) the following:
‘‘SEC. 204B. RELEASE OF WILDERNESS STUDY AREAS.
(a) IN GENERAL.—Congress finds that, for the purposes of section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)), the portions of the Dominguez Canyon Wilderness Study Area not designated as wilderness by this subtitle have been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

(b) RELEASE.—Any public land referred to in subsection (a) that is not designated as wilderness by this subtitle—
(1) is no longer subject to section 603(c) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1782(c)); and
(2) shall be managed in accordance with this subtitle and any other applicable law.

(b) McKENNA PEAK WILDERNESS STUDY AREA.—

SEC. 205. ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS.
(a) FISH AND WILDLIFE.—Nothing in this title affects the jurisdiction or responsibility of the State with respect to fish and wildlife in the State.

(b) NO BUFFER ZONES.—
(1) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this title establishes a protective perimeter or buffer zone around covered land.

(2) ACTIVITIES OUTSIDE WILDERNESS.—The fact that a nonwilderness activity or use on land outside of the covered land can be seen or heard from within covered land shall not preclude the activity or use outside the boundary of the covered land.

(c) MAPS AND LEGAL DESCRIPTIONS.—Nothing in this title is applicable after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate,
shall file a map and a legal description of each wilderness area designated by paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) only as added by section 202) and the Special Management Areas with—

(A) the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate.

(2) FORCE OF LAW.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall have the same force and effect as if included in this title, except that the Secretary or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, may correct any typographical errors in the maps and legal descriptions.

(3) PUBLIC AVAILABILITY.—Each map and legal description filed under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service.

(d) ACQUISITION OF LAND

(1) GENERAL.—The Secretary or the Secretary of the Interior, as appropriate, may acquire any land or interest in land within the boundaries of a Special Management Area or the wilderness designated under paragraphs (27) through (29) of section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) only through exchange, donation, or purchase from a willing seller.

(2) MANAGEMENT.—Any land or interest in land acquired under paragraph (1) shall be incorporated into, and administered as a part of, the wilderness or Special Management Area in which the land or interest in land is located.

(g) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, shall be permanently relinquished, transferred, and otherwise conveyed to the Secretary, in a form acceptable to the Secretary, to the extent that the laws are consistent with this section.

(2) LIMITATION OF TRANSFER.—An interest acquired through subparagraph (A) shall be permanently relinquished, transferred, and otherwise conveyed to the Secretary, in a form acceptable to the Secretary, to the extent that the laws are consistent with this section.

(3) TREATMENT OF CREDITS.—All amounts in subsection (a) shall—

(a) FUGITIVE COAL MINE METHANE USE PILOT PROGRAM

(1) CONVEYANCE TO SECRETARY.—As a condition precedent to the relinquishment of a Wolf Creek Storage Field development right, any leaseholder of a Wolf Creek Storage Field development right shall permanently relinquish, transfer, and otherwise convey to the Secretary, in a form acceptable to the Secretary, all Wolf Creek Storage Field development rights of the leaseholder.

(2) LIMITATION OF TRANSFER.—An interest acquired through subparagraph (A) shall be considered to be amounts received for the purposes of—

(a) section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 197); and


(4) TREATMENT OF CREDITS.—All amounts in the form of credits issued under subsection (a) shall be considered to be amounts received for the purposes of—

(a) section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 197); and


(5) THOMPSON DIVIDE LEASE.—

(6) THOMPSON DIVIDE MAP.—The term

(a) THOMPSON DIVIDE WITHDRAWAL AND PROTECTION AREA.—The term

(b) THOMPSON DIVIDE MAP.—The term

(c) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(d) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(e) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(f) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(g) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(h) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(i) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(j) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(k) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(l) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(m) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(n) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(o) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(p) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(q) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(r) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(s) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(t) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(u) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(v) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(w) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(x) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(y) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

(z) THOMPSON DIVIDE ABANDONED UNDERGROUND COAL MINE.—The term

{...}
Divide Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program; subdivision.

(2) PURPOSE.—The purpose of the pilot program is to promote the capture, beneficial use, mitigation, and sequestration of fugitive methane emissions—

(A) to reduce methane emissions;
(B) to provide economic development;
(C) to produce bid and royalty revenues;
(D) to improve air quality; and
(E) to improve public safety.

(3) IN GENERAL.—(A) Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete an inventory of fugitive methane emissions in accordance with subsection (b); (ii) to provide for the leasing of fugitive methane emissions in accordance with subsection (c); and (iii) to provide for the capping or destruction of fugitive methane emissions in accordance with subsection (d).

(B) COORDINATION.—In developing the plan under this paragraph, the Secretary shall coordinate with—

(i) the State;
(ii) Garfield, Gunnison, Delta, and Pitkin Counties in the State;
(iii) lessees of Federal coal within the counties referred to in subparagraph (ii); (iv) interested institutions of higher education in the State; and (v) members of the public.

(C) FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSION INVENTORY.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall complete an inventory of fugitive methane emissions.

(2) CONTENTS.—The Secretary may conduct the inventory under paragraph (1) through, or in collaboration with—

(A) the Bureau of Land Management;
(B) the United States Geological Survey;
(C) the Environmental Protection Agency;
(D) the United States Forest Service;
(E) State departments or agencies;
(F) Garfield, Gunnison, Delta, or Pitkin County in the State;
(G) the Garfield County Federal Mineral Lease District;
(H) institutions of higher education in the State;
(I) lessees of Federal coal within a county referred to in subparagraph (F); (J) the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration;
(K) the National Center for Atmospheric Research; and (L) other interested entities, including members of the public.

(3) CONTENTS.—The inventory under paragraph (1) shall include—

(A) the general location and geographic coordinates of each vent, seep, or other source producing significant fugitive methane emissions; (B) an estimate of the volume and concentration of fugitive methane emissions from each source of significant fugitive methane emissions included in the inventory; (C) any significant fugitive methane emissions taken and the basis for that emissions estimate; (D) an estimate of the total volume of fugitive methane emissions each year; (E) relevant economic data and information available from—

(i) the Environmental Protection Agency; (ii) the Mine Safety and Health Administration; and (iii) Colorado Department of Natural Resources; (iv) Colorado Public Utility Commission; (v) Colorado Department of Health and Environment; and (vi) Office of Surface Mining Reclamation and Enforcement.

(E) such other information as may be useful in advancing the purposes of the pilot program.

(4) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION; DISCLOSURE.—

(A) PUBLIC PARTICIPATION.—The Secretary shall provide opportunities for public participation in the inventory under this subsection.

(B) AVAILABILITY.—The Secretary shall make the inventory under this subsection publicly available.

(C) DISCLOSURE.—Nothing in this subsection requires the Secretary to publicly release information that—

(i) poses a threat to public safety; (ii) is confidential business information; or (iii) is otherwise protected from public disclosure.

(5) USE.—The Secretary shall use the inventory to carry out the mitigation, beneficial use, or destruction of fugitive methane emissions.

(6) FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSION LEASING PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subject to valid existing rights and in accordance with this section, not later than 1 year after the date of completion of the inventory required under subsection (b), the Secretary shall carry out a program to encourage the use and destruction of fugitive methane emissions.

(B) FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSIONS FROM COAL MINER SUBJECT TO LEASE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall authorize the holder of a valid existing Federal coal lease for a mine that is producing fugitive methane emissions to capture for use, or destroy by flaring, the fugitive methane emissions.

(B) CONDITIONS.—The authority under subparagraph (A) shall be—

(i) subject to valid existing rights; and (ii) subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(C) LIMITATIONS.—The program carried out under paragraph (A) shall only include fugitive methane emissions that can be captured for use, or destroyed by flaring, in a manner that does not—

(i) endanger the safety of any coal mine worker; or (ii) unreasonably interfere with any ongoing operation at a coal mine.

(D) COOPERATION.—

(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall work cooperatively with the holders of valid existing Federal coal leases for mines that produce fugitive methane emissions to encourage the capture of fugitive methane emissions for beneficial use, such as generating electricity, producing usable heat, transporting the energy to market, producing usable power, producing usable heat, transporting the methane to market, transforming the fugitive methane emissions into a different marketable material; or

(ii) if the beneficial use of the fugitive methane emissions is not feasible, the destruction of the fugitive methane emissions by flaring.

(E) GUIDANCE.—In furtherance of the purposes of this paragraph, not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall issue guidance for the implementation of Federal authorities and programs to encourage the capture for use, or destruction by flaring, of fugitive methane emissions while minimizing impacts on natural resources or other public interest values.

(F) ROYALTIES.—The Secretary shall determine whether any fugitive methane emissions used or destroyed pursuant to this paragraph are subject to the payment of a royalty under applicable law.

(3) FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSIONS FROM ABANDONED COAL MINES.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Except as otherwise provided by law, royalties required under subsection (c)(3), the Secretary shall, in accordance with applicable law, take all reasonable measures—

(i) to cap those fugitive methane emissions at the source in any case in which the cap will result in the long-term sequestration of all or a significant portion of the fugitive methane emissions; or (ii) if sequestration under paragraph (1) is not feasible, destroy the fugitive methane emissions by flaring.

(G) REPORT TO CONGRESS.—Not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate a report detailing—

(i) the economic and environmental impacts of the pilot program, including information on increased royalties and tax credits of avoided greenhouse gas emissions; and (ii) any recommendations by the Secretary on whether the pilot program could be expanded to include other significant sources of fugitive methane emissions from coal mines.
SEC. 306. EFFECT.  
Except as expressly provided in this title, nothing in this title—  
(1) expands, diminishes, or impairs any valid existing water rights, mining or mineral interests, or other property rights wholly or partially within the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area, including access to the leases, interests, conditions, or agreements contained in applicable Federal, State, and local laws (including regulations);  
(2) precludes the capture of methane from any active, inactive, or abandoned coal mine covered by this title, in accordance with applicable laws; or  
(3) prevents access to, or the development of, any new or existing coal mine or lease in Delta or Gunnison County in the State.

TITLE IV—CURECANTI NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

SEC. 401. DEFINITIONS.  
In this title:  
(1) MAP.—The term “map” means the map entitled “Curecanti National Recreation Area, Proposed Boundary” numbered 676/190,485C, and dated August 11, 2016.  
(2) NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.—The term “National Recreation Area” means the Curecanti National Recreation Area established by section 402(a).  
(3) SECRETARY.—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

SEC. 402. CURECANTI NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.  
(a) ESTABLISHMENT.—Effective beginning on the earlier of the date on which the Secretary approves a request under subsection (c)(2)(B)(i) and the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, there shall be established as a unit of the National Park System the Curecanti National Recreation Area in accordance with this Act, consisting of approximately 50,667 acres of land in the State, as generally depicted on the map as “Curecanti National Recreation Area Proposed Boundary”.  
(b) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—The map shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the National Park Service.  
(c) ADMINISTRATION.—  
(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall administer the National Recreation Area in accordance with—  
(A) this title; and  
(B) the laws (including regulations) generally applicable to units of the National Park System, including title 16, United States Code, chapter 1, sections 100751(a), 100752, 100753, and 102101 of title 54, United States Code.  
(2) AUTHORITY TO ENTER, APPROPRIATE, AND RESERVE MANAGEMENT AND OPERATIONS.—  
(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this title affects or interferes with the authority of the Secretary—  
(i) to operate the Uncompahgre Valley Reclamation Project under the reclamation laws;  
(ii) to operate the Wayne N. Aspinall Unit of the Curecanti National Recreation Area under the Act of April 11, 1956 (commonly known as the “Colorado River Storage Project Act”) (43 U.S.C. 620 et seq.);  
(iii) under the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (16 U.S.C. 4601–4612 et seq.).  
(B) RECLAMATION LAND.—  
(i) BY REQUEST TO RETAIN ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—If, before the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Reclamation submits to the Secretary a request for the Commissioner of Reclamation to retain administrative jurisdiction over the minimum quantity of land within the land identified on the map as “Lands withdrawn or acquired for Bureau of Reclamation projects” that the Commissioner of Reclamation identifies as necessary for the effective operation of Bureau of Reclamation water facilities, the Secretary—  
(I) approve, with modifications, or disapprove the request; and  
(II) if the request is approved under clause (I), make any modifications to the map that are necessary to reflect that the Commissioner of Reclamation retains management authority over the minimum quantity of land required to fulfill the reclamation mission.  
(ii) TRANSFER OF LAND.—  
(I) IN GENERAL.—If, before the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Reclamation submits to the Director of the National Park Service by not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, there shall be transferred from the Commissioner of Reclamation to the Director of the National Park Service by not later than the date that is 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Commissioner of Reclamation submits to the National Recreation Area under subclause (I) for reclamation purposes, including for the operating, management, and expansion or replacement of facilities.  
(II) ACCESS TO TRANSFERRED LAND.—  
(aa) IN GENERAL.—Subject to item (bb), the Commissioner of Reclamation shall retain access to the land transferred to the Director of the National Park Service during the period of transfer, unless the Secretary determines that grazing on the Federal land would prevent the Secretary from fulfilling the purposes and functions of the National Recreation Area.  
(bb) MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.—The terms of the access authorized under item (aa) shall be specified by a memorandum of understanding entered into between the Commissioner of Reclamation and the Director of the National Park Service not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act.  
(3) MANAGEMENT AGREEMENTS.—  
(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may enter into management agreements, or modify management agreements in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, relating to the authority of the Director of the National Park Service, the Commissioner of Reclamation, the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, or the Chief of the Forest Service to manage Federal land within or adjacent to the boundary of the National Recreation Area.  
(B) STATE LAND.—The Secretary may enter into cooperative management agreements for any land administered by the State that is within or adjacent to the boundary of the National Recreation Area, in accordance with the cooperative management authority under section 101703 of title 54, United States Code.  
(4) RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES.—  
(A) AUTHORIZATION.—Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the Secretary shall allow, consistent with the grazing leases, boating, hunting, and fishing in the National Recreation Area in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws.  
(B) CLOSURES; DESIGNATED ZONES.—  
(i) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary, acting through the Superintendent of the National Recreation Area, may designate zones in which, or portions of, the use of boating, hunting, or fishing shall be permitted in the National Recreation Area under subparagraph (A) for reasons of public safety, administration, or compliance with applicable laws.  
(ii) CONSULTATION REQUIRED.—Except in the case of an emergency, any closure proposed by the Secretary under clause (i) shall not take effect until after the date on which the Superintendent of the National Recreation Area consults with—  
(I) the appropriate State agency responsible for hunting and fishing activities; and  
(II) the Board of County Commissioners in each county in which the zone is proposed to be designated.  
(C) LANDOWNER ASSISTANCE.—On the written request of an individual that owns private land located within or adjacent to the boundary of the National Recreation Area, the Secretary may work in partnership with the individual to enhance the long-term conservation of natural, cultural, recreational, and scenic resources in and around the National Recreation Area—  
(A) by acquiring all or a portion of the private land or interests in private land located not more than 3 miles from the boundary of the National Recreation Area by purchase, exchange, or donation, in accordance with section 403;  
(B) by providing technical assistance to the individual, including cooperative assistance;  
(C) through available grant programs; and  
(D) by supporting conservation easement opportunities.  
(D) WITHDRAWAL.—Subject to valid existing rights, all Federal land within the National Recreation Area is withdrawn—  
(A) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;  
(B) any appropriation, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and  
(C) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.  
(E) GELING.—(A) STATE LAND SUBJECT TO A STATE GRAZING LEASE.—  
(i) IN GENERAL.—If State land acquired under this title is subject to a State grazing lease in effect on the date of acquisition, the Secretary shall allow the grazing to continue for the re-  
(ii) the term of the lease, subject to the related terms and conditions of user agreements, including permitted stocking rates, grazing fee levels, access rights, and ownership and use of range improvements.  
(ii) ACCESS.—A lessee of State land may continue its use of established routes within the National Recreation Area for purposes of administering the lease if the use was permitted before the date of enactment of this Act, subject to terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.  
(B) STATE AND PRIVATE LAND.—The Secretary may, in accordance with applicable laws, au-  
(these purposes; and  
(C) PRIVATE LAND.—On private land acquired under section 403 for the National Recreation Area on which grazing is allowed or grazing on Federal land located within the boundary of the National Recreation Area is subject to a State grazing lease in effect on the date of acquisition, the Secretary may allow the continuation and renewal of grazing on the land based on the terms of acquisition or by agreement between the Secretary and the lessee, subject to applicable law (including regulations).  
(D) FEDERAL LAND.—The Secretary shall—  
(i) allow, consistent with the grazing leases, uses, and practices in effect as of the date of en- 
(ii) in the case of a lease or permit vacated for a period of 3 or more years, terminate the lease or permit.  
(E) TERMINATION OF LEASES.—Within the National Recreation Area, the Secretary may—  
(i) accept the voluntary termination of a lease or permit for grazing; or  
(ii) in the case of a lease or permit vacated for a period of 3 or more years, terminate the lease or permit.  
(F) WATER RIGHTS.—Nothing in this title—  
(A) affects any use or allocation in existence on the date of enactment of this Act; or  
(B) authorizes or imposes any new reserved water, water right, or interest in water;  
(C) affects any vested absolute or decreed conditional water right in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, including any water right held by the United States;  
(D) affects any interstate water compact in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;  
(E) affects any interstate water compact in existence on the date of enactment of this Act; or  
(F) terminates any water right, whether or not appropriated by the United States in the State on or before the date of enactment of this Act.
(9) Fishing Easements.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Nothing in this title diminishes or alters the fish and wildlife program for the Aspinall Unit developed under section 8 of the Act (specifically known as the “Colorado River Storage Project Act”) (70 Stat. 110, chapter 203; 43 U.S.C. 629g), by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Land Management, and the Colorado Division of Wildlife (including any successor in interest to that division) that provides for the acquisition of public access fishing easements as mitigation for the Aspinall Unit (referred to in this paragraph as the “program”).

(B) ACQUISITION OF FISHING EASEMENTS.—The Secretary shall continue to fulfill the obligation of the program to acquire 86 miles of class 1 public fishing easements to provide to sportsmen access for fishing within the Upper Gunnison Basin upstream of the Aspinall Unit, subject to the condition that no existing fishing access downstream of the Aspinall Unit shall be counted toward the minimum mileage requirement under the program.

(C) PLAN.—Not later than 1 year after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall—

(i) develop a plan for fulfilling the obligation of the Secretary described in subparagraph (B); and

(ii) submit to Congress a report that—

(I) includes the plan developed under clause (i); and

(II) describes any progress made in the acquisition of public access fishing easements as mitigation for the program.

SEC. 403. ACQUISITION OF LAND; BOUNDARY MANAGEMENT.

(a) ACQUISITION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire any land or interest in land within the boundary of the National Recreation Area.

(2) MANNER OF ACQUISITION.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Subject to subparagraph (B), land described in paragraph (1) may be acquired under this subsection by—

(i) donation;

(ii) purchase from willing sellers with donated funds; or

(iii) exchange.

(B) STATE LAND.—Land or interests in land owned by the State or a political subdivision of the State may only be acquired by purchase, donation, or exchange.

(b) TRANSFER OF ADMINISTRATIVE JURISDICTION.—

(1) FOREST SERVICE LAND.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—Administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 2,560 acres of land identified on the map as “U.S. Forest Service proposed transfer to National Park Service” is transferred to the Secretary, to be administered by the Director of the National Park Service.

(B) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—The boundary of the Gunnison National Forest may be adjusted to exclude the land transferred to the Secretary under subparagraph (A).

(2) SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR LAND.—Administrative jurisdiction over the approximately 5,040 acres of land identified on the map as “Bureau of Land Management proposed transfer to National Park Service” is transferred to the Secretary of the Interior, to be administered as part of the National Recreation Area.

(c) POTENTIAL LAND EXCHANGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The withdrawal for reclamation purposes of the land identified on the map as “Potential exchange land” shall be relinquished by the Bureau of Reclamation and revoked by the Director of the Bureau of Land Management and the land shall be transferred to the National Park Service.

(2) EXCLUSION OF NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.—On transfer of the land described in paragraph (1), the transferred land—

(A) may be exchanged by the Secretary for private land described in section 602(c)(6); and

(i) subject to a conservation easement remaining on the transferred land, to protect the scenic resources of the land;

(ii) in accordance with the laws (including regulations) and policies governing National Park Service land exchanges; and

(B) if not exchanged under subparagraph (A), shall be added to, and managed as a part of, the National Recreation Area.

(d) ADDITION TO NATIONAL RECREATION AREA.—Any land within the boundary of the National Recreation Area that is acquired by the United States shall be added to, and managed as a part of, the National Recreation Area.

SEC. 404. GENERAL MANAGEMENT PLAN.

Not later than 3 years after the date on which funds are made available to carry out this title, the Director of the National Park Service, in consultation with the Director of the Bureau of Reclamation, shall prepare a general management plan for the National Recreation Area in accordance with section 10502 of title 54, United States Code.

SEC. 405. BOUNDARY SURVEY.

The Secretary (acting through the Director of the National Park Service) shall prepare a boundary survey and legal description of the National Recreation Area.

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 116–264. Each such further amendment 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. CURTIS

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 116–264.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:

TITLES V—APPLICATION

SEC. 501. APPLICATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, this Act shall not apply to any lands or waters in the Third Congressional District of Colorado as in existence on the date of enactment of this Act.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

Mr. CURTIS. Madam Chair, before I begin, I would like to list the number of areas where I likely agree with my good friend from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

We share a State, a boundary, and our States are beautiful and full of public lands and recreational opportunities and areas that are majestic and are great treasures in our wonderful country.

I believe personally that strong, pragmatic legislation to solve these local land managements is very important and far superior to efforts like the Antiquities Act. I thank my colleague for the years that have gone into this bill and his personal time to build consensus in the area.

I found myself in his position just several months ago, offering a bill in my State. I believe the Congressmen supported that bill, and I thank him for that support. It was a million acres of public land designation in my State. While not everybody got what they wanted, we were able to approach it from a prospect where I was able to get ranchers, environmentalists, outdoor enthusiasts to support that bill.

The major difference between our two bills and why I stand today is that, on my bill, I was able to claim support from my local county commissioners. Elected officials from my State, my Governor, the State legislature, and the entire delegation of Utah were able to support that.

While I want my friend from Colorado to succeed in his endeavor, I feel moving this bill without the support of the entire delegation and its members who represent the impacted land is a mistake.

I am told that half of the Colorado delegation opposes this bill, including a Member who represents 65 percent of the land covered by the bill. While I applaud the consensus that has been put into this, I don’t believe there is enough consensus to get this bill across the finish line and into law. I think that separation of the gentleman from Colorado’s question, if this amendment passes, yes, I will support his bill. However, that is my second choice, and I think a poor, distant second choice to my first choice, which is that we would be able to find consensus with the other members of the delegation and move forward.

I can’t support a bill that lacks the consensus needed to continue through the Senate process, and I truly hope that Mr. NEGUSE and Mr. Tipton can work together to work out their remaining concerns.

I have had other Members of Congress make proposals in my district, especially in San Juan and Emery Counties. I know firsthand that proposals made in another Member’s district sometimes can cause problems. In fact, in my case, it has made it more difficult to resolve those public land issues.

Similarly, on a practical level, any proposal that is not supported by all Members of Congress who represent that area doesn’t have the consensus to get signed into the law. We all have a
Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Chair, I would like to reemphasize my praise for the Congressman from Colorado. The consensus that he mentioned is not a simple thing and should be applauded. I simply make a plea and request that the gentleman will continue to seek for that consensus, and particularly that of my colleagues and particularly his colleagues from Colorado, to see if he can get that final consensus needed to push this across the finish line.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time, and I am prepared to yield.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, we will continue to do that important work, and I appreciate the gentleman's statement in that regard with it. It is worth mentioning—I don't know that it has been mentioned yet during this debate: We have worked very hard. I have a stack of emails. This is literally 35, 40 pages of emails, exchanges between my staff who work on public lands with the Representative from the Third Congressional District over the last 8 months, working, trying to get that consensus.

I will certainly pledge to the gentleman that we are going to keep doing it.

Mr. Chair, with that, I am ready to close as well, but I will reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. Crow). The question was taken; and the Act-
ing TIS). The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.
Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I rise today to support my amendment to protect longstanding grazing rights in the Thompson Divide.

Since the days of Colorado’s pioneers, grazing rights have always played an essential role in the economy and the way of life. Generations of Coloradans have followed suit and continued to build a robust ranching community, including around the Thompson Divide.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I yield my time.

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

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

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

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I rise today to support my amendment to protect longstanding grazing rights in the Thompson Divide.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in support of my amendment addressing water rights in the Curecanti National Recreation Area.

For years, my staff and I have engaged in numerous conversations regarding the Curecanti National Recreation Area, and there has been bipartisan agreement in these discussions that water rights in the region should remain intact.

This amendment ensures that there are no unintended consequences in this legislation for longstanding water rights in the impacted area.

Mr. Chair, I would like to encourage my colleagues to be able to support this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I rise today to support my amendment to protect longstanding grazing rights in the Thompson Divide.

The Chair designates the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 53, after line 15, insert the following:

(c) GRAZING.—The grazing of livestock on public lands, I routinely hear how important ranching and the importance of protecting grazing rights, and this is true of the Thompson Divide. The permanent withdrawal of mineral and energy development in the region should not suppress any existing grazing rights.

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

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I rise today to support my amendment to protect longstanding grazing rights in the Thompson Divide.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I rise today to speak in support of my amendment addressing water rights in the Curecanti National Recreation Area.

For years, my staff and I have engaged in numerous conversations regarding the Curecanti National Recreation Area, and there has been bipartisan agreement in these discussions that water rights in the region should remain intact.

This area brings in millions of visitors each year and provides recreation opportunities that include fishing, hiking, camping, and more.

While it might be an outdoor enthusiast’s paradise, it is also a source of Colorado’s most precious resource: water.

This amendment ensures that there are no unintended consequences in this legislation for longstanding water rights in the impacted area.

Mr. Chair, I would like to encourage my colleagues to be able to support this, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to ask 25,000 acres surrounding Camp Hale as the first-ever National Historic Landscape.

Now, Camp Hale was a U.S. Army training facility for what became the 10th Mountain Division, and it was established in 1942 in Colorado to provide winter and mountain warfare training during World War II. It was also used during the Cold War as well.

This amendment would add veteran outreach and engagement activities to the proposed management plan. It is a good amendment. It would rightfully prioritize outreach and involvement of our Nation’s veterans, so I would agree with the amendment and ask that my colleagues vote “yes” on this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in part B of House Report 116–264.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 79, line 11, strike “or”.

Page 79, line 15, strike the period and insert “; or”.

Page 79, after line 15, insert the following:

(F) constitutes an express or implied Federal reservation of any water or water rights with respect to the National Recreation area.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.
The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in part B of House Report 116-264.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 82, line 3, strike “2,560” and all that follows through line 8, and insert “915 acres of Forest Service land on the map titled ‘Curecanti National Recreation Area U.S. Forest Service/National Park Service Interagency Agreement Exhibit Map, Soap Creek Area’ dated June 2017 is transferred to the Secretary, to be administered by the Director of the National Park Service as Part of the National Recreation Area.”

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to the gentleman’s comments, I will recognize the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

The Acting CHAIR. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, while I appreciate my colleague’s statement—and I don’t know that I heard a particular answer to the fundamental question as to whether or not he would be supportive of this bill were his amendment to pass—again, I think we are trying to approach this in a good faith way. We want to find consensus.

So, if the Representative from the Third Congressional District believes that this amendment is necessary to protect the ranching heritage on these lands for future generations, which is obviously a goal that he and I both share, I will support the amendment.

Mr. Chair, I am no longer in opposition and will encourage my colleagues to vote “yes” on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman’s comments and appreciate his support, actually, for this. This actually shows how we can make progress when we do have communication.

In terms of what was going on, something was lacking on some of these issues going into the CORE Act. Unfortunately, another eight amendments which I had proposed were not allowed to be discussed on this floor tonight. We have other concerns that have been expressed through our counties, through our communities, through individuals to be able to address as well.

But I am appreciative of the gentleman’s support on this amendment and for recognizing the importance of grazing rights in not only Garfield County but throughout the West.

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

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

Mr. Tipton, with that, I will reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentleman’s comments. I think what is actually important is precisely the words that the gentleman used: unintended consequences that can come.

This is a perfecting amendment to be able to make sure that we are codifying the right of residents and those grazing rights within those communities, something that is important not only to the Thompson Divide area but many of our ranchers who happen to have some grazing leases on public lands throughout the western slope of Colorado, something that is going to be important, but specifically to this bill, to make sure that we are codifying the right to have grazing within the Thompson Divide area with the mineral rights, which I had proposed were not allowed unfortunately, another eight amendments that I had proposed were not allowed, to be able to make sure that we are codifying the right to have grazing within the Thompson Divide area with the mineral rights, which I had proposed were not allowed.

This actually shows how we can make progress when we do have communication.

The gentleman’s comments and will encourage my colleagues to share, I will support the amendment.

I think what is actually important is to make sure that we are codifying the right to have grazing within the Thompson Divide area with the mineral rights, which I had proposed were not allowed.

This is a perfecting amendment to be able to make sure that we are codifying the right to have grazing within the Thompson Divide area with the mineral rights, which I had proposed were not allowed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate this amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 82, line 3, strike “2,560” and all that follows through line 8, and insert “915 acres of Forest Service land on the map titled ‘Curecanti National Recreation Area U.S. Forest Service/National Park Service Interagency Agreement Exhibit Map, Soap Creek Area’ dated June 2017 is transferred to the Secretary, to be administered by the Director of the National Park Service as Part of the National Recreation Area.”

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, this is a current memorandum that understanding something that the Forest Service itself, Chief Deputy Chris French, identified as an appropriate area for continued activities.

You know, one of the big challenges that we have in the Third Congressional District of Colorado happens to be forest management. We have seen forests literally burn to the ground. Simply to be able to have active, good forest management, to make sure that we are standing up, being able to protect our communities seems to me to be a sensible approach to be able to address something within something as expansive as the CORE Act.

The gentleman mentioned conversations with, I assume, a county commissioner from Gunnison County. We did have some contact with him today. We are going to be citing back to him conversations he had with our legislative director on this issue. So there was communication that had taken place on this. I would invite the gentleman to actually come to Montrose County to be able to visit with people who deal in the forest products areas, to be able to see how they are going to responsibly be able to deal with some of the treatment areas, to be able to protect our watersheds, to be able to protect endangered species.

I think this is an appropriate amendment to the CORE Act, and I will encourage its adoption.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chairman, with much respect to my colleague from the Third Congressional District, I have been to Montrose many times. It is a beautiful part of our state and there are wonderful people who call that community home. What I would say, again, I find it a bit ironic, with all of...
the discussion around local support and whether or not local communities support provisions of the bill or do not, on the one hand, we don’t have a single communication that I am aware of from a county that is impacted by a provision of this bill opposing the title that impacts that county. We do not have one.

The only letter of opposition, or the only communication that we have from a county opposing any of the matters that we are discussing today happens to be a communication from a county that opposes the amendment offered by the gentleman. And so, again, I struggle to understand the consistency there, but nonetheless, contextually I just want to make sure we fully explain the rationale behind the 2017 interagency agreement that my distinguished friend mentioned, because ironically enough, the agreement that the sponsor mentioned that ultimately the amendment is grounded in for the purpose of recreational facilities while congressional action is expected to legislatively establish the Curecanti National Recreation Area.”

So in 2008 and 2009 these agencies all agreed that the transfer of the full acreage of 260 acres, that was something they supported, and they were hoping that Congress would do something about it. Ten years later, it is 2019, and we have done nothing. Ultimately, the agencies came together on an interagency agreement in 2017 to at least do something in the interim with the hopes that Congress would step up and fill the void and codify those protections, which is precisely the opportunity that we have now before us. That is why I oppose this amendment and would encourage others to do the same.

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

Mr. Tipton. Mr. Chairman, once again, I want to share with my colleagues the comments, his passion. I am glad he has been to Montrose to be able to see this. And so, again, I struggle to understand the consistency there, but nonetheless, contextually I just want to make sure we fully explain the rationale behind the 2017 interagency agreement that my distinguished friend mentioned, because ironically enough, the agreement that the sponsor mentioned that ultimately the amendment is grounded in for the purpose of recreational facilities while congressional action is expected to legislatively establish the Curecanti National Recreation Area.”

So in 2008 and 2009 these agencies all agreed that the transfer of the full acreage of 260 acres, that was something they supported, and they were hoping that Congress would do something about it. Ten years later, it is 2019, and we have done nothing. Ultimately, the agencies came together on an interagency agreement in 2017 to at least do something in the interim with the hopes that Congress would step up and fill the void and codify those protections, which is precisely the opportunity that we have now before us. That is why I oppose this amendment and would encourage others to do the same.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, once again, I want to share with my colleagues the comments, his passion. I am glad he has been to Montrose to be able to see this. And so, again, I struggle to understand the consistency there, but nonetheless, contextually I just want to make sure we fully explain the rationale behind the 2017 interagency agreement that my distinguished friend mentioned, because ironically enough, the agreement that the sponsor mentioned that ultimately the amendment is grounded in for the purpose of recreational facilities while congressional action is expected to legislatively establish the Curecanti National Recreation Area.”

So in 2008 and 2009 these agencies all agreed that the transfer of the full acreage of 260 acres, that was something they supported, and they were hoping that Congress would do something about it. Ten years later, it is 2019, and we have done nothing. Ultimately, the agencies came together on an interagency agreement in 2017 to at least do something in the interim with the hopes that Congress would step up and fill the void and codify those protections, which is precisely the opportunity that we have now before us. That is why I oppose this amendment and would encourage others to do the same.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.
Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to claim the time in opposition, although I am not opposed to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Colorado?

There was no objection.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I genuinely appreciate my colleague's position on this. In fact, he will probably recall, and I believe he voted for—and our colleagues from Colorado (Mr. Neguse) did as well—my amendment, to be able to recognize the importance of this issue to the national defense of the United States. We passed that through. 417–6, as I recall, was the vote total that was on that.

So I applaud the recognition of the importance of high-altitude training facilities.

Mr. Chair, I thank my colleague, Mr. Crow, for his service to this country. That is the importance of people being able to put their lives on the line for this Nation, but we do need, I think, ultimately, to be able to go one step further.

While this recognizes the importance of it, it does not codify it. That is something that I think is really essential to making sure that the men and women in the United States military have the safest opportunities to be able to do the training that they need to be able to carry out the missions of this country.

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

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the comments of my friend from Colorado. This is certainly an example of the Colorado delegation working together, talking and collaborating, trying to figure out the best path forward for our State and the interests of all of our districts.

This is an issue, as I talked about earlier, that is very personal to me. I served in Afghanistan, and like I mentioned earlier, the pilots with whom I served received this critical training. My life and the life of my soldiers resembled received this critical training. This is an issue, as I talked about earlier, that is very personal to me. I want to read, very briefly, a letter that was sent to them by Major General Michael Loh, who not only is a pilot but is the commander of the Colorado National Guard. He said:

I am writing to express the support of the Colorado Department of Military and Veterans Affairs for the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act.

As a former officer of the United States Army, I have seen firsthand the importance of ensuring that our troops receive the best training possible. The Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act will provide important economic benefits and outdoor recreational opportunities for Coloradans while also supporting our troops.

Mr. Chair, I yield as much time as he asks for.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I want to say a deep note of gratitude to my distinguished colleague and my good friend from Colorado (Mr. Crow), who served our country so bravely and so honorably. We are all deeply grateful for his service in the Armed Forces and, of course, his service today in this Chamber.

I don’t know that I could say it any better than he did. I believe that this amendment reaffirms the support that we have for HAATS across our Colorado delegation and for the reasons he already so eloquently stated.

I think, ultimately, any further codification, as my colleague from the Third Congressional District had referenced, would be a solution in search of a problem.

Mr. Chair, I encourage every Member of this Chamber to support Mr. Crow’s important amendment.

Mr. CROW. Mr. Chair, in closing, I would like to express again the importance of honoring HAATS and its critical mission.

In July, I was pleased to join 416 of my colleagues, including Mr. Tipton, in voting for an amendment that has language that we can all get behind.

Again, I reiterate the fact that you don’t have to take anyone’s word for it sitting here having this debate tonight. The commanders on the ground, the people managing this facility, managing the pilots, in fact, the pilot himself and every member of the Colorado National Guard that manages this facility, the training that occurs, saying: Thank you. You did your work. The delegation reached out. You have mitigated our concerns. Move forward.

What else do we need other than that word of our commanders? Joe Neguse and Michael Bennet worked very hard to make sure they were addressing the concerns, and we should take their word for it, not ours.

Mr. Chair, I yield as much time as he asks for.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, I want to express my appreciation for Mr. Crow’s amendment and his leadership in this effort.

Mr. Chair, I am very happy to support this amendment, and I urge all others to support it.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The motion was agreed to. Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. Crow) having assumed the chair, Mr. PAPPAS, 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. 823) to provide for the designation of certain wilderness areas, recreation management areas, and conservation areas in the State of Colorado, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECOGNIZING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, October is Domestic Violence Awareness Month, and I rise today in support of those who have experienced domestic abuse.

Over 73,000 Tennesseans were victims of domestic violence last year. Sadly, many victims struggle for support after experiencing violence.

In Tennessee, and across America, victims of domestic violence are often times afraid to speak up about their abuse. Even worse, sometimes victims are not able to receive the help they need. This is unacceptable.

Communities across America must create safe environments for victims of domestic violence and encourage them to seek assistance.

Local organizations and shelters are always ready to help. As elected officials, we have a responsibility to make sure our constituents are aware of these resources.

I am proud to partner with the YWCA, which employs a good friend of mine, Maggie McNally, whose father I worked with for over 15 years in Nashville and who now is the speaker of the Tennessee State Senate, to raise awareness for Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

The YWCA and organizations like it are committed to ending domestic violence in our communities, and I fully support them in their mission.
SUPPORT THOSE WITH DOWN SYNDROME

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

Mr. SPANO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to Down Syndrome Awareness Month. Down syndrome occurs when abnormal cell division results in a duplicate of chromosome 21. However, those suffering from this disease are anything but abnormal, and it is time that they be viewed as valued members of our community.

Although there is no cure or prevention for Down's, there are still nations working to eradicate the disease using the only means available to them, through the willful abortion of babies identified as having Down Syndrome during prenatal screenings.

Iceeland is an example of a country where almost all women who receive a positive test result for Down Syndrome terminate their pregnancies at the recommendation of their medical practitioners.

Those with Down Syndrome can and should be given the opportunity to live full lives. They can be educated and employed. They exude joy and grace, with the most lovable personalities. Just ask their family and friends.

It is time for the world to stop being complicit in the genocide of those with Down Syndrome and to support our friends born with an extra chromosome. All life has value.

HONORING MARINE CORPS RESERVE PFC KENNETH W. LIKENS

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

Mr. LEVIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, last week, I experienced one of the true honors of my time in Congress. I participated in the burial of Marine Corps Reserve Private First Class Kenneth W. Likens of Mount Clemens, Michigan.

Private Likens died fighting to protect the freedoms of all of us on the third day of the Battle of Tarawa Atoll in the Gilbert Islands in the Pacific theater during World War II.

Incredibly, his remains, which have been missing for 75 years, were identified in May, thanks to the tireless and underappreciated efforts of Hero Flight, which refuses to give up the fight to bring democracy's heroes home.

I was so moved to attend this dignified and solemn ceremony at Great Lakes National Cemetery in Holly, Michigan, and to meet PFC Likens' nearest surviving relative, Kenneth Dolan, who was named for his uncle, the lost soldier.

PFC Likens is lost no more. He now rests in peace where he belongs, in the land of the free and the home of the brave.

STATE OF OUR MANUFACTURING ECONOMY

Mr. Speaker, I rise within this Chamber this evening to give an address on the state of our manufacturing economy. It is certainly very significant to do so this evening in the well of our House of Representatives, one of the most sacred and distinct places of our democracy, where we deliberate, exchange, and make our Nation's laws.

Certainly, the weight of a great history is also upon us, and some profound and oftentimes troubling questions are asked of us. How do we make government work for the people we represent? How do we restore trust, faith, and accountability in our Federal Government?

Henry Clay once said that government is a trust, and those elected into office, into Federal Government, are its trustees, and they work together for the benefit of the people.

We hear and see the aching headlines of dysfunction, of inability, of stagnation, questions around progress and where we seek and look to go. Trust in government is at its lowest levels, according to Pew.

We are waiting for an infrastructure deal. We are waiting for tenets of social justice, of economic justice, or equal opportunity for education.

This House of Representatives in this 116th Congress has passed some remarkable bills, over 200, in fact, bills that colleagues who preceded me worked for years to get to the House floor. Now, the American public waits for those bills to become law, to be passed through our Senate, to be signed into law. That is why we are here today.

It is very intentional this evening that I speak from the well of this Congress to whoever may be listening.

The facts are also upon us. Today, the Federal Reserve cut interest rates for the third time this year as the U.S. economy continues to slow down amid "ongoing trade disputes and weak global growth."

For it is such a fact that 98 percent of the world’s consumer base exists outside of the United States that we are in a race to sell our best-in-class product from our best-in-class workforce to the international market place.

We are closing in on this decade in just a few short weeks. It feels like months. We are entering into a new decade, and we are asking ourselves what our competitiveness agenda will be.

Tariffs, the tariff war that we are in so far has hurt businesses $34 billion since January 2018. Individual households are now at risk to pay hundreds more for consumer goods as they are increasingly impacted by this trade war: individual households, our American middle class, bearing the burden of this fallacious trade war.

Yes, we need to be tough on China. Yes, we need accountability. Yes, we need to take on illegal dumping and currency manipulation and strong-arming and the taking of our IP, but we need to do so in a way that positions us for success, that positions the American middle class on a trajectory for growth and reclaims what we lost since the mid-1990s. That income, median income, has not increased since the mid-1990s. That rests upon us as an economic charge.

Today, industrial activity is at its lowest point since June 2009—an Earth-shattering year, by the way, in the middle of a Great Recession—today, with productivity inventories and new orders falling.

I represent these manufacturers in southeastern Michigan. I represent a base of small manufacturers, the most robust supply chain of auto manufacturers in the country. I have devoted this first year in my first term in Congress hand in hand with these small businesses, with these midsize companies who employ countless people in my district, who send their children to the schools I represent.

To the other service businesses who benefit from this strong economy, why get in the way of growth?

Far, Michigan has lost 6,200 factory jobs. And we are not the only State with this type of industry as its lifeblood that is showing signs of a slowdown: States like Ohio, which has also shed 2,400 manufacturing jobs; Pennsylvania has 9,100 fewer manufacturing workers.

I hear from these individuals, these small firms, and they are wondering what it is going to take to reignite investment in our workforce and investment in them, that we have now spent more in agricultural subsidies than we have on the entire U.S. auto rescue.

The auto rescue was not a man-made crisis. It was part of a larger economic conundrum, a set of economic policies that set us on a trajectory of near implosion, of implosion of our financial economy, lifeblood.

And the lifeblood of our industrial base and good, bipartisan policy-making, of which I was part of, came together to save the auto industry—200,000 Michigan jobs, millions more across the country—an auto industry that is humming on incredible and remarkable innovation today. I know this. I see it.

There are more facts: 2 to 1 patents in autonomous vehicle technology coming out of my district; 75 percent of the R&D; rampant proliferation of electric vehicle technology going into industrial parks and seeing what is akin to, and not short of, an innovation renaissance.

We are waiting for the electric vehicle tax credit bill. We are waiting for
October 30, 2019

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H8667

an economic policy not of resistance, not of fighting, but of positioning us for success.

The statistics and the facts and the headlines are real, and they mean something in Michigan’s 11th District to the small business in Novi, to the hub of automobile manufacturing taking place in Auburn Hills, that I-75 corridor. And yet we want to compete; we want to sell; we want the investment in our American workforce.

What are we paying for it? This is a referendum on our economic policy that is coming from agencies and administrators who the body that I serve in has oversight appropriating and authorizing authority over.

Our Federal deficit has swelled to nearly $1 trillion. It is basically at $1 trillion in this year. It happened quietly. It was maybe a peep of a headline. We can’t even fathom what a $1 trillion deficit in this country means.

This isn’t to shame any individual about their spending habits, because, I guarantee you, any of my colleagues engaging in such personal egregious behavior would be declared bankrupt and unfit for office.

Our Nation cannot function with a $1 trillion deficit for the long-term. It comes at the expense of every American, and particularly an undue and saddled burden to the next generation, to those of age 18 who cannot even place a vote yet and are counting on us to enact policies.

So when the headlines start to rumble, of which they have, about a manufacturing slowdown, about an acute manufacturing recession, how can that be when we have such incredible innovations proliferating? It is because we have not reconciled our economic policy. It is because we have not embraced an economic policy for the middle class as a whole of government.

Our Democratic Caucus has, our Democratic Caucus reverberating the mantra of “for the people.” That Democratic Caucus reverberating the mantra has a value for the people being screamed loud, for our middle class, not doing anything to those under the age of 18 who cannot even place a vote yet and are counting on us to enact policies.

So when the headlines start t rumble, of which they have, about a manufacturing slowdown, about an acute manufacturing recession, how can that be when we have such incredible innovations proliferating? It is because we have not reconciled our economic policy. It is because we have not embraced an economic policy for the middle class as a whole of government.

Our Democratic Caucus has, our Democratic Caucus reverberating the mantra of “for the people.” That Democratic Caucus reverberating the mantra has a value for the people being screamed loud, for our middle class, not doing anything to those under the age of 18 who cannot even place a vote yet and are counting on us to enact policies.

So when the headlines start to rumble, of which they have, about a manufacturing slowdown, about an acute manufacturing recession, how can that be when we have such incredible innovations proliferating? It is because we have not reconciled our economic policy. It is because we have not embraced an economic policy for the middle class as a whole of government.

Our Democratic Caucus has, our Democratic Caucus reverberating the mantra of “for the people.” That Democratic Caucus reverberating the mantra has a value for the people being screamed loud, for our middle class, not doing anything to those under the age of 18 who cannot even place a vote yet and are counting on us to enact policies.

So when the headlines start to rumble, of which they have, about a manufacturing slowdown, about an acute manufacturing recession, how can that be when we have such incredible innovations proliferating? It is because we have not reconciled our economic policy. It is because we have not embraced an economic policy for the middle class as a whole of government.

Erik Brynjolfsson, MIT professor and author of a great book on the future of work in the digital age of manufacturing, recently testified in front of my committee, declaring several things which are of note to this body. He declared, his research, the research, the primary facts that drive these headlines, our research tells us that we face two urgent economic challenges: a lack of productivity growth and too much inequality.

Amid all of this, the interconnectedness of digital economy and innovation that we, as Americans, proliferated the internet, the use of information technology that is captured on the internet. It started in the late nineties with less than 10 percent of information technology on the internet. By the year 2007, 90 percent, and then today, an entirely different internet.

We now talk about the Internet of Things, the interconnectedness of devices to the technology and the wireless networks, which have a great and profound benefit to our manufacturers in Michigan. We are leaders in this industrial Internet of Things space. We are designing, producing, making, and shipping in ways that we never have before, and it needs to be shared, the prosperity. That is, what we know, we all want.

So we also raise the question of supply chain security. This is particularly important to those of us in Michigan, in Metro Detroit, recognizing how important that supply chain was in World War II. We want to create a new way for the small business JOBS Act that spurred investment of American products into international markets.

But the world is demanding our electric vehicles. It is demanding our technology. It is demanding our manufacturing.

Let’s revive the great ability to sell our products.
Let's revitalize the great ability to advocate on behalf of our labor force, our 21st century labor movement. Let's reconcile the reality of today's economy and policies that have been 19th or 20th century proposed solutions to 21st century problems, and be smart about how to win and compete again. It is a new era that begets a new trade orientation for us.

Mr. Speaker, I would be remiss in this Special Order hour, of which I am for the first time seated in my place, of not bringing the pensions of many Americans to solvency, a classic example of doing nothing; solving people's problems, not forcing small businesses to feel a pinch, not looking job layoffs in the face but saying, "We are investing in you."

We are championing legislation and policy to do just that and puts people at the forefront, those who are not armed with the biggest lobbyists or the fanciest offices but who are counting on those who hold the stewardship of trust to deliver for them. We will also recognize, in this 1-year anniversary of the last full-scale impeachment hearing, that that pathway to growth, not disinvestment.

Too many have told me: We have had to invest elsewhere, we have had to reduce ourselves from deals. We need to be competing effectively as a continent with the rest of the world. We need to take Asia by storm because we know they want our goods. We know they want our innovations. And it is that ability to do original research, the "if not for but for the Federal Government" approach to basic research investment that catalyzes and proliferates new technologies.

I am looking forward, Mr. Speaker, to continuing to learn and to grow and to advocate fiercely on behalf of my economy in Michigan's 11th Congressional District for the betterment and the semblance of our future.

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

FULL-SCALE IMPEACHMENT HISTORY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. King) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader. Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be recognized as I address you here on the floor of the House of Representatives, and I appreciate all the eyes and ears that are paying attention here this evening as we take up this bill. I want to make clear that this Congress has only addressed three previous times in the history of the United States of America.

As we go back through American antiquity, we will see that there was an impeachment process that was advanced shortly after the Civil War with Andrew Johnson as President. Then we sat back for over a century before there was another issue that arose, and that was in 1974 with the impeachment effort of Richard Nixon. We know that we are balancing the equities and policies of our manufacturing agenda has tremendous importance to the American people.

We will also recognize, in this 1-year anniversary of the last full-scale impeachment hearing, the "if not for but for the Federal Government" approach to basic research investment that catalyzes and proliferates new technologies.

I am looking forward, Mr. Speaker, to continuing to learn and to grow and to advocate fiercely on behalf of my economy in Michigan's 11th Congressional District for the betterment and the semblance of our future.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.
to the level that he should be removed from office and put Al Gore in as President of the United States?

That was the question before the United States Senate. It was profound. I will tell you, Mr. Speaker, it broke my heart this country was torn apart over the disrespect in the Oval Office, the disrespect for the United States, and the disrespect for the Constitution and the decorum of the Presidency. I had a difficult time retaining my composure when I went back to Iowa to talk about what I had seen.

I recall going out to Arlington Cemetery during that time and making my way up the hill and wandering around over to the eternal flame at the grave of President John F. Kennedy. Very close to him now, of course, is the grave of Bobby Kennedy, and not very far away is the grave of Teddy Kennedy, the three brothers who served this country so well. I remember standing with Senator Dodd and that eternal flame and looking down across Arlington Cemetery and all the crosses that were there, around 285,000 of them at the time, and looking at the bridge that goes over the Potomac and down on the Mall. If you know where to look, Mr. Speaker, it is a little bit out of center, but you can tell where the White House is from President Kennedy’s grave.

I thought about the calumny with President Kennedy’s casket winding its way down Pennsylvania Avenue, winding its way out across the Potomac River, winding its way up to Arlington, and winding its way up to that place on the hill where I was standing where President John F. Kennedy was buried with the eternal flame still burning and still blazing there on that location never having been snuffed out. I thought about a country that was full of grief for losing a President to the Presidency. I had a difficult time retaining my composure when I went over here to the House of Representatives. I believe three of them were presented over in the United States Senate. I haven’t looked that up in a long time. It is not a place I like to go revisit very often, Mr. Speaker.

I recall also that the decision was made here in the House of Representatives that said that we are impeaching the President of the United States for his activities with an intern and his refusal to tell the truth about them when he is under oath, that the trial took place over in the United States Senate. I think of my junior Senator at the time, Tom Harkin, whom I have had a chance to speak with him, who, by watching him on C-SPAN—as every Senator had to do, Mr. Speaker—walk down the center aisle of the United States Senate, as if walking down here to this table right beside me with a large book there. On that large book it said:

I do hereby pledge to do impartial justice under the law and the Constitution of the United States of America, so help me God.

Each Senator was required to sign that book that they would do impartial justice. That meant they took the position of jurors to determine whether Bill Clinton was guilty of perjury, of obstruction of justice, of obstruction of perjury, to listen to the evidence that was presented before the United States Senate and come to an objective conclusion as to whether they believed that President Clinton had violated the law in those areas. And the second question was, and if so, does it rise to the level that he should be removed from office?

He was already impeached, Mr. Speaker, but does it rise to the level that he should be removed from office?

Our Founding Fathers in the Constitution gave us those standards to interpret in our time. The wisdom of our Founding Fathers just amazes me time after time, how they left the language in such a way that we got to decide, in the context of contemporary values, whether or not the violations that said that we are impeaching President of the United States Senate and come to an objective conclusion as to whether he is guilty or not of perjury, obstruction of justice, or obstruction of perjury, so what? It didn’t rise to the level that he should be removed from office.

Time after time the Democrats who voted to protect President Bill Clinton from being removed from office made charges to turn the country against President Bill Clinton, then how do they vote to protect his position in office, even though we had a Vice President whom they liked and respected, and I think would have made a reasonably decent President during that period of time.

So let’s apply those values today. Let’s apply the Bill Clinton values today, and they come back to be this: that if the charges that actually don’t exist yet against Donald Trump are some charges that are lesser than the charges that were leveled against President Bill Clinton, then how do these Senators—some of whom are still there from 1998—how could they vote to remove Donald Trump from office in the United States Senate if they can’t even find a charge in the House of Representatives—and they have been churning around here for nearly 3 years looking for charges they can impeach him with—if they can’t come up with a charge that is perjury, obstruction of justice, or obstruction of perjury?

The biggest thing they have charged him with is collusion, and that is a laugh. The definition of collusion is pretty vague. If you and I team up together, Mr. Speaker, and we go out and set up a business enterprise, somebody will say we are colluding. If I say: I am going to sell lemonade at a stand on the corner of Fourth and Vine; and you...
say: I am going to sell lemonade on the corner of Fifth and Vine, that is collusion.

It is no crime, and it is no violation of our moral standards either, Mr. Speaker.

Whatever charges at this point have been speculated against President Trump are nowhere near that which I believe Bill Clinton was guilty of but not convicted and removed from office. But we never found out. The jury in the Senate, as I have said, gave us a verdict on the violations of President Bill Clinton. They wrapped him up in the same question: Did he commit perjury?

Democrats said: Well, who knows? It doesn't matter. I didn't have to answer that question, because I didn't think he should be removed from office even if he had. Time after time Senators signed the document, walked back, and decided, as Tom Harkin did, I will never vote to remove Bill Clinton from office, even though the Senate was created with a deadlock, a document that said that I will do impartial justice under the law.

I am saying this, Mr. Speaker, because this impeachment process that we are in the middle of now is a very political operation and organizations. Look at the votes that will come down here to the floor of the House of Representatives tomorrow. The Rules Committee met tonight, and they had their dialogue going on there. They are going to bring an impeachment resolution down here. We are going to have a debate on the rule, we are going to vote, and it is likely going to be a clear partisan vote—Republicans on one side voting “no,” Democrats on the other side voting “yes.”

They don't have to believe it, they just know which jersey they have on. I am not asserting that Republicans don't conduct themselves in a similar way. Instead, I am asserting this: if there is a political operation, and they calculate that they could bring these charges against the President of the United States, and in the effort to impeach the President find a way to tie his hands so he can't be as effective as the people who elected Donald Trump want, pray, and expect him to be.

I would take us back to this election that took place and the many hearings wherein I have questioned the witnesses before the House Judiciary Committee. Some of the witnesses whom I have questioned under oath go back to, let’s see, Janet Napolitano, Loretta Lynch, Rod Rosenstein, Christopher Wray, and James Comey. The list goes on. Peter Strzok would be one of those people. Another one I listened to would be Lisa Page. I don’t believe I ever asked her a question, but I have listened to her testify. They put this whole scenario together. The texts that went back and forth between Peter Strzok and Lisa Page told us what was going on.

They had weaponized the FBI, weaponized the Department of Justice, weaponized the State Department, and weaponized the CIA, the branches of government that were mobilized to attack not only Conservatives and Republicans, but to attack the candidate for President, Donald Trump, who said during that period of time he believed that he had been wiretapped in Trump Towers in New York.

That turns out to be true. The only way the left can argue with that, Mr. Speaker, is that they say that the definition of wiretap really doesn’t apply anymore because we have so much wireless that we are not actually wire-tapping we are just doing surveillance. An archaic term, though most recently archaic, doesn't mean President Trump wasn't right. He understood he was being bugged in the Trump Towers. Admiral Rogers, he moved his operations as President-elect out of Trump Towers in New York out to the golf course in New Jersey, where he could operate with a level of confidence that he, in that bugging in every conversation that he had.

But there was a concerted effort and it is a matter of fact today proven and not reasonably disputed that there was a sincere effort on the part of a good number of people at the highest levels of the Department of Justice, the FBI, the CIA, and the State Department to neuter this President by any means possible.

They tried to do so with their under-cutting of his campaign prior to the election in November 2016, and they continued to undercut this President as President-elect and as President of the United States.

So I am going to give a little piece of factual history here, Mr. Speaker. And that would be this: President Trump was elected, became President-elect, on the Tuesday prior to November 12, 2016. Then those 5 days on the Wednesday and November 12 was a Sunday—Sunday noon, early Sunday afternoon, all the highest ranking Democrats—except Hillary Clinton, who was still in mourning and hadn't gone out in public yet. All the highest ranking Democrats in the country found their way to the Mandarin Hotel here in Washington, D.C.

There, they were to convene a weekend, or the early part of that week, planning how they were going to—I am going to use the word “utilize” and perhaps “exploit” the Hillary Clinton presidency that they expected to be a done deal with the stamp of approval of the voters on it by that date of November 12, 5 days later, after the election.

But, of course, we all know the real history of it, and that was that Donald Trump was elected President instead. He was President-elect on the morning after the votes were counted on that Tuesday in November.

So the Democrats had the Mandarin Hotel reserved. They descended into and upon the Mandarin Hotel, November 12, Sunday afternoon, of 2016. They had to change their agenda. Their agenda was how to exploit the presidency of Hillary Clinton, and it now became: How are we going to deal with President Donald Trump?

The political article that first announces this was published the evening of November 20, and the picture in the center of that is a picture of George Soros. George Soros, one of the—I want to say the top funder for the Democratic Party in the United States of America, involved in some 60 countries, I believe, undermining the American freedom that we are trying to restore, protect, or advance, wherever it might be. George Soros was the headline.

Everybody that was there, except Hillary Clinton, they changed their agenda, Mr. Speaker. Their agenda was to be how to exploit the Hillary presidency, and it became: How do we resist Donald Trump?

In fact, that word “resist” and the movement of resistance that was beginning with demonstrations across the major cities in America, weekend after weekend, all the way up to, including, and beyond the inauguration of President Trump was a brainchild that emerged there at the Mandarin Hotel in Washington.

Not only the idea of the resistance movement, Mr. Speaker, but other ideas on what they were going to do.

By any means necessary, we have an insurance policy, as Peter Strzok wrote, to make sure that Donald Trump is never President, or if he is President, that he can't conduct the operations of a President. We are going to tie his hands one way or the other. So there they sat in the Mandarin Hotel from November 12 to November 15. They came in on Sunday afternoon, and Wednesday, noon, they are checking out of the Mandarin Hotel having had this conference, this seance, about what they are going to do with Donald Trump.

One is, they are not going to let him govern. They are going to resist. The resistance movement and that language flowed from there.

They also, I believe, designed certain pieces of language that they were going to weaponize so that they could attack Trump supporters. The Make America Great Again, MAGA, people, were going to be targeted by all kinds of pejorative statements and labels. They wrote, to make sure that Donald Trump is never President—that they had worn out that tired, old term called “racist,” the most dog-eared, worn-out card in the lexicon deck of the Democrats. They were going to continue to use “racist” because it still was effective, even though it was the most-utilized word that they had.

I will say, also, that I learned this from a former Member of Congress, Tom Tancredo, who made it very clear. He said, when they start calling you that, that is when you know you have won the argument. They can't keep up with the debate or they wouldn't fall to name-calling.
But “racism,” “racist” was worn out. They needed some other words to apply. So they began to generate some of them in the Mandarin Hotel. From that day, we started to see increased use in terms like “Nazi,” “fascist,” “white nationalist,” “white supremacy.” Those terms flowed out of the Mandarin Hotel and were kicked into gear and utilized across this country against people who were vulnerable to those kinds of labels. They knew what they were doing when they weaponized those terms.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, I happened to have gotten a little curious and did a little search through LexisNexis for the term “white nationalist.” I chased it back to the year 2000, and put the search terms in, and I asked it how many times the term “white nationalist” was used between the year 2000 and 2016. It came back virtually none. To be precise, virtually means 10 to 100 times a year by all the publications out there. All the scholarship work that is being done, all the blogs, all the comments on all the articles written, and the articles themselves added up to 100 to 200 times a year from 2000 to 2016 that the term “white nationalist” had been used.

That is virtually none in a great country like we are, with over 300 million people and all the publications that we have.

My name shows up a lot more than that, just to give you an example, Mr. Speaker, and I am not always happy about that. But virtually not used, “white nationalists.”

Then, when you get to 2016, this is the year at the Mandarin Hotel when they gathered together and decided what they are going to do to try to deny an effective Presidency for Donald Trump and to deny the will of the people to express search showed that that virtually never-used term of “white nationalist” jumped up to 10,000 times in 2016. In 2017, Mr. Speaker, it jumped to 30,000 times. In 2018, it was still there at 20,000 times.

A word that was virtually unused now had become weaponized. You can look at the charts and the graphs on this, Mr. Speaker, and you will see that “white supremacy,” “fascist,” and “Nazi” all also took jumps. But the most stark jump is “white nationalist.” The objective is to upset this country in a way that they that will have to name a special counsel to investigate the Russia collusion that we heard about for 2 years, and that special counsel needs to be Robert Mueller.

Well, see how this unfolded? Our Attorney General Jeff Sessions is a personal friend and someone whose intelligence and integrity I admire and respect, found himself in a place where he accepted some advice that I think, to this day, he would tell you he didn’t accept, but the advice was to recuse himself from anything that has to do with the Russian investigation.

Our Attorney General was essentially unable to address the circumstances of this Russia investigation. The special counsel is named—Robert Mueller. The special counsel is named by Rod Rosenstein, the Deputy Attorney General, the number two in the Department of Justice, and his position has been fallowed under significant question since that time as well.

But, Mr. Speaker, we ended up with Robert Mueller. We ended up with about 17 or so investigators/prosecutors handpicked. Handpicked by whom? Was it Robert Mueller? It sure didn’t sound like it 2 years later when he is under oath trying to explain the Mueller report before the United States Congress. It sounded more like he wasn’t in charge, or if he was in charge, he didn’t remember what was going on.

That is a good example of why when you have witnesses to testify, especially in these times, when the destiny of America is on the bubble and can turn, you have to have those witnesses open in the public where people can watch them, watch their body language, watch their facial expressions, listen for the pauses before they answer the questions, and listen to the voice inflection to determine whether you believe that witness or don’t believe that witness.

If you just end up with a transcript that one day we are able to extract from Adam Schiff, you are not able to...
evaluate the demeanor of the witnesses. What you have to do, then, is just accept what he has served up.

But the Mueller investigation went on for nearly 2 years with roughly 17 investigators. At least 13 of them clearly had a history of partisanship. Mr. Speaker. Some of them were ruthless, undercutting, partisan prosecutors. Weissmann would be one of those who come to mind for me.

One of the people on that panel was Peter Strzok, and it looks like Peter Strzok was the individual who was in the center of most everything that was going on and the weaponization of the Department of Justice and the FBI. Was he the individual who named all the folks that were part of the Mueller team? And when the text with his lover, Lisa Page, came out, and we saw the partisan, nasty, bitter, undercutting, on-the-verge-of-treason texts that came back and forth between Peter Strzok. Lisa Page, became obvious even to Robert Mueller that he needed to remove Peter Strzok from the investigative team, the Mueller team that was seeking to find something that they could impeach Donald Trump for. That was Peter Strzok.

But we went through nearly 2 years of that, $25 million to $30 million. When the Mueller report came out, they asked Robert Mueller to come to testify before Congress. Throughout all of that, the Democrats were licking their chops, Mr. Speaker, as: Surely, we have this Mueller report, He is such a smart guy, James Comey handpicked him, and James Comey despises the President, and he will move to New Zealand if Donald Trump is reelected.

Yet, what do they do? Well, we are going to have to tool up another kind of argument. What shall we use to impeach the President, but we don't know what. We don't know what we can make stick with the American people when they heard that?

Because, in the end, this judgment on the impeachment is up to the American people. That is how it transfers through the system eventually—not right away, not directly, but eventu-

ally.

Well, they finally figured out, after 2 weeks or 3 weeks or so, that they weren't going to be able to utilize the Mueller report to impeach the President. So, what do they do? Well, we are going to have to tool up another kind of an argument. What shall we use to get rid of this President? Two years burned up on the Mueller report, all the weaponization of the Department of Justice and the FBI.

I want to make sure, Mr. Speaker, that people understand. I lived through Watergate. I watched it closely.

I lived through the impeachment of Bill Clinton. I watched it closely, even more closely than the Watergate. But, as far as Bill Clinton's impeachment was concerned—and he was impeached—it wasn't so much a matter of corruption within government as it was the matter of the corruption of the President himself. Be that as it may, it threatened our Republic, our constitutional Republic.

But, if you take you back to 1974 and we talk about the Nixon impending impeachment—not the actual, but the impending impeachment. What do you think about what actually took place then and Watergate, this, I will say, horrible event within American history that tore this country apart, what happened was a few of the campaign operatives for Nixon's reelected team broke into Watergate to see what they could gather up in information from the Democrats.

That was really stupid, and it was really against the law. Yet, it wasn't within the knowledge base of President Nixon. Yet, we were about to or had invaded that space and committed that burglary. But, when Nixon found out that they had committed the burglary, he set about trying to cover it up.

So, President Nixon had a number of things, a number of responsibilities to consider when he made that decision to try to cover it up. But, nonetheless, we are at this place in history where we look back in the rearview mirror and we say that this was a mistake to try to cover it up because he got caught.

He would have been removed from office because Republicans had integrity and Democrats had partisanship and, I believe, integrity, so they decided that a President who was that dishonest, who would go to that level, needed to be removed from office. That was the judgment at the time of the people who were elected here in the House and in the Senate. And I do not quibble with those decisions or those positions that were taken.

That was Richard Nixon, 1974; Bill Clinton, 1998.

These things that I have talked about—covering up the crime of a burglary for political-motivated purposes, covering up the sexual activities by committing felonies of perjury, obstruction of justice, and subornation of perjury—those truly are at least, if they are not high crimes, serious misdemeanors.

But they came up with nothing in the Russia investigation with Robert Mueller, nothing that could stick, even though they had rigged this game against the President of the United States, President Trump, with the dossier.

And who colluded with the Russians to produce the dossier? The DNC. I mean, it started out with a check written by Paul Singer to do opposition research, because he is a never Trumper. He got what he could get out of the dossier effort, and it got handed over through Fusion GPS, funded by the DNC, and checks written through the attorney's office in order to try to defuse the trial, following the money trail on how this was put together.

But we know the dossier was unverified and it was full of manufactured narratives, much of it plugged in...
there by the Russians to upset the election results of the United States. And, if you look at their efforts, yes, they did try to affect the results of the election here in the United States, I believe that is true. But I don't know that they had any idea who they wanted—the President of the United States so much as they just wanted to create chaos within our system.

So they spent something like $100,000 on internet ads. That is a piece of it. They did other things to try to hack into几项政策 going out, there is no evidence that they affected any vote tally. There is always a speculation that, perhaps, they did affect the way some people voted.

But we also know that there were, I will say, I am going to say, hundreds of millions of dollars—it runs into the billions—spent on advertisement in this country to also affect the election.

So, I recall sitting there with a group of Russians at a conference that we had, by going excited them for their effort to upset our elections here, their response was: So 13 of our Russian hackers was in a building in Russia and they created this much patch in the United States of America for for $35 million and I am working then, there trying to be hackers. Think how bad it would have been for you all if there had been 26.

That was their answer to me.

Mr. Speaker, I reflect on that, and I have given them a little nod, kind of a little silent smile of he had enough audacity to make the statement. What it amounts to, really, is it says that 13 Russians didn't affect the election here in the United States.

What they did was wrong. They have been indicted by the Mueller people. We will never see them again. They are never going to be brought to justice. Thirty Russians, and we were all tied in knots for 2 years, $25 million to may be $30 million of the Mueller report that comes back to be nothing.

So what is the next play? It is kind of like you call a big play in a football game and you drop back to throw this pass and you get sacked for a 25- or 30-yard loss. You go back to the huddle. What are you going to do now? Well, we are not going to run a dive play that is going to get 3 yards. We are going to have to come up with another trick play.

Well, what is that going to be? Let's see. We are going to get the President for a phone call to Ukraine.

And we know the story on that. It is contemporary, Mr. Speaker. I don't have to refresh the body on this very much except that, when you read the transcript of that phone call, that transcript that has been vetted by at least six different people who are professionals to make sure that the context of that call and the language of that call was not recorded within that transcript that they type up for that call. I read it with this peace, or I thought: I am going to get to a place where I get this little peace in my gut that kind of flips and says, “Oh, he actually said that?” And I read it with that in mind, carefully.

I found no place that troubled me in any way whatsoever. When the President said, I have heard him in his own voice and person said that it was a perfect phone call, he has got a strong argument. It is pretty close to a perfect phone call; although, I don't think much of anything is ever perfect in this society.

And the request to go in and do the investigation of Burisma and any board member, as I looked at that request that was there, this country has been full of questions about what was going on in Ukraine. And if Joe Biden's son is on the board for $80,000 a month with no energy expertise whatsoever, isn't that worth looking into?

And we also have the videotape of then-Vice President Joe Biden saying: Yeah, I held a billion-dollar check out and signed it in front of the Ukrainians, and I told them that, “If you don't fire that prosecutor that is investigating the oil company whose board my son is on, if you don't fire him, I am leaving in 6 hours with the check, and I am going to announce that.” And he said—and I can't say these words here on the floor, but it was a blank. They fired him, within a very short period of time.

That leveraged the investigator out who was on the trail, at least he believed, of corruption in Ukraine, and that corruption pulled into question at least Hunter Biden, if not Joe Biden himself.

So, why was Joe Biden so determined to extort the firing of the investigator in Ukraine by dangling a billion-dollar check in front of him—which was a loan guaranty, to make the record correct. Why was Joe Biden doing that, and why is it moral for Joe Biden to use the power of the U.S. government to extort that that would be cleaning up corruption in Ukraine before U.S. dollars would be put into that system?

He is enhancing corruption. He is not cleaning up corruption. And Donald Trump's statement, if it is to be read at all, was an encouragement to go in and do the investigation to clean up the corruption, not to enhance the corruption.

A billion-dollar equivalent of a bribe by Joe Biden—I will give you this billion-dollar loan guaranty if you fire the investigator that is investigating the corruption—versus Donald Trump implying, but not saying: Can you help us out here? Can you help us with the investigation? Can you reopen this investigation into Burisma, because I am hearing a lot of problems over here in the United States about what has been going on in Ukraine.

Now, is it happenstance that Joe Biden is a potential political rival? He does not know, 24 or so Democrats altogether.

And he may still be the marginal frontrunner, although I think Elizabeth Warren—I am confident she has passed him up in Iowa, and it looks like the momentum in his campaign has flattened out. But why would President Trump be so concerned about this that he would ask that they would go in to do this investigation?

And I will say, instead, a President of the United States has a duty to investigate corruption, in oblation by law not to advance those funds until there are assurances that corruption is cleaned up.

That is a statute that has been served up to him, and it exists out there. I just don't have it in front of me to quote it to you exactly here tonight, Mr. Speaker.

So President Trump, I believe, was following not only his conscience and his own interest and following the law that compelled him to ensure that corruption was being cleaned up in Ukraine before U.S. aid could go into Ukraine.

And they found a way to turn this around and say, well, no, we are going to assign the President a motive, and then we are going to make the motive stick and then that motive will be they will rise to the level that we are going to impeach him in the United States House of Representatives for seeking to use U.S. dollars as an incentive for an investigation into his political opponent. How about an investigation into corruption?

The corruption was being investigated until Joe Biden stepped in and extorted the firing of the investigator in Ukraine. And all Donald Trump said was—can you light this back up again, and let's find out what the truth is.

Why is anybody on the other side of the aisle, Joe Biden or Hunter Biden or anyone else included, why are they worried about an investigation if they are clean? The investigation must be shut down by Democrats for some reason. I mean, from where I stand, I am clean. And so, if somebody says I am going to investigate Steve King, I say, fine, go ahead. You know, if that is all you have to do with your life, go ahead. They said the other day what happens if they bring ethics charges against those of us who went down to the SCIF and said we are going to bring sunlight into this basement room here that Adam Schiff is holding his secret amendment hearings in, and some of the Members said, well, gee, it is going to cost us millions of dollars to defend ourselves if they bring ethics charges against us. And I said, it is not going to cost me a dime. Lock me up if that is the case, because we have a Constitution that protects and preserves. We have a country to protect and preserve. We have a legacy that is handed to us from our Founding Fathers that requires us
to step up and defend our Constitution and the rule of law and the principles of truth, justice, and the American way, no matter how heavy the partisan politics get. And they are heavy. They are so heavy that the history of impeachment is written aside by ADAM SCHIFF and NANCY PELOSI.

And I picked up the impeachment resolutions from 1974, Resolution of Inquiry. “Following is the text of House Resolution 803, as approved by the House February 6, 1974. This is the Nixon impeachment resolution.”

Mr. Speaker. I include in the RECORD the 1974 resolution for the impeachment of Richard Nixon.

1974 RESOLUTION OF INQUIRY

Following is the text of House Resolution 803, as approved by the House Feb. 6, 1974.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by any subcommittee thereof appointed by the chairman for the purposes hereof and in accordance with the rules of the committee, is authorized and directed to investigate fully and completely whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise its constitutional power to impeach William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States of America. The committee shall report to the House of Representatives such resolutions, articles, or other recommendations as it deems proper.

Sec. 2.

(a) For the purpose of making such investigation, the committee is authorized to require—

(1) by subpoena or otherwise—

(A) the attendance and testimony of any person (including at a taking of a deposition by counsel for the committee); and

(B) the production of such things; and

(2) by interrogatory, the furnishing of such information; as it deems necessary to such investigation.

(b) Such authority of the committee may be exercised—

(1) by the chairman and the ranking minority member acting jointly, or, if either declines to act, by the other acting alone, except that in the event either so declines, either shall have the right to refer to the committee for decision the question whether such authority shall be so exercised and the committee shall be convened promptly to render that decision; or

(2) by the committee acting as a whole or by subcommittee.

Subpoenas and interrogatories so authorized may be issued over the signature of the chairman, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them, or any person authorized by law to administer oaths (including at a taking of a deposition by counsel for the committee); and

the production of such things; and

(b) by interrogatory, the furnishing of such information; as it deems necessary to such investigation.

Sec. 3. For the purpose of making such investigation, the committee, and any subcommittee thereof, are authorized to sit and act, without regard to clause 31 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, during the present Congress at such times and places within the United States, whether the House is meeting, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, as it deems necessary.

Res. Sec. 4. Any information or data compilations from which information can be obtained (translated if necessary, through detection devices into reasonably usable form), tangible objects, and other things of any kind.

Mr. KING of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the October 7, 1998, resolution for the impeachment of Bill Clinton.

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary, acting as a whole or by any subcommittee thereof appointed by the chairman for the purposes hereof and in accordance with the rules of the committee, is authorized and directed to investigate fully and completely whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise its constitutional power to impeach Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States of America. The committee shall report to the House of Representatives such resolutions, articles, or other recommendations as it deems proper.

For the purpose of making such investigation, the committee is authorized to require—

(1) by subpoena or otherwise—

(A) the attendance and testimony of any person (including at a taking of a deposition by counsel for the committee); and

(B) the production of such things; and

(2) by interrogatory, the furnishing of such information; as it deems necessary to such investigation.

Such authority of the committee may be exercised—

(a) by the chairman and the ranking minority member acting jointly, or, if either declines to act, by the other acting alone, except that in the event either so declines, either shall have the right to refer to the committee for decision the question whether such authority shall be so exercised and the committee shall be convened promptly to render that decision; or

(b) by the committee acting as a whole or by subcommittee.

Subpoenas and interrogatories so authorized may be issued over the signature of the chairman, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them, and may be served by any person designated by the chairman, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them, or any member designated by either of them, or any person authorized by law to administer oaths (including at a taking of a deposition by counsel for the committee); and

the production of such things; and

(b) by interrogatory, the furnishing of such information; as it deems necessary to such investigation.

The committee shall be convened promptly to render that decision; or

by the committee acting as a whole or by subcommittee.

Well great, we went down to the SCIF and shined sunlight on that, and now they have capitated to the pressure that was brought to bear that day, and they are going to have an open hearing or hearings.

But here is what we have. This is I think the ADAM SCHIFF resolution. It doesn’t have a number on it now as I believe it was brought to bear that day, and they are going to have an open hearing or hearings.

Well, I wrote a little note on there that says, yes, they are going to have an open hearing, or hearings, by a minimum of one. They might have more if they decide to, but not all. They are still determined. This resolution says that they can go back down into the basement room of the Capitol, the secret session, and conduct the inquiry with their secret rules and the public can’t see the audio, the public can’t see the video, the public nor other Members of Congress can watch the facial expressions, listen to the voice inflections, watch with their secret rules and the public can’t see it, the public can’t hear the audio, the public can’t see the video, the public nor other Members of Congress can watch the facial expressions, listen to the voice inflections, watch with their secret rules and the public can’t see it. So it would be a minimum of one.
under this resolution that comes to us tomorrow just as they are going to do one open hearing. And it might be a gavel in and gavel out. That will comply with this resolution. And they can move on.

It is also, The chair and ranking minority member of the committee—that is the secret committee, the Permanent Select Committee—shall be permitted to question witnesses for equal specified periods of longer than 5 minutes, as determined by the chair.

So if the chair wants to question the witness for 5 minutes, 10 minutes, 20 minutes, 30 minutes, even 45 minutes because they have a 90-minute cap on this, as determined by the chair. But if ADAM SCHIFF wants to question a witness for 6 minutes only, that means that DEVIN NUNES can only question that witness for 6 minutes only. Well, that is a pretty tight rule, isn’t it?

So if they like what the witness is saying, they are going to continue to ask questions. If they don’t like what he is saying, he is going to shut that questioning off, and that shuts off DEVIN NUNES, and he is the only one that can ask questions of that witness.

It says, “shall be equal for the chair and the ranking minority member.” Sure. But the chair determines how long that time will be.

And then it says, “shall not exceed 90 minutes,” which I mentioned “in the aggregate only the chair and ranking member or a Permanent Select Committee employee,” meaning staff, “if yielded to by the chair or ranking minority member may question witnesses during such periods of questioning.”

So the rest of the committee that is allowed access into that secret basement room, there in the dark, in the confines of the most secret room in the entire Capitol complex, they are constructing a method to try to impeach the President of the United States.

Banana republics do that. Soviet-style justice does that. It is not justice in the Soviet, it is not justice here.

Also it says, “At the conclusion of questioning pursuant to this paragraph, the committee shall proceed with questioning under the 5-minute rule pursuant to clause . . .” “Does that allow all Members? That is not determined.”

So minority witness requests, the ranking minority member may submit to the chair, in writing, any requests for witness testimony . . .” But “any such request shall be accompanied by a detailed written justification of the relevance of the testimony of each requested witness to the investigation described in the first section of the resolution.” Then it says, “The ranking minority member of the Permanent Select Committee is authorized, with the concurrence of the chair, to require, as deemed necessary to the investigation . . .”

Let me boil this down for you, Mr. Speaker. What it really says is, the chair has subpoena power, and the ranking member has subpoena power, if the chair allows the ranking member to have subpoena power, which means the majority runs this whole show. The ranking member, the minority, if he does not like it that he is denied subpoena power, he can appeal it to the full committee. The full committee, which is dominated by Democrats and commanded by ADAM SCHIFF and will never—and I will put this point down—will never roll their sleeves and ask for a witness that might defend the President of the United States, as called by the ranking member, DEVIN NUNES.

That is what we are dealing with.

“In the case that the chair declines to concur in a proposed action of the ranking minority member . . . the ranking minority member shall have the right to refer to the committee for decision . . .” That is just what I said. He can go to the committee, but the votes aren’t going to be there in an objective fashion. The votes are only going to be those that follow down the partisan line. That is what it is set up to do.

It says, “The chair is authorized to make publicly available . . . the transcripts of depositions.” And they may be “with appropriate redactions for classified and other sensitive information.” Other-sensitive information means whatever ADAM SCHIFF decides the public shouldn’t know if it runs contrary to his agenda will be redacted before any report comes out of there. And remember, we are not going to see the video, we are not going to hear the audio, we are not going to read the transcript. We are going to get the edited version that ADAM SCHIFF would deliver to us.

It says, “The Permanent Select Committee is directed to issue a report setting forth its findings and recommendations . . .” The chair shall transmit such report . . . to the Committee on the Judiciary. ”Well, so that is how the Judiciary Committee becomes the Judiciary Committee. The Judiciary Committee then would have the responsibility presumably of taking up an impeachment motion and debating it up or down and voting on it in the Judiciary Committee. It takes a lot of authority out of the hands of JERRY NADLER, the chair of the committee. And it says to me that the Speaker and ADAM SCHIFF and others in leadership over on this side of the aisle don’t have the confidence that JERRY NADLER will handle it the way they would like to see him handle it.

“The report required by this paragraph shall be prepared in consultation with the chairs of the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Committee on Oversight and Reform.” Prepared with their counsel with the chairs. Seems like they left out the ranking members. There will be no minority input in this. They are just going to sit down with the chairs of some other committees that they claim to be relevant and have them weigh in on this before this report comes out, Mr. Speaker.

“The chair of the Permanent Select Committee . . . in consultation with the ranking minority member, to transfer such records or materials to the Committee on the Judiciary.” The chair in consultation. What does “consultation” mean? That means ADAM SCHIFF can say, hey, DEVIN NUNES, I am going to introduce this report and send it over to the Judiciary Committee. What do you think? And ranking member NUNES can say, “I don’t like it. I think it is dishonest.” Well, to that, we consulted, now I am sending it to judiciary. That is all this language requires. This is a phony resolution, Mr. Speaker.

“Committee on the Judiciary.” It says, “The House authorizes the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct proceedings relating to the impeachment inquiry . . . including such procedures as to allow for the participation of the President and his counsel.” Oh, that is good. I would be happy to have the President’s counsel there, but it doesn’t say the judiciary, it says, authorizes the committee to conduct those proceedings. It doesn’t say shall allow the President’s counsel. So that is all missing.

. . .” Shall, as authorizes to promulgate additional procedures as it deems necessary . . . “Well, that will be the majority deeming necessary that which they think will best impeach the President, not an impartial hearing.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I want to see a balanced and a fair process, one that is consistent with the history of the United States of America.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 9 o’clock and 27 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2250

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. PAPPAS) at 10 o’clock and 50 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON H. RES. 660, DIRECTING CERTAIN COMMITTEES TO CONDUCT ONGOING INVESTIGATIONS INTO WHETHER SUFFICIENT GROUNDS EXIST FOR THE IMPEACHMENT OF DONALD JOHN TRUMP, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. McGOVERN, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116–266) on the resolution (H. Res. 660) directing certain committees to continue their ongoing investigations as part of the existing House of Representatives inquiry
BILLY PLENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Cheryl L. Johnson, Clerk of the House, reported that on October 29, 2019, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill:

H.R. 1396. To award Congressional Gold Medals to Katherine Johnson and Dr. Christine Darden, to posthumously award Congressional Gold Medals to Dorothy Vaughan and Mary Jackson, and to award a Congressional Gold Medal to honor all of the women who contributed to the success of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration during the Space Race.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn. The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 10 o’clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 31, 2019, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker’s table and referred as follows:

2788. A letter from the Deputy Chief Financial Officer, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of a violation of the Antideficiency Act, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; Public Law 97-258; (96 Stat. 296); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2789. A letter from the Associate Division Chief, Wireless Telecommunications Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission’s final rule — Accelerating Wireless Broadband Deployment by Removing Barriers to Infrastructure Investment (WT Docket No.: 17-79) received October 28, 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.

2790. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report regarding detained U.S. Citizens; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2791. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Burundi, that was declared in Executive Order 13712 of November 22, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1621(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 294(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2792. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 19-51, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2793. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report by the Director of Political-Military Affairs, 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.

2794. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 19-010, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, 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.

2795. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 19-012, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, 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.

2796. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 19-026, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, 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.

2797. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 19-027, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, 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.

2798. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 19-033, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2799. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 19-034, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2800. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 19-040, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2801. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 19-043, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2802. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 19-044, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2803. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 19-049, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2804. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 19-051, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2805. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 19-054, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) and (d) of the Arms Export Control Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

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. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2019, as amended, for printing in the Congressional Record.

ESTIMATE OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO EFFECTS FOR H.R. 2181, AS AMENDED

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
<th>2022</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budgetary Effects</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding

BUDGETARY EFFECTS OF PAY GO LEGISLATION

Pursuant to the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (PAYGO), Mr. YARMUTH hereby submits, prior to the vote on passage, for printing in the Congressional Record, that H.R. 823, the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act, as amended, would have no significant effect on the deficit, and therefore, the budgetary effects of such bill are estimated as zero.
State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTc 19-065, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(c) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-212, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2990. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTc 19-029, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(d) of the Arms Export Control Act, to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2997. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator, National Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Visas: Ineligibility Based on Public Charge Grounds [Public Notice: 10922] (RIN: 1460-AE27) received October 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2998. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's term final rule — Visas: Ineligibility Based on Public Charge Grounds [Public Notice: 10922] (RIN: 1460-AE27) received October 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2999. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of Thiafentanil in Schedule II [Docket No.: DEA-375] received October 28, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 888); jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and the Judiciary.

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. McGOVERN: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 660. Resolution directing certain committees to continue their ongoing investigations as part of the existing House agenda and to inquire into whether sufficient grounds exist for the House of Representatives to exercise its Constitutional power to impeach Donald John Trump, President of the United States of America, and for other purposes (Rept. 116—266). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. MCKINLEY: (for himself and Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire):

H. R. 4913. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Medicare program that use a formulary to include certain generic drugs and biosimilar biological products on such formularies for Medicare-covered entities to carry out a coverage program that provides to qualifying individuals health coverage and educational and occupation training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mr. STEIL: (for himself, Mr. Hill of Arkansas, Mr. Stivers, Mr. Gooden, and Mr. Hollingsworth):

H. R. 4918. A bill to provide for a 5 year extension of certain exemptions and reduced disclosure requirements for companies that were emerging growth companies and would continue to be exempt from the restrictions for the 5-year restriction on emerging growth companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CHAI: (for himself, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GEBS, Mrs. AXNE, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H. R. 4919. A bill to amend the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 to amend certain hours of service requirements for agricultural operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TAKANO: (for himself, Mr. DAVIS P. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. MENG, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. HOGGINS of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. FOXX of North Carolina, Mr. PENCE, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma):

H. R. 4920. A bill to amend title III of the United States Code to provide for an exception to certain small business contracting requirements applicable to the Department of Veteran Affairs pursuant to contracts for goods and services covered under the Ability One program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BERA:

H. R. 4921. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1980 to require a certain appointments of chiefs of mission to be from Foreign Service or Civil Service of the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. COLE, Mr. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KIBRICK, Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. FRALEY of Indiana, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. SCHORES of Illinois, Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD of California, Mr. ROTHFUS of Pennsylvania, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SCHRAMER, Mr. CUTRONA, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. TOWNS of Georgia, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. VELA, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. SCHRINE, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia):

H. R. 4916. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for terms and conditions for nonimmigrant workers performing emergency services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GABBARD: (for herself, Mr. KIM, Mr. COOK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MELTZER of New York, Ms. ROUZI, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma):

H. R. 4917. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out the renovation, repair, or expansion needs of certain elementary schools and secondary schools that educate dependants of active duty military personnel going to school under the program to Education and Labor, 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. STEIL: (for himself, Mr. Hill of Arkansas, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GOODEN, and Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH):

H. R. 4918. A bill to provide for a 5 year extension of certain exemptions and reduced disclosure requirements for companies that were emerging growth companies and would continue to be exempt from the restrictions for the 5-year restriction on emerging growth companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CHAI: (for himself, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GEBS, Mrs. AXNE, and Mr. LAMALFA):

H. R. 4919. A bill to amend the Motor Carrier Safety Improvement Act of 1999 to amend certain hours of service requirements for agricultural operations, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. TAKANO: (for himself, Mr. DAVIS P. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. MENG, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. HOGGINS of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. FOXX of North Carolina, Mr. PENCE, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma):

H. R. 4920. A bill to amend title III of the United States Code to provide for an exception to certain small business contracting requirements applicable to the Department of Veteran Affairs pursuant to contracts for goods and services covered under the Ability One program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BERA:

H. R. 4921. A bill to amend the Foreign Service Act of 1980 to require a certain appointments of chiefs of mission to be from Foreign Service or Civil Service of the Department of State, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California (for herself, Mr. LOFGREN, Mr. BALDWIN, Mr. GUNDERSON, Mr. COLE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KIBRICK, Mr. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. FRALEY of Indiana, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SCHRAMER, Mr. CUTRONA, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. TOWNS of Georgia, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. VELA, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mrs. SCHRINE, and Mr. SCOTT of Georgia):

H. R. 4916. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for terms and conditions for nonimmigrant workers performing emergency services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and Labor, and Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. GABBARD: (for herself, Mr. KIM, Mr. COOK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MELTZER of New York, Ms. ROUZI, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma):

H. R. 4917. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to carry out the renovation, repair, or expansion needs of certain elementary schools and secondary schools that educate dependants of active duty military personnel going to school under the program to Education and Labor, 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. STEIL: (for himself, Mr. Hill of Arkansas, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. GOODEN, and Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH):
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. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Ms. MAT-SU): H.R. 4932. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to expand access to telehealth services, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on 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 Mr. VEASEY (for himself and Mr. BURNETT of Pennsylvania): H.R. 4933. A bill to amend the Women in Apprenticeship and Nontraditional Occupations Act to provide for reimbursement of certain expenses and to establish new requirements for selection of grantees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mrs. WALORSKI (for herself, Mr. BANKS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. PENCE, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. JOHNSON of Arizona, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BARIN, Mr. CHIABOT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KIRBY of Oklahoma, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. SPANO, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. GRANGER, Mr. RAY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. RAWLIE, Mrs. HARTZELL, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. BUSCHON): H.R. 4934. A bill to protect the dignity of fetal remains, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. WRIGHT (for himself, Mr. JOYCE, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. RICE of Georgia, Mr. BANKS, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. GIBBS): H.R. 4935. A bill to prohibit chemical abortions performed without the presence of a healthcare provider, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. WELCH): H. Res. 663. A resolution expressing support for the designation of the week of October 24, 2019, to October 31, 2019, as “BatWeek”; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. GREEEN of Texas (for himself, Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OLSON, Mr. RUSH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. SVALWELL of California): H. Res. 664. A resolution supporting the goals and ideas of the National Domestic Violence Awareness Month; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. RYAN: H. Res. 665. A resolution reaffirming the strong partnership between the Kingdom of Denmark and the United States; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. OCASIO-CORTez (for herself, Ms. MENG, Ms. TLAIR, Ms. Napolitano, Mr. Garcia of Illinois, and Ms. Lee of New York): H. Res. 666. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives on the ratification of the United Nations Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. JOHN W. ROSE of Tennessee: H. Res. 667. A resolution condemning the government of bipartisanship and prevention for hostile subpooch authorities during the 116th Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

H. Res. 667. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 80, urging the United States Congress to increase funding for Sickle Cell Disease research; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

H. Res. 671. By Mr. TAKANO: H. Res. 672. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of California, relative to Senate Resolution No. 73, urging the Congress of the United States to speedily approve the recently negotiated United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement; 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. McKINLEY: H.R. 4913. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—Powers of Congress. 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. RUSH: H.R. 4914. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—Powers of Congress. 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. SCHNEIDER: H.R. 4915. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8—Powers of Congress. 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. LOFGREN: H.R. 4916. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1, provides Congress with the power to establish a “uniform rule of Naturalization.”

By Mr. GABBARD: H.R. 4917. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The United States Constitution including Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. STEIL: H.R. 4918. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution: 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. CRAIG: H.R. 4919. Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution: 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. BEHA:
H.R. 4921.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. JUDY CHU of California:
H.R. 4922.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Clause 1 of Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. DINGELL:
H.R. 4923.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Ms. ESHOO:
H.R. 4924.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HUIZENGA:
H.R. 4925.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. McEACHERN:
H.R. 4926.
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. MCGUINNESS:
H.R. 4927.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. HIUZ:
H.R. 4930.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. RYAN:
H.R. 4931.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. WRIGHT:
H.R. 4935.
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. 5: Mr. Higgins of New York and Mr. Langevin.
H.R. 24: Mr. Olson and Mr. Soto.
H.R. 35: Mr. Jeffries, Ms. Underwood, and Mr. McEachin.
H.R. 51: Mr. Stanton.
H.R. 94: Mr. Blumenauer.
H.R. 155: Mr. Walberg.
H.R. 217: Mrs. Wagner.
H.R. 218: Mr. Roy.
H.R. 249: Mr. Gottheimer.
H.R. 400: Mr. Payne and Ms. Moore.
H.R. 403: Mr. Gotchman.
H.R. 496: Ms. Sánchez.
H.R. 511: Mr. Evans.
H.R. 567: Mr. Harris.
H.R. 589: Mr. Murphy of North Carolina, Mr. Mitchell, Mr. Bacon, Mr. Hill of Arkansas, and Mr. Rutherford.
H.R. 669: Mr. Neguse.
H.R. 737: Mr. Amash.
H.R. 832: Mr. Cartwright.
H.R. 906: Mr. Steinfeld, Mr. Crenshaw, Mr. Lamb, and Mr. Peterson.
H.R. 912: Mr. Nadler, Mr. Frankel, Mr. Meeks, Ms. Sánchez, Mr. Omar, Mr. Clay, Mr. Langhvin, Mr. Rouda, Mr. Danny K. Davis of Illinois, Ms. Scanlon, Mr. Cohen, Ms. Espaillat, Mr. Lewis, Ms. Trair, Ms. Jayapal, Mr. Garcia of Illinois, Mr. Sherrill, Mrs. Bustos, Ms. Kelly of Illinois, Mr. McNerney, Mr. Veasey, Mrs. Watson Coleman, Ms. Padgett, Mr. Evans, Ms. Slotkin, Ms. Barragan, and Mr. Fitzpatrick.
H.R. 921: Mr. García of Illinois, Mr. Cicilline, and Mr. Neguse.
H.R. 927: Ms. Mucarsel-Powell, Mr. Castro of Texas, and Mr. Lawson of Florida.
H.R. 929: Mr. Olson.
H.R. 945: Mr. Kildee.
H.R. 958: Mr. Axne.
H.R. 996: Ms. Fischmann.
H.R. 997: Mr. Smith of Nebraska.
H.R. 1002: Mr. Stanton, Mr. Lynch, and Ms. Lee of California.
H.R. 1049: Mr. Lamb, Mr. McAdams, Mr. O’Halloran, and Mr. Doggett.
H.R. 1137: Mr. Evans.
H.R. 1152: Mr. Hice of Georgia.
H.R. 1175: Mr. Wright, Mr. Burchett, Mr. Palazzo, Mr. Johnson, Mr. Serrano, Mr. Rouzer, Mr. Fulcher, Mr. Flores, Mr. Cuello, Mr. Simpson, Mr. Thornberry, Mr. Lawson of Florida, Ms. Clarke of New York, Mr. Espaillat, and Mr. Banks.
H.R. 1195: Ms. Omar.
H.R. 1196: Mrs. Wagner.
H.R. 1167: Mr. Rush, Mr. Kuster of New Hampshire, and Ms. Jayapal.
H.R. 1380: Mr. Smith of New Jersey.
H.R. 1418: Mrs. Watson Coleman and Mr. Visclosky.
H.R. 1490: Ms. Waters, Mr. Butterfield, and Ms. Schrier.
H.R. 1498: Mr. Payne, Ms. Meng, and Ms. Sánchez.
H.R. 1479: Mr. Cartwright and Mr. Stepanak.
H.R. 1597: Mr. Perlmutter, Mr. Cisneros, Mr. Crow, Mr. Olson, and Mr. Trone.
H.R. 1623: Mr. Engel.
H.R. 1643: Ms. Meng.
H.R. 1646: Mrs. Axne.
H.R. 1688: Mr. Khanna.
H.R. 1695: Mr. Johnson of Georgia and Mr. Bishop of Georgia.
H.R. 1767: Mr. Espaillat and Ms. Velázquez.
H.R. 1771: Mr. Meeks and Mr. Khanna.
H.R. 1784: Ms. Mucarsel-Powell.
H.R. 1794: Ms. Slotkin.
H.R. 1810: Ms. Raskin.
H.R. 1869: Mr. Cunningham, Mr. Peterson, and Mr. Crawford.
H.R. 1875: Mr. Cook and Mr. Case.
H.R. 1876: Ms. Escobar, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, Mr. Morelle, Mr. Beyer, Mr. Suzzi, Ms. Malinowski, Mrs. Axne, Mr. Huffman, Ms. Sánchez, Ms. Gallowly, Mr. Garamendi, Mr. Kildee, and Mr. Engler.
H.R. 1959: Mr. Diaz-Balart.
H.R. 1962: Mr. Gallagher.
H.R. 2013: Mr. Quigley.
H.R. 2117: Mr. Cunningham.
H.R. 2146: Ms. Brownley of California.
H.R. 2166: Mr. Espaillat.
H.R. 2178: Mrs. Beatty and Mr. Jeffries.
H.R. 2236: Ms. Lisa of Nevada.
H.R. 2214: Mr. Clay.
H.R. 2231: Mr. Calvert.
H.R. 2326: Mrs. Miller.
H.R. 2339: Mr. McNerney and Mr. Lucan.
H.R. 2402: Mr. Pappas.
H.R. 2417: Mr. Raskin.
H.R. 2419: Ms. Lie of California.
H.R. 2467: Mr. Newton.
H.R. 2508: Mr. Foster.
H.R. 2646: Mr. Peters.
H.R. 2689: Mr. Doggett.
H.R. 2771: Mr. Levin of Michigan.
H.R. 2812: Mr. Soto.
H.R. 2816: Mr. Van Drew.
H.R. 2818: Mr. DeFazio.
H.R. 2836: Mr. Trathan.
H.R. 2885: Ms. Sewell of Alabama, Mr. Pocan, Mr. Pappas, Mr. Budd, and Mr. Long.
H.R. 2896: Mr. Malinowski.
H.R. 2903: Mr. Wittman.
H.R. 2975: Mr. Golden.
H.R. 2982: Ms. Axne.
H.R. 2986: Ms. Haaland and Mrs. Luria.
H.R. 3073: Mr. Cooper.
H.R. 3107: Mr. Kevin Hen of Oklahoma, Mr. Rodney Davis of Illinois, Ms. Davis of California, and Mr. Carson of Indiana.
H.R. 3115: Mr. DeSaulnier, Mr. Harder of California, Mr. Thompson of California, Mr. Neguse, Mr. Posey, Mr. Kinzinger, Mr. Graves of Georgia, Mr. Foster, Ms. Kuster of New Hampshire, Ms. Shalala, Mr. Hurd of Texas, Mr. Smith of Washington, Ms. Barragan, Mr. McCaul, Mr. Thompson of Pennsylvania, Mr. LaTutta, Ms. Pressley, Mr. Espaillat, Mr. Foster, Mr. Foster, Mr. Foster, Ms. Rodgers of Washington, and Ms. Sánchez.
H.R. 3119: Mr. Lujan.
H.R. 3211: Mr. Rogers of Alabama and Ms. Stefanik.
H.R. 3215: Ms. Titus.
H.R. 3216: Mrs. Lee of Nevada.
H.R. 3219: Mr. Ryan.
H.R. 3222: Ms. Clark of Massachusetts.
H.R. 3224: Mr. Pappas and Mr. Rose of New York.
H.R. 3249: Mr. Spano.
H.R. 3328: Ms. Schakowsky, Mr. Rush, Mr. Meeks, and Mr. Ghielmetta.
H.R. 3350: Mr. Chaffetz.
H.R. 3347: Mr. Rush.
H.R. 3346: Mr. Larsen of Washington.
H.R. 3451: Ms. Wasserman Schultz and Ms. Westcott.
H.R. 3452: Ms. Wasserman Schultz.
H.R. 3479: Ms. Mucarsel-Powell.