



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 30, 2019

No. 172

House of Representatives

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 obliterate 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.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H8599

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.

If, on the other hand, a claimant is given refugee status, let's rally behind them. Let's show them what America is really like. Let's help them achieve the American dream. I think that is what Elijah Cummings would do.

CONGRESSIONAL GOLD STAR FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. KEVIN HERN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. 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 started with this legislation will give 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 MIKIE SHERRILL, as well as the tenacious perseverance of both families of the fallen soldiers.

HONORING VANESSA WHITING OF CLEVELAND, OHIO

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

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor Vanessa Whiting of Cleve-

land, 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 her community 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 revitalizing struggling neighborhoods 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, Karam 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 Hometown Health Hospital of the Year for 2019.

I am proud of the work that Clinch Memorial Hospital is doing to provide high-quality care to our rural communities in the First Congressional District of Georgia. With unique challenges facing rural healthcare systems across the Nation, Clinch Memorial Hospital has met these challenges head-on and is using groundbreaking

programs to better the care for individuals in the surrounding rural communities.

Over the last 2 years, the hospital's CEO, Ms. Angela Ammons, has added new programs to help people with substance abuse issues, a swing-bed system to more efficiently use their resources, and a new wound care unit. But most importantly, she has nearly miraculously turned around the hospital's financials, maintaining the community's access to healthcare and keeping the local economy churning.

Clinch Memorial Hospital is more than deserving of the Hospital of the Year Award.

Congratulations, and keep up the good work.

NATIONAL PHARMACIST MONTH 2019

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize October as being National Pharmacist Month 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 communities around the 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 104 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. After the 40 Days for Life Vigil is over, I hope you will join me in continuing the fight to save the lives of our children.

□ 1015

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 win this award, 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 both the 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 they maintain close-knit relationships through her work as president of the Camden Partnership.

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 an ardent 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 together 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-inside 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, when Rosa Parks fell on hard times after refusing to give up her seat on a segregated Montgomery bus, in what launched the civil rights movement, John hired her to work in his district office in Detroit, where she worked until she retired in 1988.

For more than 30 years, he fought for H.R. 40, the Commission to Study and Develop Reparation Proposals for African-Americans Act, which calls for a commission to study reparations for 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.

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 cele-

brating 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 Greece to the Italians and the Axis forces.

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. That 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, but 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, the very 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 he 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, Romania 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 been the clash that would have determined which power ruled the world—coupled 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 have the resources of the globe lined up against you.

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

So I rise to honor, support, and, with awe, celebrate the Greek fighters, who George Beres writes: “As Hitler learned, Greeks can be stubborn against all odds. ‘Oxi,’ the word ‘no’ in Greek, may sound like a negative, but it has become the most positive word in the language. It suggests the independence of a small nation when confronted by selfish demands of much larger nations.”

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.

The Greeks did it 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 has descended from the democracy that was 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 gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of long-time Seattle resident Ginny NiCarthy.

Ginny was a wonderful friend, author, activist, and advocate. She was humble, brilliant, and deeply compassionate, and she changed the lives of tens of thousands of people across the world through her writing and her activism.

She passed away at the age of 92 last month, choosing to die gracefully on her own terms before dementia could take over her life and her mind.

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, Ginny 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.

Informed by her experience working 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 NiCarthy in the 1970s to use an Irish prefix that means “daughter of,” rather than “Mc,” which means “son of.” This was emblematic of her deeply-rooted feminism and her drive to challenge the status quo in every aspect of her life.

In 1972, Ginny cofounded Seattle Rape Relief, which at the time was the only rape crisis center in the country. The volunteer-run organization managed a 24-hour hotline for sexual assault victims.

A decade later, she published her groundbreaking book, “Getting Free: A Handbook for Women in Abusive Relationships.” Her book, based on the premise that women’s voices needed to be heard and believed, became a bible for domestic violence survivors. Translated into multiple languages, her book had and continues to have a global impact.

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, youth, 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 her 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, even 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 strong—in 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. She was right there on every major issue that we fought for, whether that was a \$15 minimum wage, rights for immigrants, mass incarceration of Black and Brown people, sexual assault, and LGBTQ rights. It is fitting that The New York Times devoted a substantial part of one of their pages of obituaries to Ginny and her national impact.

I would like to commemorate Ginny’s lifetime of achievements, her decades of service to our community, and her never-ending dedication to the fight for justice. My heart is with her loving family and friends.

Mr. Speaker, may Ginny rest in peace. May Ginny rest in power. She will long be remembered and missed by all of us.

END SECRET IMPEACHMENT PROCEEDINGS

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

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, there are crossroads in the history of every great nation so historically significant, so fraught with dramatic consequences, that those in position to influence that nation’s direction are compelled to do all they can to ensure it does not fall to the dustbin of history.

□ 1030

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, withheld pertinent facts, denied the 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 our dark 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 empty assurance 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 remember and 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 Fil-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 in October because the first recorded arrival of Filipinos in the continental United States took place in 1587, when the Luzones 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 Fil-Ams in Hawaii.

Today, our Fil-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 very 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 Dizon 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 Asian 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 Philippines 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 him and his five siblings of his father, a laborer, and mother, a teacher, to the values they instilled, and to the constant nurturing and support of his 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 God bless"—"maraming salamat po and dios ti agngina"—and congratulations. I truly look forward to partnering with you on your next proud chapters.

RECOGNIZING PENNSBURY ATHLETIC ASSOCIATION 12-AND-UNDER AND 8-AND-UNDER BASEBALL TEAMS

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Pennsbury Athletic Association 12-and-under and 8-and-under baseball teams, who were both honored for their championship-winning seasons.

The 8-and-under team had an undefeated regular season. They went on to win the district, State, mid-Atlantic, and world series championships. The team's final record was an impressive 38-1, which included going undefeated during the Cal Ripken World Series.

The 12-and-under team had a great season as well, winning the annual Keystone Cup State tournament. Winning is nothing new for this team. In the last 4 years, they have won two State titles and four district titles. They will be finishing the season with an amazing trip to Cooperstown for the national tournament.

Mr. Speaker, the accomplishments of these teams show the importance sports can play in our children's lives. Team sports teach the importance of hard work, being part of a team, dedication, and sportsmanship. All these skills help mold our children and will help mold our children into the leaders of tomorrow.

I commend the accomplishments of these amazing kids and their coaches.

RECOGNIZING BRISTOL TOWNSHIP POLICE OFFICERS CJ WINIK AND KURT LEACOCK

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize two police officers from Bristol Township.

Officers CJ Winik and Kurt Leacock were promoted to the rank of sergeant in front of family, friends, and colleagues. Both officers serve on the Bucks County Homicide by Vehicle Task Force.

Sergeant Winik has been a part of the Bristol police force since 2006. He has worked as a field training officer, accident reconstructionist, firearms instructor, community response unit officer, and on the SWAT team. He will serve in the administrative division, supervising professional standards, accreditation, and training management.

Sergeant Leacock has been part of the department since 2007. He has served as a field training officer, drug recognition expert, and on the crisis intervention team. He will share duties with shift commander Sergeant Tom Gaffney on patrol.

Mr. Speaker, the role both of these officers play in keeping our community safe is admirable, and I want to wish the best to both of these men in their new positions and thank them for all their service to our community.

IN SUPPORT OF NATIONAL VETERANS SMALL BUSINESS WEEK

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 the remarkable 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 Republican 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 is under 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.

□ 1045

And then in May, Trump's Department of Defense wrote to Congress again and said the aid is on the way and all necessary preconditions to release 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 answer.

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 reason the aid had been held up is because of a directive from the President of the United States.

A week later, on July 25, the President made a phone call to the Ukrainian leader and pressured a foreign government to target an American citizen for political gain and solicit foreign interference in the 2020 election.

That undermines our national security. The American people have a right to ask: Is that an abuse of power?

That is what the impeachment inquiry 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 engaging 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 families in my hometown of Columbus, Ohio.

Our Nation has always been a beacon of hope and light for those who face violence, 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.

Take, for example, Bashiya, who currently 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 hardworking. 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 Australia. 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 with no end in sight, and the continued threats convinced Hamad that he needed to flee for his life, so he fled to Australia. That was in 2012.

Bashiya and the two children continued to wait for approval of the Special Immigrant Visa program, and finally, in 2016, 7 years after they applied, they got the news they were waiting for. They were approved. Now, it has been 7 years since Bashiya has seen her husband and since he has seen his children. The system has torn the family apart. Bashiya's story is not uncommon. There are others.

Jackie, a dedicated and compassionate social worker from Uganda, is the mother of two sons. Jackie has not seen her oldest son, Arinda, since 2014, when she fled Nairobi, Kenya and came to the United States. Arinda will turn 8 years old on November 13. And on November 21, his case to join his mother will have been pending for 2 years. For 2 years this family has been in bureaucratic limbo, and it has taken its toll. Jackie is seriously considering having her son adopted by a family in Canada so she at least will be separated by less time and geography.

Our system is broken. We are forcing refugees to other countries like Australia and Canada, and we are not living up to the standards of the shining beacon for people facing persecution and violence. We are a Nation of immigrants. We are a Nation of opportunity, and we need to act like it. We will continue to encourage the administration to increase the refugee caps to make the vetting process under the State Department more efficient and to ensure resources are available to give refugees the certainty that they need.

I hope that my colleagues will join me and make a difference for people like Bashiya and Jackie and make a difference for our communities, because we are all stronger when we embrace our history as the world's melting pot.

RECOGNIZING KERENSA WING AS THE NATIONAL PRINCIPAL OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate you making some time in the day today. It is not very often that one of us gets named the very best in our field. Such a recognition is very powerful. And today, Mr. Speaker, you can't see it from where you are standing, but I have a list of the three finalists in the National Association of Secondary School Principals Principal of the Year program.

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate each and every one of them. They are: Joey Jones from Robert Frost Middle School right around the corner in Rockville, Maryland; Lindsa McIntyre from Jeremiah E. Burke High School in Dorchester, Massachusetts; and Kerensa Wing from Collins Hill High School in Suwanee, Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot succeed in our communities without dedicated public servants like these, and it will

come as no surprise to you, since I am down here on the floor today congratulating these three finalists, that the national association named as the Principal of the Year from my very own district, from the Gwinnett County school system, Kerensa Wing at Collins Hill High School.

Mr. Speaker, to meet Kerensa Wing, the first thing you will notice is that charisma that she has that connects her with her students and with her parents. That partnership that she develops with her administrators and with her teachers, that is the partnership that we strive for here and the one that is recognizing Kerensa Wing out of 90,000 principals across the country.

Mr. Speaker, Ms. Wing has spent her 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 5 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 decisionmaking is that love of students, a teacher at heart. This work, as you know, is not a work 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.

She was actually here in 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.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 54 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. SÁNCHEZ) at noon.

PRAYER

Bishop Robert Barron, Archdiocese of Los Angeles, Santa Barbara, California, offered the following prayer:

O God, source of all justice, You have summoned everyone who works in this Chamber to walk the path of righteousness, to foster life and liberty, to care especially for the poorest and most vulnerable in our society. Free these servants of Yours, O Lord, of all those attachments to wealth or power or privilege or fame that would prevent them from following the course You have set out for them. Make them mindful of the time when they first heard Your voice and followed it with idealism and enthusiasm.

Illumine their minds, direct their wills, stir up in them a holy passion for doing what is right, despite the cost. Give them the knowledge that whenever they strive for justice, they are pleasing to You. And shower, O Lord, Your choicest blessings upon our country.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. CICILLINE led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING BISHOP ROBERT BARRON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. SUOZZI. Madam Speaker, I rise to welcome Bishop Robert Barron, who gave the opening prayer today, here to the Chamber.

Bishop Barron is the second-most followed Catholic on social media after the Pope. He is a remarkable man who

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 40 million times, and he has over 1.7 million followers on Facebook.

He is a number one Amazon best-selling author and has published 16 books. He has created the groundbreaking documentary "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 the detention 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 criminal penalties 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 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 MITCH MCCONNELL 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 anyplace else in the world.

Our constituents want a government that works for the people of this coun-

try. 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 of South Carolina. 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 our 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 KUKIQUI

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

Mr. ROSE of New York. 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 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 overcome 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 threatened to take away Adem's father as well.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues 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 permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

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 Pullman, Washington, to play for Washington State University. At Washington 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 mentality 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 hometown well. Good luck, and go Jags.

SHOULD ABUSE OF POWER BE ALLOWED

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

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 loyalty to each other." That was what President Trump promised us on the day he was inaugurated.

Over the past few months, our President has broken that promise. He has lied. He has corrupted. He has obstructed.

Our President threatened the security 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. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

HONORING AMERICAN HERO STAN CVAR

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

Mr. STAUBER. Madam Speaker, Veterans Day is right around the corner. In anticipation of this important holiday, I rise to recognize a veteran from my district whose service and patriotism 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, Minnesota. Unfortunately, back in September, someone stole Stan's American flag from his property. Stan was devastated, as the flag was not just a symbol of the Nation he risked his life to serve but a treasured gift from his son.

The fact that someone stole a cherished American flag from a member of the Greatest Generation was deeply upsetting to many in the northland, myself 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 approaches, let us all remember that after everything our veterans have done for us, we must always ensure that we are standing up for them.

□ 1215

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICING LEGISLATION

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

Mr. HORSFORD. 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 senior from Las Vegas, shared with me her challenges in obtaining her medications. The blood thinners and cholesterol medications she is prescribed are so expensive that, if it weren't for samples 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 Capping 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 Cummings Lower Drug Costs Now Act.

Madam Speaker, I urge all my colleagues 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 permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TAYLOR. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the efforts of countless volunteers and public servants across north Texas who helped ease the burden of last week's tornadoes.

When natural disaster strikes, families suffer. It takes a strong community to bring hope out of the wreckage.

Communities with solid foundations do more than just rebuild homes, businesses, and schools. They help relieve heartache that follows catastrophic loss.

Countless faith-based and nonprofit organizations, including the Network of Community Ministries, the American 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 communities.

Likewise, city leaders, like those in Richardson and Dallas, have banded together to show support and provide valuable 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.

PRESCRIPTION DRUG PRICING IS A TOP HEALTH PRIORITY

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

Mr. MCADAMS. Madam Speaker, lowering prescription drug costs is the

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 my 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 crisscrossing 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 bipartisan 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 just words 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; and to end the scourge of veteran homelessness, as we have done in Lake County, in my district in Illinois.

To that end, I am proud of the bipartisan legislation I introduced to reauthorize the Boots to Business entrepreneurship training 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. RUIZ asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. RUIZ. Madam Speaker, earlier this month, James Madison Elementary School in Indio, California, closed after rust, mold, and corrosion 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 Cummings.

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 benefit 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.

Rural America is being left behind. 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 ARMENIAN 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, Syrians, Arameans, Maronites, and other Christians, by the Ottoman Empire constituted the 20th century's first genocide.

As a Jewish American, the 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 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. 1373.

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

□ 1227

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 1 hour 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).

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 sits 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 operator pierced 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 Havasu Falls, or to the seeps and springs that flow into the Grand Canyon and, eventually, to the Colorado River itself.

□ 1230

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 House 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 show it, and national security and nuclear non-proliferation experts have routinely raised the alarm that this fear-mongering 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.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I rise in opposition to H.R. 1373, the so-called Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act. It is an antimining attack on northern Arizona and my district.

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 in this bill 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 Arizona State Land Department 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. It is a source 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. If nothing 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 a Canadian mine, 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, successful uranium mining occurred in the 1980s. These mines were reclaimed 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 returned with 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—that was accurately stated, that he represents 70 percent of the designated area in this legislation.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN).

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 treasure with 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 Cold War.

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 of the southwest, and the 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 alluvial fans 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 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. MCCLINTOCK).

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

Madam Chairwoman, when I chaired the Federal Lands Subcommittee a few years ago, the ranking Democratic member was from Massachusetts. She shared the Democrats' goal of having the Federal Government acquire as much land in the west as it possibly could. Try as I might, I could never impress upon her the difference between a State like Massachusetts, where the Federal Government owns only 1.2 percent of the land, and a State like mine, California, where it controls 46 percent. I have got one county in my district where the Federal Government owns 93 percent of the land.

And I tried in vain to get her to understand the dire economic implications for her district if the Federal Government one day seized 46 percent of her State, took it off the tax rolls, restricted public access, and forbade any productive use on it. What would that do to her State's economy? Yet, that is precisely what the Federal Government has done to the west.

Now, the Federal Government owns 39 percent of the State of Arizona. Our

holdings include the largest deposit of high-grade uranium ore in the United States, one of the largest in the world. Its development is critically important to our future defense and energy needs at a time when 93 percent of the uranium we use comes from foreign governments.

Now, the Federal Government not only owns these critical deposits, it is responsible to the American people for their wise management and productive use.

Now, a rational person might say, well, thank God we can be independent of foreign governments and develop these reserves for the benefit of taxpayers and the economy. A rational person might say that.

But, of course, this bill is anything but rational. It would close these Federal lands, a million acres of them, far from the Grand Canyon, I might add, just to be clear, and forbid the American people from benefiting from these rich uranium deposits on the land that the American people own.

□ 1245

This bill imposes a completely irrational total prohibition on the development of these resources and devastates the economic potential for the communities nearby.

Indeed, this bill is most strongly opposed by the local representative from these communities, Congressman GOSAR. The elected county supervisor from Mohave County came to Washington to plead with the Democrats not to hobble the economy of their rural district in this way. Once again, the Democrats dismissed the pleas of local residents in order to scratch their own ideological itch to seize as much land as they can and put it off-limits to the American people.

Madam Chair, I would remind the Democrats that this was the practice of the early Kings of England. They set aside one-third of the English countryside, declared them to be the King's Forests, off-limits to the common people. This practice so enraged the English people that no fewer than five clauses in the Magna Carta were written to redress their grievance.

Not content to limit such devastating restrictions to the Federal lands, this measure would also hamstring mining on tens of thousands of acres of State trust fund lands, which help fund Arizona's public schools and hospitals.

The Democrats have waged a war against agriculture and mining for many years now. This bill is just their latest ham-handed example.

I think the American people need to wake up to what a devastating future these policies will produce. Think about this: Everything that we touch, everything that provides for our survival, our comfort, our quality of life, absolutely everything, is either mined or is grown. I don't know of any exceptions.

I think it is time we carefully consider the nihilism of the modern left

and where it would take our communities and where it would take our country before it is too late.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK), my colleague.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 1373, the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act.

I have lived in Arizona my entire life, born and raised there. I remember frequently visiting the canyon as a child, marveling at its magnificence and its beauty. 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 clear from the land.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Mrs. KIRKPATRICK. Madam Chair, one more point. When it rains in that watershed, rain carries that uranium contamination to our stock tanks and ponds, and then that contamination goes into our cattle.

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.

Madam Chair, I thank the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. KIRKPATRICK) for acknowledging that.

We are going to go back to learning about geology. Once again, we have these breccia pipes, and you can see them on this location on the platform here.

Now, let's look at something that naturally occurs in the next picture. What do you think this is? This is an exposed breccia pipe next to an alluvial fan.

This is exactly what she was talking about. When water and air get to this, it immerses it into the water and carries it down.

This is a concentrated supply of uranium. Wouldn't it be better to mine that area? That is what we have to get after. It is safe; it is effective; and it will show some mitigation.

Madam Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

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

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

This bill is very cleverly named to imply that it is safeguarding the Grand

Canyon, something I believe that we all support. After all, who wouldn't want to protect one of our Nation's most iconic natural sites?

But when we look at what this bill actually does, we quickly see that it has very little to do with the Grand Canyon. Instead, 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.

Let me make this clear: H.R. 1373, the so-called Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act, focuses on land outside Grand Canyon National Park, miles away from the canyon.

To hear this policy described, it sounds like we would be backing backhoes and trucks right up to the canyon and chipping off the rim of the canyon, but that is just not so. This is land very far outside of the park.

This policy is progressive. It progressively increases outside bureaucratic control over more Federal land.

The policy and the world view that supports it 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 to want all 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.

As 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

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 gentleman, Chairman 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, which is why 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 preserving the Grand Canyon and supporting this important bill.

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

Madam Chair, it is great that the gentleman brought 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 and look 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 is kowtowing to the wealthy and elite environmental lobby by ignoring science and facts and legislating over 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.

□ 1300

Or, how about visiting the Hermit Mine in Arizona. This was a functional uranium mine in the 1980s. 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. GOSAR. 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 persisted 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. GOSAR. 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 looked like: 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 water, 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 gentlewoman 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 Southwest 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 Con-

gress 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 hear from Americans about the value of conserving our public lands and protecting our air and our water. The Trump administration's agenda puts that all at risk by prioritizing profits for mining companies over our public health and the health of our environment.

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 for-

got 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 1½ 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 empowered because 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. GRIJALVA. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time to close.

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; a letter from the Uranium Producers of America in strong opposition to the bill; an article from The Epoch Times, dated September of 2019, basically talking about the U.S. needs alternatives to China's rare earth monopoly, once again, a stranglehold.

WESTERN CAUCUS, CHAIRMAN PAUL GOSAR
OPPOSITION TO H.R. 1373

So far H.R. 1373 is opposed by: American Exploration & Mining Association (Group Letter), Arizona Liberty (Group Letter), Arizona Mining Association (Group Letter), Arizona Pork Producers (Group Letter), Arizona Rock Products Association (Group Letter), Citizens For America (Group Letter), Conservative Coalition of Northern Arizona (Group Letter), Conservatives for Property Rights (Letter), Denver Lumber Company (Letter), enCore Energy Corp (Letter), Lake Havasu Chamber of Commerce (Letter); the Mohave County Supervisors (Resolution), National Mining Association (Letter), National Stone, Sand & Gravel Association (Letter), New Mexico Cattle Growers' Association (Letter), New Mexico Federal Lands Council (Letter), New Mexico Wool Growers Association (Letter), Western Energy Alliance (Group Letter).

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 1373—GRAND CANYON CENTENNIAL PROTECTION ACT—REP. GRIJALVA, D-AZ, AND 122 CO-SPONSORS

The Administration strongly opposes H.R. 1373, the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act. This bill would permanently make more than 1 million acres of Federal lands in Arizona off limits to development and uses that would otherwise be permissible under Federal laws governing public lands, mining, mineral, and geothermal leasing. The Administration opposes such a large, permanent withdrawal, which would prohibit environmentally responsible development, as determined through site-specific analysis, of uranium and other mineral resources.

The United States has an extraordinary abundance of mineral resources, both onshore and offshore, but this legislation would restrict our ability to access critical minerals like uranium in an area known to have

them in large supply. Moreover, the size of the withdrawal included in H.R. 1373 is inconsistent with the Administration's goal of striking the appropriate balance for use of public lands described in two executive orders. This withdrawal would conflict with the objectives set forth in Executive Order 13783, Promoting Energy Independence and Economic Growth, and Executive Order 13817, A Federal Strategy to Ensure Secure and Reliable Supplies of Critical Minerals. Development of our Nation's mineral resources is essential to ensuring the Nation's geopolitical security, and this bill would not help us achieve that goal.

If H.R. 1373 were presented to the President, his advisors would recommend that he veto it.

URANIUM PRODUCERS OF AMERICA.

Santa Fe, New Mexico, October 28, 2019.

HON. RAUL GRIJALVA,
Chairman, House Natural Resources Committee,
Washington, DC.

HON. ROB BISHOP,
Ranking Member, House Natural Resources
Committee, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GRIJALVA AND RANKING 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 revenues, 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 over one million acres of federal land from mineral development ignores the comprehensive suite of federal, state, 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 success of 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 power our 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 the electricity for the U.S. power grid, 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 domestic uranium industry and becoming completely reliant on imported uranium. Uranium imports from state-backed entities have created an uneven global playing field on which market-driven uranium companies in the United States are unable to compete. An increasing share of uranium imports into the United States are coming from government or state-controlled entities located 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. U.S. uranium companies are not competing with free market companies in the RSOI; they are competing with governments more concerned about increasing market share, and geopolitical advantage, than profitability.

We urge you to vote against H.R. 1373 and instead prioritize policies to revive and expand 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 can't 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 such a move would damage their economy along with America's. The Chinese are smarter than that.

CHINA STATE MEDIA HINTS AT EMBARGO

Besides, the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) has another, more tangible ace up its sleeve. As unbelievable as it sounds, 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 corner 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, against the U.S. blacklisting of Huawei. China's biggest telecom equipment manufacturer and a leader in 5G networks. Since all media in China is controlled by the Chinese Communist Party (CCP), it's a certainty that 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 40 percent until 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 retribution 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 produced 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 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, say, 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. producers' competitiveness. By the mid-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 mines." The costs and health risks of producing REEs are in the processing. For instance, since toxins and radiation are a by-product of processing REEs, many Western nations' environmental and labor laws make processing them both costly and a health risk to miners. It has been easier much cheaper for other nations to let China produce them, since neither health codes nor environmental standards are significant factors there.

AN 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 it would take to bridge the supply gap and find alternatives? One mitigating factor is Australian-based Lynas, the world's only major rare-earth producer outside of China. It has partnered with Texas-based Blue Line to establish U.S. operations by 2021. However, 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 was previously 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 that REEs play in both military and consumer products is impossible to overstate. The U.S. economy is dependent upon 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 REE is not just an option, it's a necessity.

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. These are condensed pipes, vertically. What is happening is that, as water runs—and this is a lot of sedimentary rock. That is why the Grand Canyon is so deep.

When it runs over these breccia pipes, like we have talked about, they are exposed naturally. Prior to that, they are covered with what they call a sulfite 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 if you get rid of our only mining uranium concentrator, it doesn't come back. It won't come back. And then you sold your soul to China and you sold your soul to Russia, because they own the monopoly.

□ 1315

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. That is wrong. This 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 Bennett 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 upon millions upon millions of years old. As that water runs down, as that air runs down, we contaminate 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 exposed, 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 in there?

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 after 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 previously mined area. It 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 go.

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 investment. 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 uranium concentration. 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 district.

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 water 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 not 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, Tribal 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 a treaty 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, and jeopardizing 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 swift adoption of H.R. 1373, 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 original hippies, he's also 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 Pacifists known as Mennonites. Every August, as kids, we would remember the US government's atomic bombing of Japan by lighting candles and sending them on paper boats at Bittersweet 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 endangered species, to have 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 that with tall buildings they 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?

I started out as an anti-nuclear activist 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 environmentalist 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.

We 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, though. 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 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 2005 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 1970s. 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 fuels. Last year Germany got 40 percent of its electricity from coal, 13 percent from nuclear, 12 percent from natural gas, 12 percent from wind, and six percent from solar.

Keep in mind that you don't just have to 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 from solar.

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 shocked 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 out?

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 very windy.

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 is to increase the amount of 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 to deal with climate 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 while Germany gets just 46 percent, or about half as much clean energy.

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 due to that.

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 about half as much emissions. Coal to gas switching would have resulted in lower emissions except for the fact that Germany took nuclear reactors off-line. 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 finds 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 becomes 30 percent of your electricity, Hirth finds, and the value of solar drops by half when 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—whereas it takes five or ten years to build a nuclear plant. 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 ten years of deployment for the two technologies and it's a stark comparison.

Well, I can tell what you're thinking, because it's what I was thinking: it sounds like I might need to rethink my views of 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, and who was very influential, was George Monbiot.

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 her concern for the accident. She's a totally independent professor of pathology at Imperial College in London.

I called her and said, "I'd like to present on the science of radiation but I'm not a radiation scientist, so can I just steal your slides? If you let me, I'll put your 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—is natural.

I was like, "That sounds alright. I like natural foods. Natural radiation from hot springs."

Gerry said, "No, actually, natural radiation is just as potentially harmful as artificial radiation."

What's striking is that the total amount of ionizing radiation we're exposed to just from Chernobyl and Fukushima but all of the atomic bomb testing in the sixties and 70s totals just 0.3 percent. Most of the radiation we're exposed to comes from the earth, the atmosphere, and the buildings around us.

Let's look at the big one: Chernobyl. This was the event that led me to be anti-nuclear and become an anti-nuclear activist.

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 credible scientists at different universities doing the research.

This was a pivotal moment for me. Chernobyl is the worst nuclear accident we've ever had. Some people say 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 they come up with is 28 deaths from acute radiation syndrome, 15 deaths from thyroid cancer over the last 25 years. As horrible as it sounds, thyroid cancer is the best cancer to get because hardly anybody dies from it. It's highly treatable. You can have a surgery to remove the thyroid gland and take thyroxine, which is a synthetic substitute. In fact, most of the people who died were in remote rural areas where they couldn't get the treatment they needed.

If you take the 16,000 people who got thyroid cancer from Chernobyl, they estimate 160 of them will die from it. And it's not like they're dying of it right away. They'll die from it in old age. That's not to say it's okay, but it's to put it in some context.

And there's no evidence of any increase in thyroid cancer outside of the three nations most affected, Russia, Ukraine and Belarus. There's no evidence of an effect by Chernobyl on fertility, birth malformations, or infant mortality; nor for causing an increase in adverse pregnancy outcomes or still births; nor for any genetic effects.

I think this last one is the most striking thing: there's no evidence of any increase in nonthyroid cancer including among the cohort who put out the Chernobyl fire and cleaned it up afterwards.

I'm still surprised by this finding, and so I put the link to the web site on that slide, because I don't think you should take my word for it. Reading about Chernobyl was, for me, a big part of changing my mind.

What about Fukushima? It was the second worst nuclear disaster in history and a lot smaller than Chernobyl. There have been no deaths from radiation exposure, which is pretty amazing. Meanwhile, 1,500 people died being pulled out of nursing homes, hospitals—it was insane. It was a panic. The Japanese government shouldn't have done that. It violated every standard of what you're supposed to do an accident. You're supposed to shelter-in-place. In fact, by pulling people out of their homes and moving them around outside they actually exposed more people to more radiation.

And you have to put that in comparison of the other things that were going on, like the 15,000 to 20,000 dying instantly from drowning—pinned down by many different technologies, by the way—from that tsunami.

So while there was no increase in thyroid cancer, there was the stress and fear from believing you were contaminated despite the evidence showing that that wasn't the case at all.

Some scientists did an interesting study. They took a bunch of school children from France to Fukushima and had them wear dosimeters, which is what we call geiger counters now.

You can see here that when those kids go through the airport security system their radiation exposures spiked. When they flew from Paris to Tokyo on the airplane their radiation exposures spiked. They went through the French embassy's security system their radiation exposures spiked.

When they went to the city of Tomioka, which received a lot of radiation from the accident, it was just a tiny blip compared to the security systems.

Let's put this in an even larger context. If you live in a big city like London, Berlin, or New York, you increase your mortality risk by 2.8 percent, just from air pollution alone. If you live with someone who smokes cigarettes your mortality risk increases 1.7 percent.

But if you were someone who cleaned up Chernobyl, your mortality risk increased just one percent. That's just because there wasn't as much radiation exposure as people thought.

I'm from the state of Colorado in the United States where we have an annual exposure to radiation about the same as what people who live around Chernobyl get.

This is really basic science and is right there on their web site but nobody knows it. Only eight percent of Russians surveyed accurately predicted the death toll from Chernobyl, and zero percent accurately predicted the death toll from Fukushima.

Meanwhile, there are seven million premature deaths per year from air pollution

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 has actually saved 1.8 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 is safely contained anywhere. All of the other waste for electricity goes into the environment including from coal, natural gas and—here's another uncomfortable conclusion—solar panels.

There's no plan 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 more materials are 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. And if you care 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 somebody else who changed his mind about nuclear power, and somebody else who was 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 was 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 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.

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.

□ 1401

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.

□ 1403

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. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, all time for general debate had expired.

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

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of 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. 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.*

(b) WITHDRAWAL.—*Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 1,006,545 acres of Federal land in the State of Arizona, generally depicted on the Map as "Federal Mineral Estate to be Withdrawn", including any land or interest in land that is acquired by the United States after the date of the enactment of this Act, are hereby withdrawn from—*

(1) *all forms of entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;*

(2) *location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and*

(3) *operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.*

(c) AVAILABILITY OF MAP.—*The Map shall be kept on file and made available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management.*

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part C of House Report 116-264. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered 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. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part C of House Report 116-264.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:
SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

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

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, my amendment states that this act shall not become effective until the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with the Secretary of Labor, finds that the withdrawal will not adversely affect jobs available to Native Americans, other minorities, and women.

I believe deeply in protecting the environment for my grandchildren, but I also believe in protecting the potential employment opportunities of Arizonans, especially those in underserved communities. Resource development benefits the economies of local communities.

As noted at markup in the Committee on Natural Resources, the temporary political mineral withdrawal imposed in 2012 by the Obama administration, which focused on banning mining, cost Arizona and Utah thousands

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 quaint 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 previous administration reviewed job opportunities in the region. They found that mining could likely support 295 direct jobs—295 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 economies. That would help all the communities in the 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. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, through the Chairman to the gentleman on the other side, I would like to know if the gentleman actually supports a mine in Arizona.

That is a question.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, once again, now we find out the true understanding of the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA), that he doesn’t approve of any mines whatsoever. And why that is so important here is that we talk about indigenous people and empowerment. Well, let’s focus back on this.

Recently, the Navajo Generating Station, which was commissioned by Congress to provide power for the water for CAP that revolutionized Arizona for its growth, the delivery of water, was all given to the Tribes, the Navajo and Hopi—not just the coal mine, but the power plant as well. These were great-

paying jobs. They had benefits. It empowered the Native Americans.

Now, what is interesting about that is that now we are shuttering this enterprise down. Eighty percent of the Hopis’ operating budget per year is going away; 60 percent of the Navajos’ operating budget is going away.

And, interestingly, what is our answer from our colleagues on the other side? Welfare.

Oh, my Lord, my God, I can’t believe what I am hearing. Welfare, that is the answer.

So let’s go back and have a little bit of a geological conversation again, because rock sets you free.

Once again, these breccia pipes are on this part of the Grand Canyon. This is where everybody goes.

Look at these breccia pipes that are exposed. They are water soluble. That drains down. Gravity takes it down. That is why you are getting that infiltration into the water.

I am not here to hurt anybody. I refuse to do that. But I am not here to turn my back on Native Americans who are empowered instead of victimized.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is a “gotcha” amendment. The substance of the amendment is misdirected, to say the least, and it ignores history and ignores the reality that we are in right now.

That reality is that, when I began to get involved in this issue more than a decade ago, it was in response to discussions that I had with the Havasupai Tribe, with the Navajo Tribe, with the Hopi Tribe, and with other indigenous nations in and around the Grand Canyon. The consensus and the unity around the issue that we have to protect the Grand Canyon was important, not only for religious, cultural, and sacred reasons, but also for the fact that that is their home.

At the end of the day, the vote today is a response to that work, to their advocacy, to their support, and to the input that they had on the legislation. It is a vote to affirm by this Congress that, indeed, the concerns that they raised are real and important.

Mr. Chair, I would 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.

□ 1415

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 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.

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.

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

I recognize there is some sensitivity, or even a misunderstanding in this Chamber to legislating in other Members' districts, but I would point out that it is something we do almost every day that we are here. We vote on policies that impact the Nation, which is why we are a national legislature.

I would also point out that the gentleman from Arizona offered numerous amendments to a bill in New Mexico, the Chaco Canyon legislation, that will be considered later today, and those lands are certainly not in his district.

If each of us only ever legislated in our own district, we would be doing a disservice to the American people, but we would never get anything done, as well. Furthermore, every Member of the Chamber has a responsibility to support sovereign Tribal Nations who have asked this body to protect the Grand Canyon.

Serving the American people requires that we take a national view into account. The lands protected in H.R. 1373 are public lands belonging to every American. They protect an iconic American landscape, the Grand Canyon, important to people across this country. I can also easily think of 30 million Americans, most of whom are outside the gentleman's district, who want to see the clean waters of the Colorado River protected.

The Colorado River provides drinking water to Phoenix, Tucson, Las Vegas, Los Angeles, and to countless cities and towns across the west. It needs to be protected from uranium mining. The lands in the gentleman's district were not included in this bill arbitrarily. They were added after an extensive multiyear study and public process that accounted for a long list of regional factors before recommending withdrawal.

The land in the gentleman's district is essential to protecting the Grand Canyon and the Colorado River watershed from uranium's toxic impacts.

We also need to consider the support for this proposal on the ground. In a bipartisan poll, almost two-thirds of Arizonans supported permanent protections for the lands around the Grand Canyon, including those in the gentleman's district.

Representative O'HALLERAN, who represents the vast majority of the lands in this bill, is an original cosponsor and a vocal supporter, because he knows that this bill is important to all his constituents. H.R. 1373 receives vocal support from Tribal communities, including Havasupai, Navajo Nation, Hopi Nation, the Hualapai, the Inter Tribal Association of Arizona, and the National Congress of American Indians.

The bill receives support from Coconino County and the city of Flagstaff, who have a major stake in protecting the clean waters of the Grand Canyon. H.R. 1373 is supported by recreationalists, sportsmen, conservationists, and hundreds of local organizations and individuals from Arizona and across this Nation.

This bill is a broadly supported effort to protect public lands that belong to all Americans. The bill is an effort to protect the Grand Canyon. A vocal minority of opponents who will never be swayed should not stop the overwhelming voice of the American people.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Once again, I am sure glad that the opposition actually brought that up about New Mexico, because what we are actually doing is, we are representing the voices that didn't get a chance to speak out on behalf of their claim, their allotments, but we will get to that. And we will be showing you exactly why we are doing that.

In my district, there are eight historic mines included in this withdrawal area. Six are in my district. Also included in the withdrawal area is the potential for 20 new mines that would provide hundreds of high-paying jobs to the local communities in Mohave County north of Grand Canyon. Not only am I opposed to the inclusion of Mohave County in this bill, but so are the Mohave County Board of Supervisors, who unanimously voted to oppose this bill.

In addition to the board of supervisors, local business organizations are also opposed to this bill, including Lake Havasu Area Chamber of Commerce, Arizona Rock Products Association, Arizona Pork Producers Council, plus many others.

I say to my colleagues, local residents and businesses in Mohave County should have a say. They should not be swayed.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the letter against this bill, H.R. 1373, from the Mohave County Board of Supervisors.

MOHAVE COUNTY RESOLUTION No. 2019-065

OPPOSING H.R. 1373 WHICH SEEKS TO MAKE PERMANENT THE 2012 URANIUM MINING BAN

Whereas, Mohave County is located in Northwestern Arizona and the Mohave County Board of Supervisors is committed to wise stewardship and land conservation and continued recreational access for hunters, anglers, campers, and other recreationists, as well as allowing for productive uses, including agriculture, timber production, mining, and energy and natural resource development;

Whereas, on January 9, 2012, President Barack Obama's Interior Secretary, Ken Salazar withdrew from mineral entry 1.07 million acres of subsurface estate in Coconino and Mohave Counties, in northern Arizona;

Whereas, one of the richest grades of uranium ore in North America sits untouched in the northern region of Mohave County due to the 2012 withdrawal. The 375 million pounds of uranium deposit in the area is the equivalent of enough electricity generating capacity for the entire state of California's 40 million people for 22.4 years;

Whereas, the affected area included in the withdrawal was specifically left open for multiple use as part of an open 1984 compromise agreement directed at the behest of House Interior Committee Chairman Morris Udall among environmental groups, the mining industry, the livestock industry, both states of Arizona and Utah and signed into law by President Ronald Reagan;

Whereas, That compromise created 6 to 8 mile protective buffer zones around the Grand Canyon National Park in the form of 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 southwest has historically been a major economic driver for the region. Mohave County and our neighboring State of Utah could see major economic potential with the opening of more uranium mining near the Arizona Strip. Mining in the 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 Raul Grijalva has introduced H.R. 1373, titled the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act that aims to make permanent the 2012 uranium mining ban along with including a mining ban on any land or interest in land 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 Wilderness areas or within the Grand Canyon National Park itself;

Whereas, the Government's own Draft Environmental Impact Statement stated that there is no evidence to show that mining activities outside the Grand Canyon National Park pose a risk to areas within the Colorado River drainage or inside the National Park itself;

Whereas, Modern mining industry reclamation 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 Native American and local populations and are demonstrably improved and safe;

Whereas, Arizona and neighboring Utah have abundant in-ground uranium resources, considerable existing uranium infrastructure, and large numbers of qualified workers capable of supplying defense and energy needs for decades to come;

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 that Mohave County strongly 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:

Mohave County Board of Supervisors: HILDY ANGIUS,

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 and red. The red are the most concentrated 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 actually doing is cleaning this up. Wouldn't that be amazing, amazing that we are actually interceding on the best behavior and the best acknowledgements of the 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 actually intercede, where we are actually intervening on this, making and improving the landscape. That is amazing. That is absolutely amazing.

Once again, this is untouched. Man is not here. This is what nature has done to expose this. 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 permeation down into lower aquifers replenishing limited water supplies that we actually have. It is amazing what the rocks do. They set you free.

And my district has said, listen, exclude us from this overreach by the Federal Government. The Federal Government has hardly been a champion in regard 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 withdrawal. I would hope that everybody would listen to the people from my district.

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 forgetting the essence of what we are talking about here today. And the essence is the Grand Canyon, something that is recognized nationally, not only as an environmental icon, but the dependency that 40 million people have on the water of the Grand Canyon. And while we want to minimize this, the reality is that the history tells us and current health studies tell us of the impact that Native communities have suffered because of uranium contamination in their water, in their air, and in their land. Those are reasons enough to put aside a very special place and permanently ban uranium mining.

This amendment cuts an exception based on territorial imperative or some provincial thought that we are not all

part of one great Nation. This is a national issue and should be treated that way.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 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. EFFECTIVE DATE.

The withdrawal under section 2 of this Act shall not go into effect until the Secretary of the Interior completes a mineral survey of the area proposed for withdrawal, including uranium, rare earth elements, geothermal and oil and gas resources, and determines that there are no mineral resources, geothermal resources, or critical minerals present other than uranium.

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.

H.R. 1373 permanently bans oil, natural gas, geothermal, uranium, and other critical minerals and rare earth leasing and production on over a million acres of land in Arizona. This commonsense amendment does not kill the bill. It delays the effective date until we have done adequate mapping and surveying of the minerals and resources in this area.

Specifically, the amendment allows the bill to go into effect when the Secretary of the Interior completes a mineral survey of the area proposed for withdrawal including uranium, rare earth elements, geothermal, and oil and gas resources, and determines that there are no mineral resources, geothermal resources, or critical minerals present, other than uranium.

The temporary political mineral withdrawal imposed in 2012 by the Obama administration that focused exclusively on banning mining cost the surrounding areas in Arizona and Utah between two and 4,000 jobs and \$29 billion in overall regional economic activity. The previous administration's misguided actions killed more than 7,000 hard-rock mining claims in the area over a 3-year span.

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 valuable minerals, 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 permanently 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.

□ 1430

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 bill.

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

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

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

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

This is a very 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 reclaim 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 taking 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 we can 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 investiture. You are not doing your due diligence 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. I ask everybody to vote "yes" on the amendment.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, 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. So the urgency for 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 that 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 decade upon decade 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 House 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.

CHACO CULTURAL HERITAGE AREA PROTECTION ACT OF 2019

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HAALAND. 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. 2181.

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

There was 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.

□ 1439

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 considered read the first time.

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 gentleman from New Mexico.

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

Mr. Chair, Du hino-meh. Idza dyu-qe-dza. Svwmimi 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 LUJÁN, Senator TOM UDALL, and Senator MARTIN HEINRICH for their years of hard work on this important legislation.

This proposal, sponsored by my good friend and fellow New Mexico Representative, Mr. LUJÁN, 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 35th 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 Congress, the Natural 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 the world over 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.

□ 1445

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. Chairman, 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 not yet been 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.

If you 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 impugns access to that area.

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, NAVAJO INDIAN ALLOTTEE,
NAGEEZI CHAPTER

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

LEGISLATIVE HEARING ON H.R. 2181 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 twenty years.

Many people don't understand our Native American heritage and the fact that many individual Navajo Nation members such as I own private lands and the minerals underneath them. This is a steadfast personal property right that sustains our livelihoods and way of life. 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. I'm not exaggerating the importance of this income. In 2015, the Federal Indian Minerals Office distributed \$96 million to 20,835 allottees. That's a significant source of income in an area that continues to struggle with unemployment.

My ancestors were allotted the land and mineral rights by the United States government many generations ago, and it pains me to see that my own leaders, both tribal and in the U.S. House of Representatives and Senate, are supporting a bill that would put my oil and natural gas rights off limits and/or seriously prevent my family from receiving income from the valuable energy resources that we own.

I am not alone. Many other Indian allottees in the Greater Chaco region agree with me. In fact, I have here a petition signed by 131 of us allottees opposing this buffer zone bill.

I also have with me another petition signed by many allottees that states that

the environmentalists' voice is not our voice. 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.

I also have two resolutions from the Huerfano and Nageezi chapters signed by our chapter presidents supporting us Navajo Allotment landowners and recognizing our opposition to this bill. These chapter resolutions call for a meeting with Senators Udall and Heinrich so that we can express our concerns with the bill and how it will limit our rights.

I am disappointed that the Department of the Interior, which is supposed to manage our mineral rights in trust to 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 and others opposed to responsible oil and natural gas development in the area. I continue to feel that the Interior Department and members of Congress are ignoring the voice of Indian 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. Our voices should and 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 withdrawn by 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.

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 checkerboard pattern of lands, where allottee lands are often surrounded by BLM lands, particularly in the northeast segment of the buffer, if companies cannot access all minerals along the lateral of a horizontal well, they will not access any.

Companies will simply be 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 right 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 Historic Preservation 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 opposing 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 # HUE-090-18

Supporting the Navajo Allotment Owners in Opposition of "The Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018" and Furthermore 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 2907.

Whereas:

1. Huerfano Chapter is a certified governmental entity of the Navajo Nation charged with the responsibility to solicit, promote, and protect the interest and the welfare of the chapter and its community pursuant to the Navajo Nation Resolution CJ20-55, December 02, 1995 and Resolution CAP 34-98, adopting the Local Governance Act (LGA); and

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 (09) sub-communities 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 2907; 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 allotment lands. The Navajo communities, including the Navajo Reservation has always been in a very depressed economic state for many years and such development of natural resources gives Navajo families benefit for their daily lives; and

5. Navajo Allotment owners are concern that self-serving special interest organizations are violating the rights of Navajo Allotment Land Owners, that such publicized demonstrations and meetings by these special interest and outside groups have over shadowed the Navajo allotment land owners who benefits from oil and development on their allotment lands; and

6. Navajo Allotment Land Owners do not share opinions of environmentalists voicing their objectives on natural resources developments. These are over publicized objectives by the environmentalists have drowned out and overshadowed Navajo Allotment Land Owners Rights; 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 exchange for citizenships. Therefore, as Navajo People being land owners, they have the right to lease, develop, or excavate their lands; Now therefore be it

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 2904.

2. Huerfano Chapter hereby further supports and requests U.S. Senator Tom 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 content and reasons of the proposed “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018”. The meeting will allow Navajo Allotment Land Owners to express their concerns of the proposed “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018” and how it will limit their rights.

CERTIFICATION

We hereby certify that the foregoing resolution was duly presented and discussed at a duly called meeting of Huerfano Chapter, Navajo Nation (New Mexico), at which a quorum was present, and that the same was passed by a vote of 12 in favor, 00 opposed, and 08 abstained this 08th day of July 2018.

Motion by: Larry J. Bonney.
Second by: Cecil Werito Jr.

BEN WOODY JR.,
Chapter President.
IRENE L. HARVEY,
Chapter Vice-President.
LOIS Y. WERITO,
Secretary/Treasurer.

RESOLUTION OF NAGEEZI CHAPTER—EASTERN
AGENCY, DISTRICT 19
RESOLUTION # NC-18-077

Supporting the Navajo Allotment Owners in Opposition of The “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018” and Furthermore 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 2907

Whereas:

1. Pursuant to 26 N.N.C. §1(B), the Nageezi Chapter is delegated the governmental authority to make decisions over local matters consistent with Navajo Law, Custom, and Tradition and under 11 N.N.C., Part 1, Section 10, is delegated authority to make local decisions in the best interest and welfare of the community members; and

2. Nageezi Chapter with the population of 2500 to 3000 residents, registered and nonregistered voters, is made of up of nine (09) subcommunities including and not limited to: Nageezi, Lybrook, Twin Pines, Blanco, Kimbeto, Chaco Canyon, Escavada, Betoni Wash, Kinnadiz, and Dzilth-na-o-dith-hle, being one of the largest land base chapters in the Eastern Agency of the Navajo Nation; and

3. Navajo Allotment Land Owners met on June 12, 2018 at Nageezi Chapter where over eighty-five (85) attended to voice their opinions on the proposed “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018 or Senate Bill 2907; 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 allotment lands. Navajo communities, including the Navajo Reservation has always been in a very depressed economic state for many years and such development of natural resources gives Navajo families benefits to their daily lives; and

5. Navajo Allotment Land Owners are concerned that self-serving special interest organizations are violating the rights of Nav-

ajo Allotment Land Owners. That such publicized demonstrations and meetings by these special interest and outside groups have over shadowed the Navajo Allotment Land Owners whom currently benefitting from oil and gas development on their allotment lands; and

6. Navajo Allotment Land Owners do not share opinions of environmentalists voicing their objections on natural resources developments. These over publicized objections by the environmentalists have drowned out and overshadowed Navajo Allotment Land Owners Rights; 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 exchange for citizenships. Therefore, as Navajo People being land owners, they have the right to lease, develop, or excavate their lands; Now therefore be it

Resolved That: 1. Nageezi 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 Heinrich to attend a meeting with Navajo Allotment Land Owners on the “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018” to explain the content and reasons of the proposed “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018”. The meeting will allow Navajo Allotment Land Owners to express their concerns of the proposed “Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2018” and how it will limit their rights.

CERTIFICATION

We Hereby Certify that the Foregoing Resolution #NC-18-077 was duly presented and discussed at a duly called meeting of Nageezi Chapter, Navajo Nation (New Mexico), at which a quorum was present, motioned by Delora Hesuse, seconded by Leon Sam, was voted on with 52 in favor, 00 opposed, and 03 abstained, this 01st day of July 2018.

ERVIN CHAVEZ,
Chapter President.
JESSICA PLATERO,
Secretary/Treasurer.

Mr. GOSAR. I should note, these are significant sums which the Navajo allottees depend on each and every year. According to a 2017 Department of the Interior IG report, 20,855 Navajo allottees receive a collective \$96 million per year from revenues raised through responsible oil and gas development on their allotments. Quite simply, infringing on their right to develop their mineral resources jeopardizes their quality of life.

Further, oil and gas development has blessed the State of New Mexico with significant budget windfalls in recent years. Just last week, the Department of the Interior announced that the State of New Mexico would receive \$1.17 billion in revenues from Federal oil and gas development, the highest disbursement in the State’s history.

2018 was a record-breaking year for oil and gas development in New Mexico, with State revenues reaching \$2.2 billion, total. Roughly half of these revenues will return directly to the State’s schools, investing in higher pay for teachers and staff, while other

funds were allocated for infrastructure projects and public services.

These funds were provided by oil and gas operations on not only Federal lands, but on State trust lands, as well. Roughly 8 percent of the withdrawal area in this bill is owned by the State of New Mexico and can be developed for the benefit of its citizens. Enacting this bill will cut off the revenue streams from both Federal and State energy development, reducing future revenues for educational initiatives like those signed into law earlier this year.

Mr. Chairman, the Chaco Cultural History Park is already protected and off limits to oil and gas development. If leasing were to occur in the surrounding area, it would be subject to a multitude of Federal laws and regulations before any development could begin, including the National Historic Preservation Act, designed to protect culturally significant areas and artifacts on all Federal lands.

Before we declare a permanent ban on energy development in such a large area, we need to have all of the facts. We need to have a complete scientific review and stakeholder engagement 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. LUJÁN).

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, my colleague 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, visit with the elders, the women who are there, the children who are in proximity of those fumes that my colleague, the chairwoman, DEB HAALAND from New Mexico, was able to describe, where you don't just smell the methane; technology today allows you to see 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 lies need 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 production.

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 myself; the Representative from the district, Congresswoman DEB HAALAND, one of the first two Native 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 Commissioner 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 being desecrated either.

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 Navajo allottees. They have seen, time and time again, promises made by the Federal Government and promises not kept.

So, once again, who would you rather believe, the allottees or the BLM? Personally, 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 allottee 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, reclaiming 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 here. It is clear 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 another attempt 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 American energy dominance is a great strategy. 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 immediately 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 arbitrary 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 resources. So far, they have placed moratoriums on oil and gas production in the eastern Gulf of Mexico, in the Pacific 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 development only increases prices for American consumers. And make no

mistake, these increases have the largest impact on our most vulnerable communities.

□ 1500

I said this on the floor in September—many of us have—and I will say it again today, the United States is blessed because our land is filled with an abundance of natural resources. My own congressional district back in Louisiana is home of one of the largest natural gas reserves in the country.

We believe, we insist that we have the means and the responsibility to use those God-given resources to create jobs, foster economic growth, and pave the way to an era of American energy dominance. Oppressive policies like the ones before us today have been our own worst enemy.

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

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEG0).

Mr. GALLEG0. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act.

Ancient civilizations called the area around Chaco Canyon home thousands of years before the earliest settlers of ancient Egypt and Mesopotamia. In fact, Native American people have occupied this region continuously since 10,000 BC, creating massive public and ceremonial buildings, a complex system of roads for trade, and beautiful crafts and artwork.

Today, there are more than 4,000 archeological sites, millions of artifacts, and countless sacred cultural resources that provide modern-day Native people a direct link to their ancestors who lived in the area thousands of years ago.

Reckless oil and gas development could destroy the fragile archeological and cultural resources in the area, including ones that have not yet been discovered or cataloged. In fact, there has never been a comprehensive Native-led study of the cultural resources in the Chaco region.

It is fitting that we are talking about protecting Chaco Canyon in New Mexico and the Grand Canyon in Arizona on the same day. Both are UNESCO World Heritage sites, and both are national treasures needlessly threatened by industry to pad their bottom line.

That is why I strongly support the Grand Canyon Centennial Protection Act debated earlier and why I urge my colleagues to support this bill and the 10-mile protection zone around Chaco Canyon's archeological resources and the present-day communities that it creates.

This is sacred ground that we have an obligation to protect for future generations to enjoy and learn about. We must pass this bill to preserve this place to teach our children and our children's children about the rich history and culture of the Native people who lived in the American Southwest.

I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

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 landgrab 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 June 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 environmental stewardship 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 Fed-

eral 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.

But that is not the issue here. 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 invite my colleague to come out to New Mexico. I will take the gentleman out there. Congresswoman DEBRA HAALAND would love to host the gentleman.

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. We have the two worst methane emissions of anywhere in the country, even though we don't have the most oil and gas production.

I am sorry my colleague is not able to stay for this debate.

Mr. Chairman, right now, there is a theft taking place to U.S. taxpayers because there is intentional leaking of methane that is taking place. You can see it.

There is technology, now, that allows you not just to—when you are out there, Mr. Chairman, you can smell it. But the technology now lets you see these plumes going into people's homes who live right there.

Let's find a way to be smart about this. I agree with that. But there are places we have to protect, and this is one of them.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. TONKO).

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

Mr. Chair, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2019.

One thousand years ago, Chaco Canyon was the center of a vibrant ancestral Puebloan culture that became the focal point for ceremonies, for trade, and for political activity in the prehistoric Four Corners area.

Today, thousands of ancestral sites and cultural resources are spread across the Chaco region, while at the same time pump jacks, such as the one shown here, have become increasingly present across the landscape.

Currently, only a small portion of the region's sacred sites and abundant cultural resources are protected within the Chaco Cultural National Historical Park, with much of the surrounding land available for oil and gas development.

The greater Chaco region is a prime example of how sacred sites are facing increased threats from encroaching oil and gas development and the Trump administration's energy dominance agenda. The Bureau of Land Management has already leased over 90 percent of the public land in the larger San Juan Basin for oil and gas extraction, and under the Trump administration, BLM has proposed to lease parcels near Chaco on three different occasions.

Increased fossil fuel extraction not only threatens the region's cultural resources, it also threatens clean air and water, as well as the health and safety of surrounding communities.

New Mexico's methane emissions are already the highest in the country, and it will only get worse if the region is open to increased extraction. That released methane—a greenhouse gas that is 34 times more impactful than CO₂—is a significant contributor to the ongoing climate crisis.

I urge my colleagues to safeguard our Nation against the threat of continued climate change and vote to protect Chaco's unparalleled collection of ancient ruins and the health of local communities from the impacts of oil and gas extraction.

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

I would love to engage with the gentleman from New Mexico if the gentleman would not mind.

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 would let the gentleman know that I am one of

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, 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.

Does the gentleman know why they flare the methane? That is stealing from taxpayers.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, reclaiming my time, I have no problem. What I would ask in return is let's turn around and go back to Petra Nova down in Texas where we have a coal-fired plant that actually captures 100 percent of any emissions. It takes it down into the gas areas and actually injects it back in, squeezegeeing what the rest of the oil and gas is, and then it condenses into limestone. It is pretty interesting technology.

So I appreciate the gentleman for his back-and-forth, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. HAALAND. 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 want to see Chaco, 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 irreplaceable 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.

□ 1515

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 on here 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 will contend that the Federal Government has 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 have 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 dealt 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 all deal 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 parklands 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 that 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 land?

Yes, obviously.

But, once again, Mr. Chairman, we have three bills that make that play on

first base look really good in comparison.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. 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, and as I would urge 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 protected.

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 treasure.

I support reasonable oil and gas development throughout the West in my State, New Mexico, Arizona, Utah, and so many places. But just because we should have oil and gas development in appropriate places doesn't mean we should have it everywhere, certainly not near or in Chaco Canyon. That is why I support this legislation, Mr. Chairman, and I urge all of my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

Mr. Chairman, for the record, I would like to reiterate a number of institutions that are against H.R. 2181. To preface that, we set precedents and we codify precedents. So that is why, Mr. Chairman, you will have multiple States disagreeing with H.R. 2181.

So for those who are against H.R. 2181, you have the American Exploration and Mining Association, there is a group letter; Arizona Liberty, group letter; Arizona Mining Association, group letter; Arizona Pork Producers, group letter; Arizona Rock Products Association; group letter; Conservatives for Property Rights, a letter; Denver Lumber Company, a letter; enCore Energy Corporation; Mohave County Supervisor Buster Johnson, a letter; New Mexico Business Coalition, a letter; New Mexico Cattle Growers Association; New Mexico Federal Lands Council; New Mexico Wool Growers Association; Western Energy Alliance; and Women's Mining Coalition. These are just some of the people who are against it.

When we look at this board, we have this designation, you see it here in Chaco Canyon.

What wisdom did they have when they first put this together?

That is what I want to ask. The dimensions here are for a reason.

Why are we expending this, particularly when there is so little trust in the Federal Government?

I think we have just realized that we had to move a part of our government—I think the BLM, if I remember right—out to Grand Junction, Colorado, so that we actually had some bureaucrats who actually understood the dilemmas that are out there in Western culture and in Western States.

Yes, Western States gave up a lot. They gave a lot up compared to our Eastern cohorts. We gave property to the Federal Government for stewardship, however, that has been abused. The products that we were supposed to get off those lands as public lands have dwindled.

Eastern States call us beggars in regard to payment in lieu of taxes because we can't tax these Federal lands. And we are begging for pennies on the dollar.

Something is wrong with that.

We are also vested in the community application of the best management of these resources and getting the highest yield out of it. It is like an investment.

How do we get the best out of this area?

When you look at this, no wonder the Navajo allottees don't trust the Federal Government. Tell me when the Federal Government has honored their promise.

Look at the Navajo generating station in Arizona. This was a promise to the Navajo and Hopi Tribes to have work that was dependent upon them, that gave them the benefits of that entrepreneurship and that reflection of minerals. Sixty percent of the Navajo economy is based off of the Navajo generating station at the mine. That is gone. Eighty percent of the Hopis on the mine and NGS. That is gone. So it is no wonder these Navajo allottees don't trust the Federal Government. I don't blame them.

Trust is a series of promises kept. Until we can start honoring our promises, we have got to stop this foolishness. There is plenty of land there. I want to see my sites, but I also want my energy, too. There is a way of going about it.

We engaged with the gentleman from New Mexico. It is going to be a wonderful aspect to start talking about technology in regard to recouping 100 percent of the methane and anything else that comes out of it.

I do come from northern Arizona where I can see the stars. I don't want to ever lose sight of that, because I think it was Buzz Lightyear who said: To infinity and beyond. That is the way we should also be.

But it is not about victimization, it is about empowerment. I believe these Navajo allottees deserve their rights to make sure that the government honors their promise. I want cultural sites to be honored. But I wonder what the difference is when this site is held in this parameter and why we are going about the business to expand it even further.

Once again, enough is enough.

Mr. LUJAN. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. LUJAN. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate 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 benefiting from oil and gas development on their allotment lands. Navajo communities, including the Navajo Reservation, has always been in a very depressed economic state for many years and such development of natural resources gives Navajo families benefits to their daily lives."

The Bureau of Land Management did provide assurance that there would be no impact to those royalty payments.

So to answer the question of might infringe, the Department of the Interior and the Bureau of Land Management have said absolutely not would there be any infringement. So I appreciate the gentleman's time, and I appreciate the clarification.

Mr. GOSAR. 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 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 promise; and, once again, I beseech individuals until the government starts honoring promises, they are not entitled to the hierarchy of trust. That is just it. I trust people more than I do the government. A government that can give all can take all. I'm not for that. I'm for empowerment. I'm not for victimization.

What I have 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-paying jobs in northern Arizona, and we are going to give them welfare?

How discouraging is that?

Does that lift a person's spirit?

No, it doesn't.

It doesn't give them upward mobility. I thought that was the American experience. It is sad that we are at this point in time. I think we need to have

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 this, it continually 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. This bill 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 LUJÁN for his hard work.

I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on H.R. 2181, and I invite anyone to come to New Mexico 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 Pork Producers (Group Letter), Arizona Rock Products Association (Group Letter), Citizens For America (Group Letter), Conservative Coalition of Northern Arizona (Group Letter), Conservatives for Property

Rights (Letter), Denver Lumber Company (Letter), enCore Energy Corp (Letter), Mohave County Supervisor Buster Johnson (Letter), New Mexico Business Coalition (Letter), New Mexico Cattle Growers Association (Letter), New Mexico Federal Lands Council (Letter), New Mexico Wool Growers Association (Letter), Western Energy Alliance (Letter), Women's Mining Coalition (Group Letter).

JULY 16, 2019.

Hon. RAÚL GRIJALVA,
Chairman, House Committee on Natural Resources, Washington, DC.

Hon. ROB 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 into production.

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 bill will harm tribal members, reduce general fund and education revenues infringe on private property rights and negatively impact local economies.

The area in question has proven 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 in the fund. More than \$820 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 their 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 that hold private 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 do not.

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 artifacts of the Chaco people, as well as avoiding impacts on newly discovered artifacts, which it has always done. American energy production and protecting the environment are not mutually 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. ROB 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 leadership plans 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 act 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 extraction complications for the Tribal allottees along with any companies they partner with and will lead to a de facto mineral extraction ban on their lands.

At a June 5, 2019 hearing in 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 witness also submitted for the record a petition signed by 131 Navajo allottees opposing this legislation, as well as two resolutions

from the Huerfano and Nageezi Navajo chapters, which are closest to this area, expressing support for the Navajo allotment landowners and recognizing their opposition to this bill.

IPAA has been content to let the Chaco Canyon RMP process proceed to its conclusion. However, we cannot support any efforts to increase the area's boundary before all the RMP 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, IPAA urges you to vote "NO" on H.R. 2181.

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. ROB 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 in 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 pockets of allottee minerals. If the bill passes, companies will have no recourse but to avoid developing Indian allottee energy resources.

For this reason, Indian allottees oppose this bill. When Indian allottee Delora Hesuse testified before the committee in June, she attached to her testimony petitions with signatures of other allottees who also oppose the threat to their families' oil and natural gas income. As she testified, the money she and 20,835 other Indian allottees earn from their energy property is about \$96 million annually. That huge source of income in an area otherwise plagued by unemployment and poverty is threatened by this bill.

The area containing the highly productive Mancos Shale that would be excluded from federal development has been proven to hold large reserves of oil and natural gas. But the exclusionary zone imposed by this bill is completely unnecessary, as oil and natural 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 boundaries is to protect the culturally significant ruins and great houses of the Chaco people.

We urge the committee not to pass this bill. Thank you for considering our input.

Sincerely,

KATHLEEN M. SGAMMA,
President.

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 printed in part D of House Report 116-264 shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, shall be considered as read.

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

H.R. 2181

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 "Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that—

(1) there are archeological, sacred, and historic 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 resources found in the Chaco Culture National Historical Park, including the resources recognized by the amendment made by section 3 of the Chacoan Outliers Protection Act of 1995 (16 U.S.C. 410ii note; Public Law 104-11) providing for additional Chaco Culture Archeological Protection Sites;

(B) a significant number of which are concentrated within the immediate area surrounding the Chaco Culture National Historical Park; and

(C) that are commonly recognized by archeologists;

(6) long considered one of the best places for stargazing in the world, Chaco Culture National Historical Park—

(A) in 1991, established a night skies protection initiative and interpretive program to protect the night sky in the area of the Chaco Culture National Historical Park; and

(B) in 2013, was certified as an International Dark Sky Park;

(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; and

(B) public land, which includes additional cultural resources and sacred sites;

(8) for over 110 years, the Federal Government has recognized the importance of the area in which the Chacoan people lived and has acted to protect historic and sacred sites in the area, including—

(A) Chaco Canyon, which was designated as a National Monument in 1907 and as the Chaco Culture National Historical Park in 1980;

(B) the Aztec Ruins, which was designated as a National Monument in 1923 and expanded in each of 1928, 1930, 1948, and 1988; and

(C) the 39 Chaco Culture Archeological Protection Sites designated in 1995;

(9) recognizes that the standard for Tribal consultation is outlined in Executive Order 13175 (25 U.S.C. 5301 note; relating to consultation and coordination with Indian Tribal governments);

(10) extensive natural gas development has occurred in the Greater Chaco region that affect the health, safety, economies, and quality of life of local communities;

(11) renewed interest in oil exploration and production within the Mancos/Gallup Shale play has increased the potential for—

(A) significant impacts on resources and visitor experiences at the Chaco Culture National Historical Park; and

(B) additional impacts on local communities in the Greater Chaco region, including Pueblos and Indian Tribes;

(12) a mineral withdrawal in the landscape around the Chaco Culture National Historical Park would prevent leasing and development in the immediate area surrounding the Chaco Culture National Historical Park, which would protect resources and visitor experiences at the Chaco Culture National Historical Park; and

(13) additional studies and protective measures should be undertaken to address health, safety, and environmental impacts on communities and interests of Pueblos and Indian Tribes in the Greater Chaco landscape.

SEC. 3. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) COVERED LEASE.—The term "covered lease" means any oil and gas lease for Federal land—

(A) on which drilling operations have not been commenced before the end of the primary term of the applicable lease;

(B) that is not producing oil or gas in paying quantities; and

(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 Cultural Heritage Withdrawal Area, as depicted 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).

(3) MAP.—The term "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.

SEC. 4. WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LAND IN THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Subject to any valid existing rights, the Federal land 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.

(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 resource management plan 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 ACQUIRED 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 on or after 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 undermining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

SEC. 6. EFFECT.

Nothing in this Act—

(1) affects the mineral rights of an Indian Tribe or member of an Indian Tribe to trust land or allotment land; or

(2) 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 by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The CHAIR. No further amendment to the bill, as amended, 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 considered 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. LUJÁN

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part E of House Report 116-264.

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

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 6, line 25, insert “on Federal lands and of Federal minerals” after “development”.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. LUJÁN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. LUJÁN. Mr. Chairman, I am optimistic that this amendment may even pass on a voice vote because I have been listening closely to my colleagues on the other side of the aisle about the importance of providing clarifying language to ensure that we are able to make sure that we are meeting the goals that we have laid out.

So I am hopeful, Mr. Chairman, that this may be a short debate, but one that will definitely pass and make sure that we are embracing both sides of the aisle.

Mr. Chairman, this simple amendment would further clarify that this proposal only withdraws Federal resources. The withdrawal in H.R. 2181 would not impact nor remove valid existing rights. This includes any lands and minerals owned by a Tribe or a member of a Tribe, including allotment land, and it will include any valid rights to lands or minerals held by the State of New Mexico.

I introduced this bill to prevent further encroachment of Federal oil and gas development on the sacred sites of the greater Chaco Canyon region. These sites have withstood the test of time, 800 A.D. They have stood for thousands of years and give us a window into the past.

Yet, every year, oil and gas development on Federal lands inch closer and closer, threatening these sites and thousands of ancient artifacts within the region. The Chaco Culture National Historical Park has significant religious, cultural, and archaeological value to the original peoples of the Southwest.

Under this administration, Chaco does continue to face greater threats. Under the Trump administration, the BLM has proposed to sell leases near Chaco Canyon three times since March 2018. But I will also give some credit to the administration. Each time, under the Trump administration, the sales were withdrawn by the BLM under the Department of the Interior after pushback from the Native American communities. And each time, the administration promised meaningful consultation, which is living up to our trust responsibility, something that I shared with my colleague on the other side of the aisle. Sadly, the meaningful consultation never took place, yet the leases were up again for sale only months later.

It is time for Congress to heed the 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 not 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.

If my colleagues have 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 sovereignty. 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.

Leaders were at the table for every step of this process, helping to decide how these resources should be protected. I will forever remember the conversations I had with Navajo elders and children who continue to share their concerns associated with protecting the sacred site.

I will just close, Mr. Chairman, by reminding us once again that when we lay our loved ones to rest, we will do everything we can to protect those sacred sites. This weekend, I found myself next to the Nambe Church in the community where I live, half a mile away from where I rest my head, remembering those who have fallen, cleaning those sites, pulling up the weeds, raking the ground, paying my respects. I can't imagine how my mom or I would feel if those places would be desecrated.

That is all that we are asking. Let's come together. Let's protect these sacred sites. Let's do it together.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition, although I am not opposed to the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, when I look at this, I see the aptitude to try to amend this to give access. I have to tell the gentleman, though, it doesn't go far enough.

Mr. Chair, I think what we have to do is guarantee access so that Congress is specifically and intentionally demanding that they have that access because you know as well as I know that, once again, government problems exist. I will give the gentleman an example.

In the last land package, we have a land package that included the La Paz

land exchange by BLM. Do you know what the big problem now has been? It was signed into law. It has been about access. Our legislation actually said that it did not impugn any of the mineral estates, but then the BLM came back and said, listen, that doesn't guarantee you access to it.

That is why I think it doesn't go far enough.

I would love to see it say that it requires the allottees access to those lands. But I am not opposed to it. I think it slightly makes it better.

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 doesn't 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 that even 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 guaranteed because those 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 finding.

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 of the State, the 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, number two, 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 this 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 trust agencies and private businesses 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 increasing multiple use on public lands. We can have our cake, and we can eat it, too.

To put it simply, instead of needlessly locking up more land, 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.

□ 1545

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.

Earlier, 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 of New Mexico MARTIN HEINRICH 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 allotted 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 that 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 allottees.

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 rise in favor of this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. 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. 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:

At the end of the bill, insert the following:
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.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, 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 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 for Native communities. In 2015 alone, the Federal Indian Mineral Office distributed \$96 million to more than 20,000 allottees around the country.

At the June 5, 2019, hearing on H.R. 2181, the Committee on Natural Resources heard testimony from Delora Hesuse, a citizen of the Navajo Nation, Nageezi chapter, and a Navajo allottee, who owns mineral resources in the proposed area.

Ms. Hesuse testified 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."

Apparently, the voices of Ms. Hesuse and other allottees who have spoken to the committee have not been heard. This amendment is an effort to acknowledge that their livelihoods could be drastically diminished by this legislation.

I ask the Members of this body to put themselves in the shoes of the Native American allottees who have staked their livelihood on the mineral rights on their properties that are rightfully theirs, only to have the Federal Government strip them of their rights. I believe that is an injustice.

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

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

The CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New Mexico is recognized for 5 minutes.

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 perspectives 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 it already today, but this bill receives the complete support 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 threaten 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, we have heard this argument. We have hashed and rehashed it over and over again. Not only that, but my colleague, Mr. LUJÁN, said it very plainly: The allottees will not be hampered by H.R. 2181.

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

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

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. 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. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ARRINGTON

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in part E of House Report 116-264.

Mr. ARRINGTON. 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. ARRINGTON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. ARRINGTON. 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. 2181, the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act.

My amendment would prevent the proposed ban 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 sacred 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, drilling for minerals already prohibited within the Chaco Canyon Historical 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.

□ 1600

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 for a century now. 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 opposed 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 can be drilled from a hole in 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. ARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Private property rights are a cornerstone of our democracy and our free society. 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, clothe, 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 energy jobs for 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 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.

Ms. HAALAND. Mr. Chairman, 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. We oppose this amendment.

I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE CHAIR

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part E of House Report 116-264 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 4 by Mr. ARRINGTON of Texas.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 233, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 593]

AYES—191

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

NOES—233

Adams	Carson (IN)	Craig
Aguilar	Cartwright	Crist
Allred	Case	Crow
Axne	Casten (IL)	Cuellar
Barragán	Castor (FL)	Cunningham
Bass	Castro (TX)	Davids (KS)
Bera	Chu, Judy	Davis (CA)
Beyer	Cicilline	Davis, Danny K.
Bishop (GA)	Cisneros	Dean
Blumenauer	Clark (MA)	DeFazio
Blunt Rochester	Clarke (NY)	DeGette
Bonamici	Clay	DeLauro
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cleaver	DelBene
Brindisi	Clyburn	Delgado
Brown (MD)	Cohen	Demings
Brownley (CA)	Connolly	DeSaulnier
Bustos	Cooper	Deutch
Butterfield	Correa	Dingell
Carbajal	Costa	Doggett
Cárdenas	Courtney	Doyle, Michael F.
	Cox (CA)	

Engel	Levin (MI)	Ruppersberger
Escobar	Lewis	Rush
Eshoo	Lieu, Ted	Ryan
Espallat	Lipinski	Sablan
Evans	Loebsock	San Nicolas
Finkenauer	Lofgren	Sánchez
Fitzpatrick	Lowenthal	Sarbanes
Fletcher	Lowey	Scanlon
Foster	Lujan	Schakowsky
Frankel	Luria	Schiff
Fudge	Lynch	Schneider
Gallego	Malinowski	Schrader
Garamendi	Maloney	Schrier
Garcia (IL)	Carolyn B.	Schroeder
Garcia (TX)	Maloney, Sean	Scott (VA)
Golden	Matsui	Scott, David
Gomez	McBath	Serrano
Gonzalez (TX)	McCollum	Sewell (AL)
Gottheimer	McGovern	Shalala
Green, Al (TX)	McNerney	Sherman
Grijalva	Meeks	Sherrill
Haaland	Meng	Sires
Harder (CA)	Moore	Slotkin
Hastings	Morelle	Smith (WA)
Hayes	Moulton	Soto
Heck	Mucarsel-Powell	Spanberger
Higgins (NY)	Murphy (FL)	Speier
Himes	Nadler	Stanton
Horn, Kendra S.	Napolitano	Stefanik
Horsford	Neal	Stevens
Houlahan	Neguse	Suozyi
Hoyer	Norcross	Swalwell (CA)
Huffman	Norton	Takano
Jackson Lee	O'Halleran	Thompson (MS)
Jayapal	Ocasio-Cortez	Titus
Jeffries	Omar	Tlaib
Johnson (GA)	Pallone	Tonko
Johnson (TX)	Panetta	Torres (CA)
Kaptur	Pappas	Torres Small (NM)
Katko	Pascrell	
Keating	Payne	
Kennedy	Perlmutter	Trahan
Khanna	Peters	Trone
Kildee	Peterson	Underwood
Kilmer	Phillips	Van Drew
Kim	Pingree	Vargas
Kind	Plaskett	Veasey
Kirkpatrick	Pocan	Vela
Krishnamoorthi	Porter	Velázquez
Kuster (NH)	Pressley	Vislosky
Lamb	Price (NC)	Wasserman
Langevin	Quigley	Schultz
Larsen (WA)	Raskin	Waters
Larson (CT)	Rice (NY)	Watson Coleman
Lawrence	Richmond	Welch
Lawson (FL)	Rose (NY)	Wexton
Lee (CA)	Rouda	Wild
Lee (NV)	Roybal-Allard	Wilson (FL)
Levin (CA)	Ruiz	Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—13

Beatty	Hill (CA)	Rooney (FL)
Gabbard	Hudson	Rose, John W.
González-Colón	Kelly (IL)	Thompson (CA)
(PR)	McEachin	Timmons
Hice (GA)	Radewagen	

□ 1639

Messrs. PAPPAS, CICILLINE, O'HALLERAN, GOLDEN, SWALWELL of California, and PETERSON changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. RICE of South Carolina, KELLER, ADERHOLT, and COOK changed their vote from "no" to "aye."

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

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. KILDEE). 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.

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:

[Roll No. 594]

AYES—181

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

NOES—243

Adams	Casten (IL)	Dauids (KS)
Aguilar	Castor (FL)	Davis (CA)
Allred	Castro (TX)	Davis, Danny K.
Amash	Chu, Judy	Dean
Axne	Cicilline	DeFazio
Barragán	Cisneros	DeGette
Bass	Clark (MA)	DeLauro
Bera	Clarke (NY)	DeBene
Beyer	Clay	Delgado
Bishop (GA)	Cleaver	Demings
Blumenauer	Clyburn	DeSaulnier
Blunt Rochester	Cohen	Deutch
Bonamici	Cole	Dingell
Boyle, Brendan	Connolly	Doggett
F.	Cook	Doyle, Michael
Brindisi	Cooper	F.
Brown (MD)	Correa	Engel
Brownley (CA)	Costa	Escobar
Bustos	Courtney	Eshoo
Butterfield	Cox (CA)	Españat
Calvert	Craig	Evans
Carbajal	Crist	Finkenauer
Cárdenas	Crow	Fitzpatrick
Carson (IN)	Cuellar	Fletcher
Cartwright	Cunningham	Fortenberry

Foster	Lofgren	Sablan
Frankel	Lowenthal	San Nicolas
Fudge	Lowey	Sánchez
Gallego	Lujan	Sarbanes
Garamendi	Luria	Scanlon
García (IL)	Lynch	Schakowsky
García (TX)	Malinowski	Schiff
Golden	Maloney,	Schneider
Gomez	Carolyn B.	Schrader
Gonzalez (TX)	Maloney, Sean	Schrier
Gottheimer	Matsui	Scott (VA)
Green, Al (TX)	McBath	Scott, David
Grijalva	McCollum	Serrano
Haaland	McGovern	Sewell (AL)
Harder (CA)	McNerney	Shalala
Hastings	Meeeks	Sherman
Hayes	Meng	Sherrill
Heck	Moore	Simpson
Herrera Beutler	Morelle	Sires
Higgins (NY)	Moulton	Smith (NJ)
Himes	Mucarsel-Powell	Smith (WA)
Horn, Kendra S.	Murphy (FL)	Soto
Horsford	Nadler	Spanberger
Houlihan	Napolitano	Speier
Hoyer	Neal	Stanton
Huffman	Neguse	Stefanik
Jackson Lee	Norcross	Stevens
Jayapal	Norton	Suozi
Jeffries	O'Halleran	Swalwell (CA)
Johnson (GA)	Ocasio-Cortez	Takano
Johnson (TX)	Omar	Thompson (MS)
Kaptur	Pallone	Titus
Katko	Panetta	Tlaib
Keating	Pappas	Tonko
Kelly (IL)	Pascrell	Torres (CA)
Kennedy	Payne	Torres Small
Khanna	Perlmutter	(NM)
Kildee	Peters	Trahan
Kilmer	Peterson	Trone
Kim	Phillips	Underwood
Kind	Pingree	Upton
King (NY)	Plaskett	Van Drew
Kirkpatrick	Pocan	Vargas
Krishnamoorthi	Porter	Veasey
Kuster (NH)	Pressley	Vela
Lamb	Price (NC)	Velázquez
Langevin	Quigley	Visclosky
Larsen (WA)	Raskin	Wasserman
Larson (CT)	Rice (NY)	Schultz
Lawson (FL)	Richmond	Waters
Lee (CA)	Rooney (FL)	Watson Coleman
Lee (NV)	Rose (NY)	Welch
Levin (CA)	Rouda	Wexton
Levin (MI)	Roybal-Allard	Wild
Lewis	Ruiz	Wilson (FL)
Lieu, Ted	Ruppersberger	Yarmuth
Lipinski	Rush	
Loeb sack	Ryan	

NOT VOTING—13

Beatty	Hice (GA)	Radewagen
Case	Hill (CA)	Rose, John W.
Gabbard	Hudson	Thompson (CA)
González-Colón	Lawrence	Timmons
(PR)	McEachin	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1645

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

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ARRINGTON
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 181, noes 245, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 595]

AYES—181

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

NOES—245

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

Haaland	Maloney, Sean	Schakowsky
Harder (CA)	Matsui	Schiff
Hastings	McAdams	Schneider
Hayes	McBath	Schrader
Heck	McCollum	Schrier
Herrera Beutler	McGovern	Scott (VA)
Higgins (NY)	McNerney	Scott, David
Himes	Meeks	Serrano
Horn, Kendra S.	Meng	Sewell (AL)
Horsford	Moore	Shalala
Houlahan	Morelle	Sherman
Hoyer	Moulton	Sherrill
Huffman	Mucarsel-Powell	Simpson
Jackson Lee	Murphy (FL)	Sires
Jayapal	Nadler	Slotkin
Jeffries	Napolitano	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (GA)	Neal	Smith (WA)
Johnson (TX)	Neguse	Soto
Kaptur	Norcross	Spanberger
Katko	Norton	Speier
Keating	O'Halleran	Stanton
Kelly (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	Stefanik
Kennedy	Omar	Stevens
Khanna	Pallone	Suozi
Kildee	Panetta	Swalwell (CA)
Kim	Pappas	Takano
Kimber	Pascarell	Takano
Kind	Payne	Thompson (MS)
King (NY)	Perlmutter	Tipton
Kirkpatrick	Peters	Titus
Krishnamoorthi	Peterson	Tlaib
Kuster (NH)	Phillips	Tonko
Lamb	Pingree	Torres (CA)
Langevin	Plaskett	Torres Small
Larsen (WA)	Pocan	(NM)
Larson (CT)	Porter	Trahan
Lawrence	Pressley	Trone
Lawson (FL)	Price (NC)	Underwood
Lee (CA)	Quigley	Upton
Lee (NV)	Raskin	Van Drew
Levin (CA)	Rice (NY)	Vargas
Levin (MI)	Richmond	Veasey
Lewis	Rooney (FL)	Vela
Lieu, Ted	Rose (NY)	Velázquez
Lipinski	Rouda	Visclosky
Loebsock	Roybal-Allard	Wasserman
Lofgren	Ruiz	Schultz
Lowenthal	Ruppersberger	Waters
Lowey	Rush	Watson Coleman
Luján	Ryan	Welch
Luria	Sablan	Wexton
Lynch	San Nicolas	Wild
Malinowski	Sánchez	Wilson (FL)
Maloney,	Sarbanes	Yarmuth
Carolyn B.	Scanlon	

NOT VOTING—11

Beatty	Hice (GA)	Radewagen
Gabbard	Hill (CA)	Rose, John W.
González-Colón	Hudson	Thompson (CA)
(PR)	McEachin	Timmons

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1651

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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 House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 2181) to provide for the withdrawal and protection of certain Federal land in the State of New Mexico, and, pursuant to House Resolution 656, reported the bill, as amended by that resolution, back to the House with a further 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 amendment.

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 read 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 not go into effect if the Secretary 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 a question of life and death to many rural economies.

In west Texas, and for my neighbors in eastern New Mexico, energy producers are as crucial to our communities as educators, healthcare providers, and agricultural producers. Traditional sources of energy make up 90 percent of our Nation's energy supply and support over 10 million jobs in this great country.

In New Mexico alone, Mr. Speaker, more than 100,000 jobs are oil and gas related. A whopping one-third of the State's budget comes from oil and gas revenues. That is over \$2 billion, half of which supports funding public education.

Thousands of Navajo landowners receive millions of dollars every year from oil and gas royalties. Putting a permanent ban on any future mineral development outside the National Park would be devastating for local economies, the Navajo people, and the entire State of New Mexico.

Therefore, my motion to recommit will prevent this legislation from taking effect until it is confirmed that New Mexico will not suffer this severe economic harm resulting in a loss of revenue. That is revenue used to fund schools, roads, hospitals, 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. It is 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, because they also recognize the value of our outdoor economy which requires a clean environment.

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 Indians are under threat unless we act. Tribes across New Mexico and this country have asked this body to protect Chaco Canyon. We shouldn't put the sacred sites of Chaco Canyon and our environment at risk on the impossible theory that we can become energy dominant or that we need to open every single acre to oil and gas development regardless of how special that land is.

If we really want to lead in energy, we should take a larger role in renewable energy and low-carbon energy sources, and New Mexico can lead the way with our 300 days of sun per year and our abundance of wind.

Unfortunately, the Trump administration prioritizes fossil fuels and believes the future lies in coal, oil, and gas. But the President is wrong, and Republicans are wrong. The world's power sources are changing, and no one stands to benefit more from U.S. leadership during this transition than American consumers.

The only question that remains is whether this body will help lead our Nation in implementing a modern, clean energy agenda or whether we will remain stuck in the past, holding on to the 1950s like there is no future to believe in.

Now is not the time to open our protected public lands up to unnecessary oil and gas extraction. Now is the time to protect these important places and to lift up the voices of communities on the ground.

Some things are more important than money, and my ancestral homeland most definitely is.

I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to recommit and support this bill that would protect the sacred lands in New Mexico and that is Chaco Canyon.

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. ARRINGTON. 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 199, noes 222, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 596]

AYES—199

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brindisi
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gonzalez (OH)

Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Huizenga
Hunter
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (IA)
King (PA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marchant
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McAdams
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes

Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spanberger
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Thornberry
Tipton
Torres Small
(NM)
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOES—222

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Amash
Axne
Barragan

Bass
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester

Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Clever
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael
F.
Engel
Escobar
Español
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gallo
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.

Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsock
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney
Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne

Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Vislosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Weston
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—10

Beatty
Eshoo
Gabbard
Hice (GA)

Hill (CA)
Hudson
McEachin
Rose, John W.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1710

Ms. STEFANIK changed her vote from "no" to "aye."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

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

Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos

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

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

NAYS—174

Abraham	Allen	Amodei
Aderholt	Amash	Armstrong

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

NOT VOTING—12

Beatty	Hill (CA)	Rooney (FL)
Curtis	Hudson	Rose, John W.
Gabbard	McEachin	Thompson (CA)
Hice (GA)	Palazzo	Timmons

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1717

Mr. WILLIAMS changed his vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mrs. LEE of Nevada and Mr. REED changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRAND CANYON CENTENNIAL PROTECTION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. CARSON of Indiana). 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 Michigan (Mr. KILDEE) kindly take the chair.

□ 1719

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. KILDEE (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 3 printed in part C of House Report 116-264 offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part C of House Report 116-264 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 3 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 185, noes 240, not voting 12, as follows:

[Roll No. 598]

AYES—185

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

Gooden Luetkemeyer Schweikert Perlmutter Scanlon Thompson (MS) Keller Murphy (NC) Stauber
 Gosar Marchant Scott, Austin Peters Schakowsky Titus Kelly (MS) Newhouse Steil
 Granger Marshall Scott, David Peterson Schiff Tlaib Kelly (PA) Normman Steube
 Graves (GA) Massie Shimkus Schneider Tonko King (IA) Nunes Stewart
 Graves (LA) Mast Smith (MO) Pingree Schrader Torres (CA) Kinzinger Olson Stivers
 Graves (MO) McCarthy Smith (NE) Plaskett Schrier Torres Small Kustoff (TN) Palazzo Taylor
 Green (TN) McCaul Smucker Pocan Scott (VA) Scott, David Trahan LaHood Palmer Thompson (PA)
 Griffith McClintock Spano Porter Scott, David Serrano Lamborn LaMalfa Thornberry
 Grothman McHenry Stauber Pressley Price (AL) Sewell (AL) Latta Lamborn Pence
 Guest McKinley Stefanik Quigley Raskin Shalala Latta Posey Perry
 Guthrie Meadows Steil Raskin Sherrill Shalala Lamborn Perry
 Hagedorn Meuser Steube Rice (NY) Sherman Sherrill Shalala Lamborn Posey
 Harris Miller Stewart Richmond Sires Simpson Soto Veasey Long Reschenthaler
 Hartzler Mitchell Stivers Stivers Simpson Soto Veasey Long Reschenthaler
 Hern, Kevin Moolenaar Stivers Taylor Rooney (FL) Sires Simpson Soto Veasey Long Reschenthaler
 Higgins (LA) Mooney (WV) Mooney (WV) Rose (NY) Slotkin Smith (NJ) Visclosky Marchant Roby
 Hill (AR) Mullin Thornberry Roybal-Allard Smith (WA) Wasserman Marshall Rodgers (WA)
 Holding Murphy (NC) Tipton Ruiz Ruybal-Allard Smith (WA) Wasserman Marshall Rodgers (WA)
 Hollingsworth Newhouse Turner Ruybal-Allard Smith (WA) Wasserman Marshall Rodgers (WA)
 Huizenga Norman Upton Ruppersberger Soto Schultz Waters Watson Coleman Mast
 Hunter Nunes Wagner Rush Speier Stanton Ryan Stevens Wild Wilson (FL) McHenry
 Hurd (TX) Olson Ryan Stantton Ryan Stevens Wild Wilson (FL) McHenry
 Johnson (LA) Palazzo Walden Sablan San Nicolas Suenzi Swalwell (CA) McKinley
 Johnson (OH) Palmer Walker San Nicolas Suenzi Swalwell (CA) McKinley
 Johnson (SD) Pence Walorski Sanchez Swalwell (CA) McKinley
 Jordan Perry Walorski Sanchez Swalwell (CA) McKinley
 Joyce (OH) Posey Waltz Sarbanes Takano Yarmuth Meadows Scott, Austin
 Joyce (PA) Ratcliffe Watkins Weber (TX) Gabbard Hudson Thompson (CA) Timmons Mullin
 Katko Reed Webber (TX) Gabbard Hudson Thompson (CA) Timmons Mullin
 Keller Reschenthaler Webber (TX) Gabbard Hudson Thompson (CA) Timmons Mullin
 Kelly (MS) Rice (SC) Wenstrup Westerman Williams Wilson (SC) Smith (MO)
 Kelly (PA) Riggleman Westerman Williams Wilson (SC) Smith (MO)
 Kustoff (TN) Roby Williams Wilson (SC) Smith (MO)
 LaHood Rodgers (WA) Roe, David P. Wittman
 LaMalfa Roe, David P. Wittman
 Lamborn Rogers (AL) Rogers (KY) Rouzer Rutherford Scalise
 Latta Rogers (KY) Rouzer Rutherford Scalise
 Lesko Rouzer Rutherford Scalise
 Long Roy Young Zeldin
 Loudermilk Rutherford Scalise
 Lucas Rutherford Scalise

NOES—240

Adams Delgado King (NY) Beatty Hill (CA) Rose, John W.
 Aguilar Demings Kinzinger Gabbard Hudson Thompson (CA) Timmons
 Allred DeSaulnier Kirkpatrick Krushnamoorthi King (IA) King (IA) Timmons
 Amash Deutch Krishnamoorthi King (IA) King (IA) Timmons
 Axne Dingell Kuster (NH) González-Colón (PR) McEachin
 Barragán Doggett Lamb Hice (GA) Radewagen
 Bass Doyle, Michael Langevin Larsen (WA) Larson (CT) Lawrence Lawson (FL) Lee (CA) Lee (NV) Levin (CA) Levin (MI) Lewis Lieu, Ted Lipinski Loeb sack Lofgren Lowenthal Lowey Lujan Luria Lynch Maloney, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Matsui McAdams McBeth McCollum McGovern McNeerney Meeks Meng Moore Morelle Moulton Mucarsel-Powell Nadler Neapolitano Neal Neguse Norcross Norton O'Halleran Ocasio-Cortez Omar Pallone Panetta Pappas Pascrell Payne Perlmutter Peters Peterson Phillips Pingree Plaskett Pocan Porter Pressley Price (NC) Quigley Raskin Rice (NY) Richmond Rooney (FL) Rose (NY) Rouda Roy Roybal-Allard Ruiz Ruppersberger Ryan Sablan San Nicolas
 Adams Delgado King (NY) Beatty Hill (CA) Rose, John W.
 Aguilar Demings Kinzinger Gabbard Hudson Thompson (CA) Timmons
 Allred DeSaulnier Kirkpatrick Krushnamoorthi King (IA) King (IA) Timmons
 Amash Deutch Krishnamoorthi King (IA) King (IA) Timmons
 Axne Dingell Kuster (NH) González-Colón (PR) McEachin
 Barragán Doggett Lamb Hice (GA) Radewagen
 Bass Doyle, Michael Langevin Larsen (WA) Larson (CT) Lawrence Lawson (FL) Lee (CA) Lee (NV) Levin (CA) Levin (MI) Lewis Lieu, Ted Lipinski Loeb sack Lofgren Lowenthal Lowey Lujan Luria Lynch Maloney, Carolyn B. Maloney, Sean Matsui McAdams McBeth McCollum McGovern McNeerney Meeks Meng Moore Morelle Moulton Mucarsel-Powell Nadler Neapolitano Neal Neguse Norcross Norton O'Halleran Ocasio-Cortez Omar Pallone Panetta Pappas Pascrell Payne Perlmutter Peters Peterson Phillips Pingree Plaskett Pocan Porter Pressley Price (NC) Quigley Raskin Rice (NY) Richmond Rooney (FL) Rose (NY) Rouda Roy Roybal-Allard Ruiz Ruppersberger Ryan Sablan San Nicolas

NOT VOTING—12

Hill (CA) Rose, John W.
 Hudson Thompson (CA) Timmons
 King (IA) King (IA) Timmons
 McEachin
 Radewagen

□ 1724

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

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 243, not voting 16, as follows:

[Roll No. 599]

AYES—178

Abraham Carter (TX) Gonzalez (OH)
 Aderholt Chabot Gooden
 Allen Cheney Gosar
 Amodei Cline Granger
 Armstrong Cloud Graves (GA)
 Arrington Collins (GA) Graves (LA)
 Babin Comer Graves (MO)
 Bacon Conaway Green (TN)
 Baird Crawford Griffith
 Balderson Crenshaw Grothman
 Banks Curtis Guest
 Barr Davidson (OH)
 Bergman Davis, Rodney Hagedorn
 Biggs DesJarlais Harris
 Bilirakis Murphy (FL) Diaz-Balart
 Bishop (NC) Bishop (NC) Duncan
 Bishop (UT) Bishop (UT) Dunn
 Bost Emmer Hill (AR)
 Brooks (AL) Estes Holding
 Brooks (IN) Ferguson Hollingsworth
 Buchanan Fleischmann Huizenga
 Buck Flores Hunter
 Bucshon Foyx (NC) Hurd (TX)
 Budd Fulcher Johnson (LA)
 Burchett Gaetz Johnson (OH)
 Burgess Gallagher Johnson (SD)
 Byrne Gallagher Jordan
 Calvert Gibbs Joyce (OH)
 Carter (GA) Gohmert Joyce (PA)

Keller Kelly (MS) Murphy (NC) Stauber
 Kelly (PA) Kelly (PA) Newhouse Steil
 King (IA) King (IA) Normman Steube
 Kinzinger Olson Stewart
 Kustoff (TN) Olson Stivers
 LaHood Palazzo Taylor
 LaMalfa Palmer Thompson (PA)
 Lamborn Pence Thornberry
 Latta Lamborn Perry
 Lesko Posey
 Long Ratcliffe
 Loudermilk Long Reschenthaler
 Lucas Lucas Rice (SC)
 Luetkemeyer Luetkemeyer Riggleman
 Marchant Marchant Roby
 Marshall Marshall Rodgers (WA)
 Massie Massie Roe, David P.
 Mast McCarthy Rogers (AL)
 McCaul McCaul Rogers (KY)
 McClintock McClintock Rouzer
 McHenry McHenry Rutherford
 McKinley McKinley Scalise
 Meadows Meadows Schweikert
 Meuser Meuser Scott, Austin
 Miller Miller Sensenbrenner
 Mitchell Mitchell Shimkus
 Moolenaar Moolenaar Smith (MO)
 Mooney (WV) Mooney (WV) Smith (NE)
 Mullin Mullin Smucker
 Spano Spano

NOES—243

Adams Doyle, Michael Levin (MI)
 Aguilar F. Lewis
 Allred Engel Lieu, Ted
 Amash Escobar Lipinski
 Axne Eshoo Loeb sack
 Barragán Espallat Lofgren
 Bass Evans Lowenthal
 Bera Finkenauer Lowey
 Beyer Fitzpatrick Lujan
 Bishop (GA) Fletcher Luria
 Blumenauer Fortenberry Lynch
 Blunt Rochester Foster Maloney,
 Bonamici Frankel Carolyn B.
 Boyle, Brendan Fudge Maloney, Sean
 F. Gallego Matsui
 Brindisi Garamendi McAdams
 Brown (MD) Garcia (IL) McBeth
 Brownley (CA) Garcia (TX) McCollum
 Bustos Golden McGovern
 Butterfield Gomez McNeerney
 Carbajal Gonzalez (TX) Meeks
 Cárdenas Gottheimer Meng
 Carson (IN) Green, Al (TX) Moore
 Cartwright Grijalva Morelle
 Case Haaland Moulton
 Casten (IL) Harder (CA) Mucarsel-Powell
 Castor (FL) Hastings Murphy (FL)
 Castro (TX) Hayes Nadler
 Chu, Judy Heck Neapolitano
 Cicilline Herrera Beutler Neal
 Cisneros Higgins (NY) Neguse
 Clark (MA) Himes Norcross
 Clarke (NY) Horn, Kendra S. Norton
 Clay Horsford O'Halleran
 Cleaver Houlahan Ocasio-Cortez
 Clyburn Hoyer Omar
 Cohen Huffman Jackson Lee
 Connolly Huffman Lee Panetta
 Cooper Jayapal Pappas
 Correa Connolly Jeffries Pascrell
 Costa Johnson (GA) Payne
 Courtney Johnson (TX) Perlmutter
 Cox (CA) Keating Peters
 Craig Keating Peterson
 Crist Kelly (IL) Pingree
 Crow Kennedy Plaskett
 Cuellar Khanna Pocan
 Cunningham Kim Porter
 Davids (KS) Kind Pressley
 Davis (CA) King (NY) Price (NC)
 Davis, Danny K. Kirkpatrick Rice (NY)
 Dean Krishnamoorthi Richmond
 DeFazio Kuster (NH) Rooney (FL)
 DeGette Lamb Rose (NY)
 DeLauro Langevin Rouda
 DelBene Larsen (WA) Roy
 Delgado Larson (CT) Roybal-Allard
 Demings Lawrence Ruiz
 DeSaulnier Lawson (FL) Ruppersberger
 Deutch Lee (CA) Ryan
 Dingell Lee (NV) Sablan
 Doggett Levin (CA) San Nicolas

Sánchez	Smith (NJ)	Trahan	Kinzinger	Nunes	Stefanik	Sherman	Takano	Veasey
Sarbanes	Smith (WA)	Trone	Kustoff (TN)	Olson	Steil	Sherrill	Thompson (MS)	Vela
Scanlon	Soto	Underwood	LaHood	Palazzo	Steube	Simpson	Titus	Velázquez
Schakowsky	Spanberger	Upton	LaMalfa	Palmer	Stewart	Sires	Tlaib	Visclosky
Schiff	Speier	Van Drew	Lamborn	Pence	Stivers	Slotkin	Tonko	Wasserman
Schneider	Stanton	Vargas	Latta	Perry	Taylor	Smith (NJ)	Torres (CA)	Schultz
Schrader	Stefanik	Veasey	Lesko	Posey	Thompson (PA)	Smith (WA)	Torres Small	Waters
Schrier	Stevens	Velázquez	Long	Ratcliffe	Thornberry	Soto	(NM)	Watson Coleman
Scott (VA)	Suzuki	Visclosky	Loudermilk	Reed	Tipton	Spanberger	Trahan	Welch
Scott, David	Swalwell (CA)	Wasserman	Lucas	Reschenthaler	Turner	Speier	Trone	Wexton
Serrano	Takano	Schultz	Luetkemeyer	Rice (SC)	Wagner	Stanton	Underwood	Wild
Sewell (AL)	Thompson (MS)	Waters	Marchant	Riggleman	Walberg	Stevens	Upton	Wilson (FL)
Shalala	Titus	Watson Coleman	Marshall	Roby	Walden	Suzuki	Van Drew	Yarmuth
Sherman	Tlaib	Welch	Massie	Rodgers (WA)	Walker	Swalwell (CA)	Vargas	
Sherrill	Tonko	Wexton	Mast	Roe, David P.	Walorski			
Simpson	Torres (CA)	Wild	McAdams	Rogers (AL)	Waltz			
Sires	Torres Small	Wilson (FL)	McCarthy	Rogers (KY)	Watkins	Beatty	Hill (CA)	Rose, John W.
Slotkin	(NM)	Yarmuth	McCaul	Rouzer	Weber (TX)	Gabbard	Hudson	Rush
			McClintock	Roy	Webster (FL)	González-Colón	McEachin	San Nicolas
			McHenry	Rutherford	Wenstrup	(PR)	Meadows	Thompson (CA)
			McKinley	Scalise	Westerman	Hice (GA)	Radewagen	Timmons
			Meuser	Schweikert	Williams			
			Miller	Scott, Austin	Wilson (SC)			
			Mitchell	Sensenbrenner	Wittman			
			Moolenaar	Shimkus	Womack			
			Mooney (WV)	Smith (MO)	Woodall			
			Mullin	Smith (NE)	Wright			
			Murphy (NC)	Smucker	Yoho			
			Newhouse	Spano	Young			
			Norman	Stauber	Zeldin			

NOT VOTING—16

Beatty	Hill (CA)	Rush
Brady	Hudson	Thompson (CA)
Gabbard	Malinowski	Timmons
González-Colón	McEachin	Vela
(PR)	Radewagen	Wright
Hice (GA)	Rose, John W.	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1729

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 186, noes 237, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 600]

AYES—186

Abraham	Carter (TX)	Granger
Aderholt	Chabot	Graves (GA)
Allen	Cheney	Graves (LA)
Amash	Cline	Graves (MO)
Amodei	Cloud	Green (TN)
Armstrong	Collins (GA)	Griffith
Arrington	Comer	Grothman
Babin	Conaway	Guest
Bacon	Crawford	Guthrie
Baird	Crenshaw	Hagedorn
Balderson	Curtis	Harris
Banks	Davidson (OH)	Hartzler
Barr	Davis, Rodney	Hern, Kevin
Bergman	DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler
Biggs	Diaz-Balart	Higgins (LA)
Bilirakis	Duncan	Hill (AR)
Bishop (NC)	Dunn	Holding
Bishop (UT)	Emmer	Hollingsworth
Bost	Estes	Huizenga
Brady	Ferguson	Hunter
Brindisi	Fleischmann	Hurd (TX)
Brooks (AL)	Flores	Johnson (LA)
Brooks (IN)	Fox (NC)	Johnson (OH)
Buchanan	Fulcher	Johnson (SD)
Buck	Gaetz	Jordan
Bucshon	Gallagher	Joyce (OH)
Budd	Gianforte	Joyce (PA)
Burchett	Gibbs	Katko
Burgess	Gohmert	Keller
Byrne	Gonzalez (OH)	Kelly (MS)
Calvert	Gooden	Kelly (PA)
Carter (GA)	Gosar	King (IA)

Adams	Espaillet	Luria
Agullar	Evans	Lynch
Allred	Finkenauer	Malinowski
Axne	Fitzpatrick	Maloney,
Barragán	Fletcher	Carolyn B.
Bass	Fortenberry	Maloney, Sean
Bera	Foster	Matsui
Beyer	Frankel	McBath
Bishop (GA)	Fudge	McCollum
Blumenauer	Gallego	McGovern
Blunt Rochester	Garamendi	McNerney
Bonamici	Garcia (IL)	Meeks
Boyle, Brendan	Garcia (TX)	Meng
F.	Golden	Moore
Brown (MD)	Gomez	Morelle
Brownley (CA)	Gonzalez (TX)	Moulton
Bustos	Gottheimer	Mucarsel-Powell
Butterfield	Green, Al (TX)	Murphy (FL)
Carbajal	Grijalva	Nadler
Cárdenas	Haaland	Napolitano
Carson (IN)	Harder (CA)	Neal
Cartwright	Hastings	Neguse
Case	Hayes	Norcross
Casten (IL)	Heck	Norton
Castor (FL)	Higgins (NY)	O'Halleran
Castro (TX)	Himes	Ocasio-Cortez
Chu, Judy	Horn, Kendra S.	Omar
Ciilline	Horsford	Pallone
Cisneros	Houlahan	Panetta
Clark (MA)	Hoyer	Pappas
Clarke (NY)	Huffman	Pascrell
Clay	Jackson Lee	Payne
Cleaver	Jayapal	Perlmutter
Clyburn	Jeffries	Peters
Cohen	Johnson (GA)	Peterson
Cole	Johnson (TX)	Phillips
Connolly	Kaptur	Pingree
Cook	Keating	Plaskett
Cooper	Kelly (IL)	Pocan
Correa	Kennedy	Porter
Costa	Khanna	Pressley
Courtney	Kildee	Price (NC)
Cox (CA)	Kilmer	Quigley
Craig	Kim	Raskin
Crist	King	Rice (NY)
Curtis	King (NY)	Richmond
Cuellar	Kirkpatrick	Rooney (FL)
Cunningham	Krishnamoorthi	Rose (NY)
Davids (KS)	Kuster (NH)	Rouda
Davis (CA)	Lamb	Roybal-Allard
Davis, Danny K.	Langevin	Ruiz
Dean	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
DeFazio	Larson (CT)	Ryan
DeGette	Lawrence	Sablan
DeLauro	Lawson (FL)	Sánchez
DeBene	Lee (CA)	Sarbanes
Delgado	Lee (NV)	Scanlon
Demings	Levin (CA)	Schakowsky
DeSaulnier	Levin (MI)	Schiff
Deuch	Lewis	Schneider
Dingell	Lieu, Ted	Schrader
Doggett	Lipinski	Schrier
Doyle, Michael	Loebback	Scott (VA)
F.	Lofgren	Scott, David
Engel	Lowenthal	Serrano
Escobar	Lowey	Sewell (AL)
Eshoo	Lujan	Shalala

NOES—237

NOT VOTING—14

Beatty	Hill (CA)	Rose, John W.
Gabbard	Hudson	Rush
González-Colón	McEachin	San Nicolas
(PR)	Meadows	Thompson (CA)
Hice (GA)	Radewagen	Timmons

□ 1734

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 is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

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

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

Mr. WITTMAN. Yes, in its current form.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Wittman moves to recommit the bill H.R. 1373 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. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

This Act shall not be effective until the Secretary of the Interior, in consultation with appropriate entities, issues a report concluding that the withdrawal under section 2 will not result in increased mineral imports from Russia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and 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 aims to permanently prohibit 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—countries 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 do not have our best interests in mind, and this bill would only exacerbate the problem.

In 2018, 97 percent of U.S. demand for uranium was met by foreign imports. At least 51 percent of those uranium imports were sourced from countries that are unfriendly to the United States, including Russia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and Chinese-owned mines in Namibia.

In the past, 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. Cur-

rently, 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 advances 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 and largest deposit of uranium 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 impacts 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. 1373.

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.

Although it is hard to take my colleague seriously on this concern when members of his own party and the President refuse to acknowledge what the intelligence community and millions upon millions of Americans already know, Russia interfered in the 2016 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 theatrical.

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 less than 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 testified 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 rattle 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 need to protect the Grand Canyon from further uranium mining. I could even show you data from the Heritage Foundation, a known friend of our colleagues, showing the Republican arguments about uranium security are, here 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.

On 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 for 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.

So I ask my colleagues here today, if the Grand Canyon isn't worth protecting, what is? What are we doing here if we are willing to let public lands owned and cherished by all Americans get sold to the highest bidder? This really shouldn't be up for debate. After all, my friends and colleagues, it is the Grand Canyon. We owe it to ourselves, we owe it to generations to come to do our part to permanently protect the Grand Canyon, and in protecting the Grand Canyon respect Native communities that came to us and said we need this, we need it for our lives, and we need it for the generations to come.

I urge a "no" vote on the motion to recommit, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

There was no objection.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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 196, noes 226, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 601]

AYES—196

Abraham	Crenshaw	Hollingsworth
Aderholt	Curtis	Horn, Kendra S.
Allen	Davidson (OH)	Huizenga
Amodei	Davis, Rodney	Hunter
Armstrong	DesJarlais	Hurd (TX)
Arrington	Diaz-Balart	Johnson (LA)
Babin	Duncan	Johnson (OH)
Bacon	Dunn	Johnson (SD)
Baird	Emmer	Jordan
Balderson	Estes	Joyce (OH)
Banks	Ferguson	Joyce (PA)
Barr	Fitzpatrick	Katko
Bergman	Fleischmann	Keller
Biggs	Flores	Kelly (MS)
Bilirakis	Fortenberry	Kelly (PA)
Bishop (NC)	Fox (NC)	King (IA)
Bishop (UT)	Fulcher	King (NY)
Bost	Gaetz	Kinzinger
Brady	Gallagher	Kustoff (TN)
Brindisi	Gianforte	LaHood
Brooks (AL)	Gibbs	LaMalfa
Brooks (IN)	Gohmert	Lamborn
Buchanan	Gonzalez (OH)	Latta
Buck	Gooden	Lesko
Buechson	Gosar	Long
Budd	Granger	Loudermilk
Burchett	Graves (GA)	Lucas
Burgess	Graves (LA)	Luetkemeyer
Byrne	Graves (MO)	Marchant
Calvert	Green (TN)	Marshall
Carter (GA)	Griffith	Massie
Carter (TX)	Grothman	Mast
Chabot	Guest	McAdams
Cheney	Guthrie	McCarthy
Cline	Hagedorn	McCaull
Cloud	Harris	McClintock
Cole	Hartzler	McHenry
Collins (GA)	Hern, Kevin	McKinley
Comer	Herrera Beutler	Meadows
Conaway	Higgins (LA)	Meuser
Cook	Hill (AR)	Miller
Crawford	Holding	Mitchell

Moolenaar	Rouzer	Turner
Mooney (WV)	Roy	Upton
Mullin	Rutherford	Wagner
Murphy (NC)	Scalise	Walberg
Newhouse	Schweikert	Walden
Norman	Scott, Austin	Walker
Nunes	Sensenbrenner	Walorski
Olson	Shimkus	Waltz
Palazzo	Simpson	Watkins
Palmer	Smith (MO)	Weber (TX)
Pence	Smith (NE)	Webster (FL)
Perry	Smith (NJ)	Wenstrup
Posey	Smucker	Westerman
Ratcliffe	Spano	Williams
Reed	Stauber	Wilson (SC)
Reschenthaler	Stefanik	Wittman
Rice (SC)	Steil	Womack
Riggleman	Steube	Woodall
Roby	Stewart	Wright
Rodgers (WA)	Stivers	Yoho
Roe, David P.	Taylor	Young
Rogers (AL)	Thompson (PA)	Zeldin
Rogers (KY)	Thornberry	
Rooney (FL)	Tipton	

NOES—226

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

Vela	Waters	Wilson (FL)
Velázquez	Watson Coleman	Yarmuth
Visclosky	Welch	
Wasserman	Wexton	
Schultz	Wild	

NOT VOTING—9

Beatty	Hill (CA)	Rose, John W.
Gabbard	Hudson	Thompson (CA)
Hice (GA)	McEachin	Timmons

□ 1754

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 236, noes 185, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 602]

AYES—236

Adams	Dingell	Lawrence
Aguilar	Doggett	Lawson (FL)
Alford	Doyle, Michael F.	Lee (CA)
Axne	F.	Lee (NV)
Barragan	Engel	Levin (CA)
Bass	Escobar	Levin (MI)
Bera	Eshoo	Lewis
Beyer	Espallat	Lieu, Ted
Bishop (GA)	Evans	Lipinski
Blumenauer	Finkenauer	Loeb sack
Blunt Rochester	Fitzpatrick	Lofgren
Bonamici	Fletcher	Lowenthal
Boyle, Brendan F.	Foster	Lowe y
Brindisi	Frankel	Lujan
Brown (MD)	Fudge	Luria
Brownley (CA)	Gallego	Lynch
Bustos	Garamendi	Malinowski
Butterfield	Garcia (IL)	Maloney,
Carbajal	Garcia (TX)	Carolyn B.
Cardenas	Golden	Maloney, Sean
Cartwright	Gomez	Matsui
Case	Gonzalez (TX)	McAdams
Casten (IL)	Gottheimer	McBath
Castor (FL)	Green, Al (TX)	McCollum
Castro (TX)	Grijalva	McGovern
Chu, Judy	Haaland	McNerney
Cicilline	Harder (CA)	Meeks
Cisneros	Hastings	Meng
Clark (MA)	Hayes	Moore
Clarke (NY)	Heck	Morelle
Clay	Herrera Beutler	Moulton
Cleaver	Higgins (NY)	Mucarsel-Powell
Clyburn	Himes	Murphy (FL)
Cohen	Horn, Kendra S.	Nadler
Cole	Horsford	Napolitano
Connolly	Houlahan	Neal
Cook	Hoyer	Neguse
Cooper	Huffman	Norcross
Correa	Jackson Lee	O'Halleran
Costa	Jayapal	Ocasio-Cortez
Courtney	Jeffries	Omar
Cox (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Craig	Johnson (TX)	Panetta
Crist	Kaptur	Pappas
Crow	Katko	Pascrell
Cuellar	Keating	Payne
Cunningham	Kelly (IL)	Perlmutter
Davids (KS)	Kennedy	Peters
Davis (CA)	Khanna	Peterson
Dean	Kildee	Phillips
DeFazio	Kim	Pingree
DeGette	Kind	Pocan
DeLauro	Kirkpatrick	Porter
DelBene	Krishnamoorthi	Pressley
Delgado	Kuster (NH)	Price (NC)
Demings	Lamb	Quigley
DeSaulnier	Langevin	Raskin
Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Rice (NY)
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Richmond
Doggett		Rooney (FL)

Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman

Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stefanik
Stevens
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)

Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Upton
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Vislosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—185

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

Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Shimkus
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Turner
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Beatty
Gabbard
Hice (GA)
Hill (CA)
Hudson
McEachin
Rodgers (WA)
Rose, John W.
Thompson (CA)
Timmons

□ 1802

So the bill was passed.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

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 PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will remind all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

COLORADO OUTDOOR RECREATION AND ECONOMY ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

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 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. 823.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. MURPHY) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1805

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 first section 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.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE).

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

Madam Chair, I would first like to thank Chairman GRIJALVA and Chairwoman HAALAND for their support and advocacy of this bill.

I stand today in support of my bill, H.R. 823, the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act, or the CORE Act.

As Representatives for the people, as legislators here in the Halls of Congress, our job is to fight for common-sense solutions that come directly from our communities.

When our constituents raise their voices on issues that impact them, and when we are able to respond with legislation that benefits our districts and our State, that is when our work is most effective.

I am proud that the CORE Act was crafted by Coloradans over the last decade. It is a product of collaboration, careful consultation, and negotiation.

Local elected officials, community members, businesses, outdoor recreation and conservation groups, ranchers, sportsmen, they have all contributed their input and their passion for the outdoor areas that they love.

Each title in this bill has been carefully vetted by a thoughtful group of local elected leaders and community members, and each title is well deserving of consideration on the House floor today.

I will just give a brief overview of the bill.

The CORE Act would conserve over 400,000 acres of public land, and it consists of four titles that Coloradans have been asking Congress to pass, as I said, for well over a decade.

Title 1 is the Continental Divide Recreation, Wilderness and Camp Hale Legacy Act. It establishes permanent protections for nearly 100,000 acres of wilderness, recreation, and conservation areas in the White River National Forest along Colorado's Continental Divide.

The title creates two new wildlife conservation areas, totaling approximately 12,000 acres. The Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area would protect Colorado's only migration corridor over Interstate 70 for elk, bear, mule, deer, and other wildlife. The Williams Fork Wildlife Conservation Area would also enhance wildlife habitat for the greater sage grouse and other species.

Title 1 also designates the first-ever national historic landscape at Camp Hale. This unprecedented designation speaks to the storied legacy of the Army's 10th Mountain Division in Colorado and around the world. As my colleagues may know, the soldiers that trained at Camp Hale led our Nation to victory in World War II and then went on to create the outdoor recreation industry as we know it today.

The second title is the San Juan Mountains Wilderness Act. This title, which has previously received bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate, provides permanent protections for nearly 61,000 acres of land located in the heart of the San Juan Mountains in southwest Colorado. It designates some of the State's most iconic peaks as wilderness, including

two fourteeners, Mount Sneffels and Wilson Peak.

The third title is the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Act, which prevents new oil and gas development in one of Colorado's most treasured landscapes while also protecting private property rights. The Thompson Divide, through ranching and outdoor recreation, contributes \$30 million a year to the statewide economy. It is an area that is simply too valuable to drill for oil and gas.

This title also includes a pilot program to allow the 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. Ultimately, 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, currently one of only a handful of National Park Service units without a formal designation by an act of Congress. This special place consists of three reservoirs that are a designation for boating, fishing, hiking, and camping. It is a long-overdue formal designation that will allow the National Park Service to more effectively manage the area, and it also will help ensure that the Federal Government lives up to a longstanding commitment it made to the State of Colorado to provide 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 amendment to honor the life of an outstanding 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 Mountain Division and trained at Camp Hale.

I had the honor of meeting Sandy before 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 National Historic Landscape under the CORE Act. Therefore, the manager's amendment includes language to designate 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 passion for protecting the legacy of Camp Hale.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues, respectfully, to support the CORE Act, not only to honor those who came before us, but also to protect our treasured places for generations to come.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 823, a bill that creates land restrictions for approximately 400,000 acres of land in Colorado in the form of new wilderness, permanent mineral withdrawals, as well as recreation and conservation areas.

While the goals of the public lands legislation in this bill are certainly admirable and well-intended, and I have great respect for the bill's sponsor, my friend and fellow Coloradan, Congressman NEGUSE, it is clear that this proposal lacks the type of local consensus required for a bill of this scale.

I am proud to call Colorado home, and I am honored to represent the Fifth District of Colorado. I truly believe 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 provide countless outdoor recreation opportunities, 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 legislation, 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 process.

Subsequent efforts to engage on this legislation and find compromise have been largely ignored. That lack of engagement sadly continues today.

□ 1815

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 impacted counties, recreation groups, forestry health advocates, as well as the relevant Federal agencies.

One particularly worrying concern has been raised by the National Guard Bureau—not the State, but the national 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 Altitude Aviation Training Site, are creating concerns about the future of the site's ability to ensure military readiness for the men and women who may 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 landing zones.

While the sponsors of the CORE Act have indicated that their goal is to protect HAATS, the only way to provide certainty for HAATS is to codify the existing Department of Defense guidance for aircraft flying over Colorado wilderness areas.

As with any compromise, balance is key. There is no room for winner-take-all mentalities if you want to achieve lasting public land management agreements. This bill, unfortunately, has chosen a winner-take-all path that may deliver some great press releases momentarily but will ultimately fall short of becoming law. I believe this bill will not be supported in the other body and is certainly not supported by the administration.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEGUSE. 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, I would just say that local community support is so critical on public lands bills of this nature. That is why I am so proud that this bill has overwhelming support from the local communities that are impacted by it.

One thing, I suspect, that you will not hear from my distinguished colleagues on this side of the aisle is a reference to any counties, cities, or towns directly impacted by this bill that ultimately don't support it.

Just to give you a sense of some of those communities, the town of Crested Butte, the town of Carbondale, the city of Glenwood Springs, the town of Telluride, the town of Basalt, the town of Breckenridge, the town of Ophir, the town of Ridgway, the town of Mountain Village, the town of Snowmass Village, the town of Frisco, and the town of Dillon, they have all supported this bill.

Garfield County supports a provision of the bill which impacts its county. San Miguel County does the same. Gunnison County, Eagle County, San Juan County, Summit County, Ouray County, and Pitkin County—I am, in some respects, left at a loss of words in terms of trying to understand what local community support my distinguished colleague is referencing in terms of it being lacking.

And, of course, it makes perfect sense that these communities would so overwhelmingly support this bill because they have been engaged in important stakeholder input on this bill for 10 years, long before I came to Congress.

This bill has been the product of a very robust community-driven stakeholder process, which is why it has overwhelming support of not just the local communities that are impacted by it, but, ultimately, by the people shown by just a recent empirical study that over 70 percent of the people on the western side of Colorado and writ at large in the State support the provisions of the CORE Act. That is why it has also earned the support of my distinguished colleague from Colorado, the dean of our delegation.

Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

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 beginning 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 overall effort 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, one recent 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 lands. The development that was being 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, reclaiming my time, I understand where the gentlewoman is coming from.

Without getting into 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, which I think is a balance 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 proven to be effective on previous 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. Behind these efforts was a 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 a 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 these 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 listen to their input as those in the rest of western Colorado.

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 and their ideas included in any public lands legislation that impacts their region.

During a House Natural Resources Committee on the CORE Act and 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.

□ 1830

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. There is great harm in 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. Most of these 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. The weed concerns continue to progress, 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 removal of these areas that rely on Federal action to be able 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 access to be able to protect their cherished open spaces from potential wildfires, it also includes buffer zones between wilderness and nonwilderness 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.

We have, unfortunately, seen the aftermath of this fire and other fires, and they threaten the stability of roads and water quality and are great-

er 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 trails running on the borders of the wilderness area from 50 to 150 feet. With this reasonable 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 just 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. That 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 bill will head to the Senate. However, 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.

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 Colorado 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

Third Congressional District just mentioned, in his effort to eliminate some of those wilderness study areas, the case in point that permanent protections are, in fact, needed. There is a reason why we pursue these permanent protections, and that is, ultimately, to ensure that the lands are protected for future generations, like my daughter, so that she can enjoy the same treasured public lands that I have had access to.

I would also say, with respect to my colleague from the Third Congressional District, what I failed to hear during his remarks or, for that matter, the gentleman from Colorado Springs' remarks is, again, any reference to a single county that is directly impacted by this bill that opposes this bill.

I understand the gentleman referenced Montezuma County, and I found the letter from Montezuma County a bit perplexing given that none of the CORE Act designations are in their county or even bordering their county.

As I mentioned earlier, the San Miguel Board of County Commissioners, which is in the Third Congressional District, supports this bill. The Gunnison Board of County Commissioners, the Eagle Board of County Commissioners, the San Juan Board of County Commissioners, the Ouray Board of County Commissioners, the Pitkin Board of County Commissioners, and a variety of other counties have expressed support for the provisions of the bill that impact their particular county, including the Garfield Board of County Commissioners, which is in the Third Congressional District.

So, make no mistake, I respect philosophical disagreements that may exist about the need to protect public lands, and there may be—in fact, there clearly is a disagreement there, and we are going to land on different sides of that debate.

But facts matter. And, ultimately, the local communities across the State that are impacted by this bill directly have made clear that they support the CORE Act. As I said, it is no surprise that they do because they have been engaged in the debate around the CORE Act for a decade.

I have each title of the CORE Act that has been introduced since 2011 by Mr. UDALL when he served in this Chamber, by Mr. Salazar, and, of course, by Senator BENNET in the upper Chamber. This bill is the product of a decade of collaboration.

Ultimately, what I have heard from these county commissioners and so many others is that they are tired of waiting, Madam Chair.

I recognize that I am new to Washington, but ultimately, I think our job here is to deliver results for the people who elect us to serve.

I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW), who has served in our armed services so bravely, to discuss the HAATS issue, in particular. Then, I am happy to yield to

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 friends from 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 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 winning 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 recreate on the 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 delegation 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 today—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 hope that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would 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 BENNET'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 impacts that county, so that 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.

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

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 unfortunate.

Madam Chairman, 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.

□ 1845

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 consigns our lands to 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. So 7 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 produce. 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 forest will grow and grow and 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.

This bill flies in the face of 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 lands.

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 local residents, taxpayers, 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 around motorized recreation. Any 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.

Facts matter, Madam Chair.

I would ask the Chair how much time do I have remaining.

The CHAIR. 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 in areas 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 1980s.

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.

Colorado's forests are 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 2018 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 178,000 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

spruce beetle into previously uninfested forests.

Moreover, more and more Coloradans are living closer to their forests and closer to the risk of wildfire.

Again, from the report:

A recent update to the CSFS-administered Colorado Wildfire Risk Assessment Portal indicated that the population living in areas at risk to wildland fire in Colorado increased to approximately 50 percent from 2012 to 2017, surpassing 2.9 million people.

Madam Chair, Colorado has some great places, some of which are incorporated into this bill. However, as my colleague from Colorado, Mr. TIPTON, and others have alluded to, what the State needs is not an attempt at preservation. What they need is the application of science to the forests. They need conservation.

Colorado needs the utilization and management of their forests to restore their health and well-being. These forests need thinning, prescribed fire, and selective timber harvest to restore the appropriate stand density and reduce the beetle epidemic.

What these acres do not need is inaction.

Wilderness prevents any action, which threatens not just the surrounding acreage and the communities that lie within those boundaries. Our congressional responsibility is to be good stewards of our lands and ensure that they are there for future generations.

I have no doubt that was the sponsor's intent when writing this bill. However, we cannot just claim vast swaths of land and call our work done. Instead, we must be precise as to what we are designing and why.

Wilderness, in this case, is not the answer. Natural management will not be followed because when life and property are at risk, we will spend vast resources to extinguish nature's management tools.

Authorizing this action over the objections of State and Federal representation is not wise. The future will be our judge if this land is designated wilderness, and nature will deliver its verdict in time. None of us may even be alive when the verdict is delivered, but I desire for the RECORD to indicate that I argued on the side of sound science, that I argued to be responsible and use science and management to restore our forest resiliency, and that I argued to make our forest carbon sinks instead of carbon emitters.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMBORN. Madam Chair, I yield the gentleman from Arkansas an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Madam Chairwoman, I argue for wildlife, for water, and for a better environment, and it is because of these reasons that I encourage my colleagues to vote against H.R. 823.

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chairman, I have great respect for my colleague from Arkansas. I know he has a deep

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 we 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 my 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 reiterates "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 history and romance 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 CORE Act.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1900

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 a whole.

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 National Historic Landscape 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; 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 economies, 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. NEGUSE. 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 colleague 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 Gunnison, Glenwood Springs, Boulder, Fort Collins, Eagle County, Summit County, and everywhere in between, 73 percent say the ability to live near, 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 them 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 dispute about that.

We know that strong policy requires compromise, years of input, and, yes, vigorous debate. I am happy to partici-

pate 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 State 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 my 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 bill, as amended, 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”.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents for this Act is as follows:

Sec. 1. Short title; table of contents.
Sec. 2. Definition of state.

TITLE I—CONTINENTAL DIVIDE

Sec. 101. Definitions.
Sec. 102. Colorado Wilderness additions.
Sec. 103. Williams Fork Mountains Wilderness.
Sec. 104. Tenmile Recreation Management Area.
Sec. 105. Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area.
Sec. 106. Williams Fork Mountains Wildlife Conservation Area.
Sec. 107. Camp Hale National Historic Landscape.
Sec. 108. White River National Forest Boundary modification.
Sec. 109. Rocky Mountain National Park Potential Wilderness Boundary adjustment.
Sec. 110. Administrative provisions.

TITLE II—SAN JUAN MOUNTAINS

Sec. 201. Definitions.
Sec. 202. Additions to National Wilderness Preservation System.
Sec. 203. Special management areas.
Sec. 204. Release of wilderness study areas.
Sec. 205. Administrative provisions.

TITLE III—THOMPSON DIVIDE

Sec. 301. Purposes.

Sec. 302. Definitions.

Sec. 303. Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area.

Sec. 304. Thompson Divide lease exchange.

Sec. 305. Greater Thompson Divide Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program.

Sec. 306. Effect.

TITLE IV—CURECANTI NATIONAL RECREATION AREA

Sec. 401. Definitions.

Sec. 402. Curecanti National Recreation Area.

Sec. 403. Acquisition of land; boundary management.

Sec. 404. General management plan.

Sec. 405. Boundary survey.

SEC. 2. DEFINITION OF STATE.

In this Act, the term “State” means the State of Colorado.

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

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

TITLE I—CONTINENTAL DIVIDE

SEC. 101. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) *COVERED AREA.*—The term “covered area” means any area designated as wilderness by the amendments to section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) made by section 102(a).

(2) *HISTORIC LANDSCAPE.*—The term “Historic Landscape” means the Camp Hale National Historic Landscape designated by section 107(a).

(3) *RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREA.*—The term “Recreation Management Area” means the Tenmile Recreation Management Area designated by section 104(a).

(4) *SECRETARY.*—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of Agriculture.

(5) *WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AREA.*—The term “Wildlife Conservation Area” means, as applicable—

(A) the Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area designated by section 105(a); and

(B) the Williams Fork Mountains Wildlife Conservation Area designated by section 106(a).

SEC. 102. COLORADO WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.

(a) *DESIGNATION.*—Section 2(a) of the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103-77) is amended—

(1) in paragraph (18), by striking “1993,” and inserting “1993, and certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 6,896 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Ptarmigan Peak Wilderness Additions’ on the map entitled ‘Proposed Ptarmigan Peak Wilderness Additions’ and dated June 24, 2019,”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(23) *HOLY CROSS WILDERNESS ADDITION.*—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 3,866 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Megan Dickie Wilderness Addition’ on the map entitled ‘Holy Cross Wilderness Addition Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be incorporated into, and managed as part of, the Holy Cross Wilderness designated by section 102(a)(5) of Public Law 96-560 (94 Stat. 3266).”

“(24) *HOOSIER RIDGE WILDERNESS.*—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that comprises approximately 5,235 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Hoosier Ridge Wilderness’ on the map entitled ‘Tenmile Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be known as the ‘Hoosier Ridge Wilderness’.

“(25) *TENMILE WILDERNESS.*—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest

that comprises approximately 7,624 acres, as generally depicted as ‘Proposed Tenmile Wilderness’ on the map entitled ‘Tennmile Proposal’ and dated June 24, 2019, which shall be known as the ‘Tennmile Wilderness’.

“(26) **EAGLES NEST WILDERNESS ADDITIONS.**—Certain Federal land within the White River National Forest that 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 94–352 (90 Stat. 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. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary may carry out any activity in a covered area that 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 grazing of livestock on a covered area, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are considered to be necessary by the Secretary, in accordance with—

(1) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(2) the guidelines set forth in Appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular 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 103–77) (as added by subsection (a)(2)), the Secretary shall, as determined to be appropriate for the protection of watersheds, coordinate the activities of the Secretary in response to fires and flooding events with interested State and local agencies, including operations using aircraft or mechanized equipment.

SEC. 103. WILLIAMS FORK MOUNTAINS WILDERNESS.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—In furtherance of the purposes of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1131 et seq.), certain Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State, comprising approximately 8,036 acres and generally depicted as “Proposed Williams Fork Mountains Wilderness” on the map entitled “Williams Fork Mountains Proposal” and dated June 24, 2019, is designated as a potential wilderness area.

(b) **MANAGEMENT.**—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.

(c) **LIVESTOCK USE OF VACANT ALLOTMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 3 years after the date of enactment of this Act, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the Secretary shall publish a determination regarding whether 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”.

(2) **MODIFICATION OF ALLOTMENTS.**—In publishing a determination pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary may modify or combine the vacant allotments referred to in that paragraph.

(3) **PERMIT OR OTHER AUTHORIZATION.**—Not later than 1 year after the date on which a de-

termination of the Secretary to authorize livestock grazing or other use by livestock is published under paragraph (1), if applicable, the Secretary shall grant a permit or other authorization for that livestock grazing or other use in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations).

(d) **RANGE IMPROVEMENTS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—If the Secretary permits livestock grazing or other use by livestock on the potential wilderness area under subsection (c), the Secretary, or a third party authorized by the Secretary, may use any motorized or mechanized transport or equipment for purposes of constructing or rehabilitating such range improvements as are necessary to obtain appropriate livestock management objectives (including habitat and watershed restoration).

(2) **TERMINATION OF AUTHORITY.**—The authority provided by this subsection terminates on the date that is 2 years after the date on which the Secretary publishes a positive determination under subsection (c)(3).

(e) **DESIGNATION AS WILDERNESS.**—

(1) **DESIGNATION.**—The potential wilderness area designated by subsection (a) shall be designated as wilderness, to be known as the “Williams Fork Mountains Wilderness”—

(A) effective not earlier than the date that is 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act; and

(B) on the earliest of—

(i) the date on which the Secretary publishes in the Federal Register a notice that the construction or rehabilitation of range improvements under subsection (d) is complete;

(ii) the date described in subsection (d)(2); and

(iii) the effective date of a determination of the Secretary not to authorize livestock grazing or other use by livestock under subsection (c)(1).

(2) **ADMINISTRATION.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the Secretary shall manage the Williams Fork Mountains Wilderness in accordance with—

(A) the Colorado Wilderness Act of 1993 (16 U.S.C. 1132 note; Public Law 103–77); and

(B) this title.

SEC. 104. TENMILE RECREATION MANAGEMENT AREA.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 17,122 acres of Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State, as generally depicted as “Proposed Tennmile Recreation Management Area” on the map entitled “Tennmile Proposal” and dated June 24, 2019, are designated as the “Tennmile Recreation Management Area”.

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the Recreation Management Area are to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the recreational, scenic, watershed, habitat, and ecological resources of the Recreation Management Area.

(c) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall manage the Recreation Management Area—

(A) in a manner that conserves, protects, and enhances—

(i) the purposes of the Recreation Management Area described in subsection (b); and

(ii) recreation opportunities, including mountain biking, hiking, fishing, horseback riding, snowshoeing, climbing, skiing, camping, and hunting; 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) **USES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall only allow such uses of the Recreation Management Area as the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in subsection (b).

(B) **VEHICLES.**—

(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 for motorized vehicle use on the date of enactment of this Act.

(ii) **NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.**—Except as provided in clause (iii), no new or temporary road shall be constructed in the Recreation Management Area.

(iii) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Nothing in clause (i) or (ii) prevents the Secretary from—

(I) rerouting or closing an existing road or trail to protect natural resources from degradation, as the Secretary determines to be appropriate;

(II) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles for administrative purposes or roadside camping;

(III) constructing temporary roads or permitting the use of motorized vehicles to carry out pre- or post-fire watershed protection projects;

(IV) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles to carry out any activity described in subsection (d), (e)(1), or (f); or

(V) responding to an emergency.

(C) **COMMERCIAL TIMBER.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to clause (ii), no project shall be carried out in the Recreation Management Area for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber.

(ii) **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.

(d) **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 Recreation Management Area, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(e) **WATER.**—

(1) **EFFECT ON WATER MANAGEMENT INFRASTRUCTURE.**—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 future infrastructure necessary for the development or exercise of water rights decreed before the date of enactment of this Act.

(2) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Section 3(e) of the James Peak Wilderness and Protection Area Act (Public Law 107–216; 116 Stat. 1058) shall apply to the Recreation Management Area.

(f) **REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.**—Nothing in this section precludes the Secretary from authorizing, in accordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the use or leasing of Federal land within the Recreation Management Area for—

(1) a regional transportation project, including—

(A) highway widening or realignment; and

(B) construction of multimodal transportation systems; or

(2) any infrastructure, activity, or safety measure associated with the implementation or use of a facility constructed under paragraph (1).

(g) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Nothing in this section affects the designation of the Federal land within the Recreation Management Area for purposes of—

(1) section 138 of title 23, United States Code; or

(2) section 303 of title 49, United States Code.

(h) **PERMITS.**—Nothing in this section alters or limits—

(1) any permit held by a ski area or other entity; or

(2) the acceptance, review, or implementation of associated activities or facilities proposed or authorized by law or permit outside the boundaries of the Recreation Management Area.

SEC. 105. PORCUPINE GULCH WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 8,287 acres of Federal land located in the White River National Forest, as generally depicted as “Proposed Porcupine Gulch Wildlife Conservation Area” on the map entitled “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) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the Wildlife Conservation Area are—

(1) to conserve and protect a wildlife migration corridor over Interstate 70; and

(2) to conserve, protect, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the wildlife, scenic, roadless, watershed, 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) **USES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall only allow such uses of the Wildlife Conservation Area as the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in subsection (b).

(B) **RECREATION.**—The Secretary may permit such recreational activities in the Wildlife Conservation Area that the Secretary determines are consistent with the purposes described in subsection (b).

(C) **MOTORIZED VEHICLES AND MECHANIZED TRANSPORT; NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.**—

(i) **MOTORIZED VEHICLES AND MECHANIZED TRANSPORT.**—Except as provided in clause (iii), the use of motorized vehicles and mechanized transport in the Wildlife Conservation Area shall be prohibited.

(ii) **NEW OR TEMPORARY ROADS.**—Except as provided in clause (iii) and subsection (e), no new or temporary road shall be constructed within the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(iii) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Nothing in clause (i) or (ii) prevents the Secretary from—

(I) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport for administrative purposes;

(II) constructing temporary roads or permitting the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport to carry out pre- or post-fire watershed protection projects;

(III) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles or mechanized transport to carry out activities described in subsection (d) or (e); or

(IV) responding to an emergency.

(D) **COMMERCIAL TIMBER.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to clause (ii), no project shall be carried out in the Wildlife Conservation Area for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber.

(ii) **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.

(d) **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, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(e) **REGIONAL TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS.**—Nothing in this section or section 110(e) precludes the Secretary from authorizing, in ac-

cordance with applicable laws (including regulations), the use or leasing of Federal land within the Wildlife Conservation Area for—

(1) a regional transportation project, including—

(A) highway widening or realignment; and

(B) construction of multimodal transportation systems; or

(2) any infrastructure, activity, or safety measure associated with the implementation or use of a facility constructed under paragraph (1).

(f) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Nothing in this section affects the designation of the Federal land within the Wildlife Conservation Area for purposes of—

(1) section 138 of title 23, United States Code; or

(2) section 303 of title 49, United States Code.

(g) **WATER.**—Section 3(e) of the James Peak Wilderness and Protection Area Act (Public Law 107-216; 116 Stat. 1058) shall apply to the Wildlife Conservation Area.

SEC. 106. WILLIAMS FORK MOUNTAINS WILDLIFE CONSERVATION AREA.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 3,528 acres of Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State, as generally depicted as “Proposed Williams Fork Mountains Wildlife Conservation Area” on the map entitled “Williams Fork Mountains Proposal” and dated June 24, 2019, are designated as the “Williams Fork Mountains Wildlife Conservation Area” (referred to in this section as the “Wildlife Conservation Area”).

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the Wildlife Conservation Area are 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) **USES.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall only allow such uses of the Wildlife Conservation Area as the Secretary determines would further the purposes described in subsection (b).

(B) **MOTORIZED VEHICLES.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Except as provided in clause (ii), 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 (iii), no new or temporary road shall be constructed in the Wildlife Conservation Area.

(iii) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Nothing in clause (i) or (ii) prevents the Secretary from—

(I) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles for administrative purposes;

(II) authorizing the use of motorized vehicles to carry out activities described in subsection (d); or

(III) responding to an emergency.

(C) **BICYCLES.**—The use of bicycles in the Wildlife Conservation Area shall be limited to designated roads and trails.

(D) **COMMERCIAL TIMBER.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to clause (ii), no project shall be carried out in the Wildlife Conservation Area for the purpose of harvesting commercial timber.

(ii) **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.**—The 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 shall continue to apply with regard to the land in the Wildlife Conservation Area, consistent with the purposes described in subsection (b).

(d) **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, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary determines to be appropriate.

(e) **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 or leasing of Federal land within the Wildlife Conservation Area for—

(1) a regional transportation project, including—

(A) highway widening or realignment; and

(B) construction of multimodal transportation systems; or

(2) any infrastructure, activity, or safety measure associated with the implementation or use of a facility constructed under paragraph (1).

(f) **WATER.**—Section 3(e) of the James Peak Wilderness and Protection Area Act (Public Law 107-216; 116 Stat. 1058) shall apply to the Wildlife Conservation Area.

SEC. 107. CAMP HALE NATIONAL HISTORIC LANDSCAPE.

(a) **DESIGNATION.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 28,676 acres of Federal land in the White River National Forest in the State, as generally depicted as “Proposed Camp Hale National Historic Landscape” on the map entitled “Camp Hale National Historic Landscape Proposal” and dated June 24, 2019, are designated the “Camp Hale National Historic Landscape”.

(b) **PURPOSES.**—The purposes of the Historic Landscape are—

(1) to provide for—

(A) the interpretation of historic events, activities, structures, and artifacts of the Historic Landscape, including with respect to the role of the Historic Landscape in local, national, and world history;

(B) the historic preservation of the Historic Landscape, consistent with—

(i) the designation of the Historic Landscape as a national historic site; and

(ii) the other purposes of the Historic Landscape;

(C) recreational opportunities, with an emphasis on the activities related to the historic use of the Historic Landscape, including skiing, snowshoeing, snowmobiling, hiking, horseback riding, climbing, other road- and trail-based activities, and other outdoor activities; and

(D) the continued environmental remediation and removal of unexploded ordnance at the Camp Hale Formerly Used Defense Site and the Camp Hale historic cantonment area; and

(2) to conserve, protect, restore, and enhance for the benefit and enjoyment of present and future generations the scenic, watershed, and ecological resources of the Historic Landscape.

(c) **MANAGEMENT.**—

(1) **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).

(2) **MANAGEMENT PLAN.**—

(A) **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.

(B) CONTENTS.—The management plan prepared under subparagraph (A) shall include plans for—

(i) improving the interpretation of historic events, activities, structures, and artifacts of the Historic Landscape, including with respect to the role of the Historic Landscape in local, national, and world history;

(ii) conducting historic preservation activities;

(iii) managing recreational opportunities, including the use and stewardship of—

(I) the road and trail systems; and
(II) dispersed recreation resources;

(iv) the conservation, protection, restoration, or enhancement of the scenic, watershed, and ecological resources of the Historic Landscape, including conducting the restoration and enhancement project under subsection (d); and

(v) environmental remediation and, consistent with 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 PROJECT.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary shall conduct a restoration and enhancement project in the Historic Landscape—

(A) to improve aquatic, riparian, and wetland conditions in and along the Eagle River and tributaries of the Eagle River;

(B) to maintain or improve recreation and interpretive opportunities and facilities; and

(C) to conserve historic values in the Camp Hale area.

(2) COORDINATION.—In carrying out the project described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall coordinate with—

(A) the United States Army Corps of Engineers;

(B) the Camp Hale-Eagle River Headwaters Collaborative Group;

(C) the National Forest Foundation;

(D) the Colorado Department of Public Health and Environment;

(E) the Colorado State Historic Preservation Office;

(F) units of local government; and

(G) other interested organizations and members of the public.

(e) ENVIRONMENTAL REMEDIATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army shall continue to carry out the projects and activities of the Department of the Army in existence on the date of enactment of this Act relating to cleanup of—

(A) the Camp Hale Formerly Used Defense Site; or

(B) the Camp Hale historic cantonment area.

(2) REMOVAL OF UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE.—

(A) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of the Army may remove unexploded ordnance (as defined in section 101(e) of title 10, United States Code) from the Historic Landscape, as the Secretary of the Army determines to be appropriate in accordance with applicable law (including regulations).

(B) ACTION ON RECEIPT OF NOTICE.—On receipt from the Secretary of a notification of unexploded ordnance under subsection (c)(3), the Secretary of the Army may remove the unexploded ordnance in accordance with—

(i) the program for environmental restoration of formerly used defense sites under section 2701 of title 10, United States Code;

(ii) the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9601 et seq.); and

(iii) any other applicable provision of law (including regulations).

(3) EFFECT OF SUBSECTION.—Nothing in this subsection modifies any obligation in existence on the date of enactment of this Act relating to environmental remediation or removal of any unexploded ordnance located in or around the

Camp Hale historic cantonment area, the Camp Hale Formerly Used Defense Site, or the Historic Landscape, including such an obligation under—

(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).

(f) INTERAGENCY AGREEMENT.—The Secretary and the Secretary of the Army shall enter into an agreement—

(1) to specify—

(A) the activities of the Secretary relating to the management of the Historic Landscape; and

(B) the activities of the Secretary of the Army relating to environmental remediation and the removal of unexploded ordnance in accordance with subsection (e) and other applicable laws (including regulations); and

(2) 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).

(g) EFFECT.—Nothing in this section—

(1) affects the jurisdiction of the State over any water law, water right, or adjudication or administration relating to any water resource;

(2) affects any water right in existence on or after the date of enactment of this Act, or the exercise of such a water right, including—

(A) a water right under an interstate water compact (including full development of any apportionment made in accordance with such a compact);

(B) a water right decreed within, above, below, or through the Historic Landscape;

(C) a water right held by the United States;

(D) the management or operation of any reservoir, including the storage, management, release, or transportation of water; and

(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);

(3) constitutes an express or implied reservation by the United States of any reserved or appropriate water right;

(4) alters or limits—

(A) a permit held by a ski area;

(B) the implementation of activities governed by a ski area permit; or

(C) the authority of the Secretary to modify or expand an existing ski area permit;

(5) prevents the Secretary from closing portions of the Historic Landscape for public safety, environmental remediation, or other use in accordance with applicable laws; or

(6) affects—

(A) any special use permit in effect on the date of enactment of this Act; or

(B) the renewal of a permit described in subparagraph (A).

(h) FUNDING.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—There is established in the general fund of the Treasury a special account, to be known as the “Camp Hale Historic Preservation and Restoration Fund”.

(2) AUTHORIZATION OF APPROPRIATIONS.—There is authorized to be appropriated to the Camp Hale Historic Preservation and Restoration Fund \$10,000,000, to be available to the Secretary until expended, for activities relating to historic interpretation, preservation, and restoration carried out in and around the Historic Landscape.

(i) DESIGNATION OF OVERLOOK.—The interpretive site located beside United States Route 24 in the State, at 39.431N 106.323W, is hereby designated as the “Sandy Treat Overlook”.

SEC. 108. WHITE RIVER NATIONAL FOREST BOUNDARY MODIFICATION.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The boundary of the White River National Forest is modified to include the approximately 120 acres comprised of the SW 1/4, the SE 1/4, and the NE 1/4 of the SE 1/4 of sec. 1, T. 2 S., R. 80 W., 6th Principal Meridian, in Summit County in the State.

(b) LAND AND WATER CONSERVATION FUND.—For purposes of section 200306 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. 109. ROCKY MOUNTAIN NATIONAL PARK POTENTIAL WILDERNESS BOUNDARY 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.

(b) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—Section 1952(b) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (Public Law 111–11; 123 Stat. 1070) is amended by adding at the end the following:

“(3) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—The boundary of the Potential Wilderness is modified to exclude the area comprising approximately 15.5 acres of land identified as ‘Potential Wilderness to Non-wilderness’ on the map entitled ‘Rocky Mountain National Park Proposed Wilderness Area Amendment’ and dated January 16, 2018.”.

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 establishes a protective perimeter or buffer zone around—

(A) a covered area;

(B) a wilderness area or potential wilderness area designated by section 103;

(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 seen or heard from within 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 soon as practicable after the date of enactment of 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 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 filed under paragraph (1) shall be on file and available for public inspection in the appropriate offices of the Forest Service.

(d) ACQUISITION OF LAND.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary may acquire any land or interest in land within the boundaries of an area described in subsection (b)(1) 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 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) location, entry, and patent under mining laws; and
- (3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal 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 an area;
- (2) flight testing or evaluation over an area described in paragraph (1); or
- (3) the use or 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.

TITLE II—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 Agriculture.

(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 Face and San Bernardo Additions to the Lizard Head Wilderness’ 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 land 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) **WHITEHOUSE ADDITIONS.**—Certain Federal land in the Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, and Gunnison National Forests comprising approximately 12,465 acres, as generally depicted on the map entitled ‘Proposed Whitehouse 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.

“(29) **MCKENNA PEAK WILDERNESS.**—Certain Federal land 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 and San Juan 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 Forests in the State comprising approximately 792 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, 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, archaeological, paleontological, natural, scientific, recreational, wilderness, wildlife, riparian, historical, 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 subsection (b);

(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; and

(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.

(3) **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) **BICYCLES.**—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; and

(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 103–77; 107 Stat. 762), except that, for purposes of this Act—

(1) any reference contained in that section to “the lands designated as wilderness by this Act”, “the Piedra, Roubideau, and Tabeguache areas identified in section 9 of this Act, or the Bowen Gulch Protection Area or the Fossil Ridge Recreation Management Area identified in sections 5 and 6 of this Act”, or “the areas described in sections 2, 5, 6, and 9 of this Act” shall be considered to be a reference to “the Special Management Areas”; and

(2) any reference contained in that section to “this Act” shall be considered to be a reference to “the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act”.

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 2408 (16 U.S.C. 460zz–7) as section 2409; and

(2) by inserting after section 2407 (16 U.S.C. 460zz–6) the following:

“SEC. 2408. RELEASE.

“(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 laws.”.

(b) **MCKENNA PEAK WILDERNESS STUDY AREA.**—

(1) **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 McKenna Peak Wilderness Study Area in San Miguel County in the State not designated as wilderness by paragraph (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) have been adequately studied for wilderness designation.

(2) **RELEASE.**—Any public land referred to in paragraph (1) that is not designated as wilderness by paragraph (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)—

(A) 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

(B) shall be managed in accordance with applicable laws.

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.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—As soon as practicable 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) (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) **IN 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) (as added by section 202) 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.

(e) **GRAZING.**—The grazing of livestock on covered land, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be permitted to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are considered to be necessary by the Secretary with jurisdiction over the covered land, in accordance with—

(1) section 4(d)(4) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(4)); and

(2) the applicable guidelines set forth in Appendix A of the report of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs of the House of Representatives accompanying H.R. 2570 of the 101st Congress (H. Rept. 101-405) or H.R. 5487 of the 96th Congress (H. Rept. 96-617).

(f) **FIRE, INSECTS, AND DISEASES.**—In accordance with section 4(d)(1) of the Wilderness Act (16 U.S.C. 1133(d)(1)), the Secretary with jurisdiction over a 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) (as added by section 202) may carry out any activity in the wilderness area that 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.

(g) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid rights in existence on the date of enactment of this Act, the covered land and the approximately 6,590 acres generally depicted on the map entitled “Proposed Naturita Canyon Mineral Withdrawal Area” and dated September 6, 2018, is withdrawn from—

(1) 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.

TITLE III—THOMPSON DIVIDE

SEC. 301. PURPOSES.

The purposes of this title are—

(1) subject to valid existing rights, to withdraw certain Federal land in the Thompson Divide area from mineral and other disposal laws; and

(2) to promote the capture of fugitive methane emissions that would otherwise be emitted into the atmosphere—

(A) to reduce methane gas emissions; and
(B) to provide—

(i) new renewable electricity supplies and other beneficial uses of fugitive methane emissions; and

(ii) increased royalties for taxpayers.

SEC. 302. DEFINITIONS.

In this title:

(1) **FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSIONS.**—The term “fugitive methane emissions” means methane gas from those Federal lands in Garfield, Gunnison, Delta, or Pitkin County in the State generally depicted on the pilot program map as “Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program Area” that would leak or be vented into the atmosphere from an active, inactive or abandoned underground coal mine.

(2) **PILOT PROGRAM.**—The term “pilot program” means the Greater Thompson Divide Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program established by section 305(a)(1).

(3) **PILOT PROGRAM MAP.**—The term “pilot program map” means the map entitled “Greater Thompson Divide Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program Area” and dated June 17, 2019.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term “Secretary” means the Secretary of the Interior.

(5) **THOMPSON DIVIDE LEASE.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “Thompson Divide lease” means any oil or gas lease in effect on the date of enactment of this Act within the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area.

(B) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term “Thompson Divide lease” does not include any oil or gas lease that—

(i) is associated with a Wolf Creek Storage Field development right; or

(ii) before the date of enactment of this Act, has expired, been cancelled, or otherwise terminated.

(6) **THOMPSON DIVIDE MAP.**—The term “Thompson Divide map” means the map entitled “Greater Thompson Divide Area Map” and dated June 13, 2019.

(7) **THOMPSON DIVIDE WITHDRAWAL AND PROTECTION AREA.**—The term “Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area” means the Federal land and minerals generally depicted on the Thompson Divide map as the “Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area”.

(8) **WOLF CREEK STORAGE FIELD DEVELOPMENT RIGHT.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—The term “Wolf Creek Storage Field development right” means a development right for any of the Federal mineral leases numbered COC 007496, COC 007497, COC 007498, COC 007499, COC 007500, COC 007538, COC 008128, COC 015373, COC 0128018, COC 051645, and COC 051646, and generally depicted on the Thompson Divide map as “Wolf Creek Storage Agreement”.

(B) **EXCLUSIONS.**—The term “Wolf Creek Storage Field development right” does not include any storage right or related activity within the area described in subparagraph (A).

SEC. 303. THOMPSON DIVIDE WITHDRAWAL AND PROTECTION AREA.

(a) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area is withdrawn from—

(1) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(2) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(3) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(b) **SURVEYS.**—The exact acreage and legal description of the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area shall be determined by surveys approved by the Secretary, in consultation with the Secretary of Agriculture.

SEC. 304. THOMPSON DIVIDE LEASE EXCHANGE.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In exchange for the relinquishment by a leaseholder of all Thompson Divide leases of the leaseholder, the Secretary may

issue to the leaseholder credits for any bid, royalty, or rental payment due under any Federal oil or gas lease on Federal land in the State, in accordance with subsection (b).

(b) **AMOUNT OF CREDITS.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—Subject to paragraph (2), the amount of the credits issued to a leaseholder of a Thompson Divide lease relinquished under subsection (a) shall—

(A) be equal to the sum of—

(i) the amount of the bonus bids paid for the applicable Thompson Divide leases;

(ii) the amount of any rental paid for the applicable Thompson Divide leases as of the date on which the leaseholder submits to the Secretary a notice of the decision to relinquish the applicable Thompson Divide leases; and

(iii) the amount of any expenses incurred by the leaseholder of the applicable Thompson Divide leases in the preparation of any drilling permit, sundry notice, or other related submission in support of the development of the applicable Thompson Divide leases as of January 28, 2019, including any expenses relating to the preparation of any analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); and

(B) require the approval of the Secretary.

(2) **EXCLUSION.**—The amount of a credit issued under subsection (a) shall not include any expenses paid by the leaseholder of a Thompson Divide lease for legal fees or related expenses for legal work with respect to a Thompson Divide lease.

(c) **CANCELLATION.**—Effective on relinquishment under this section, and without any additional action by the Secretary, a Thompson Divide lease—

(1) shall be permanently cancelled; and

(2) shall not be reissued.

(d) **CONDITIONS.**—

(1) **APPLICABLE LAW.**—Except as otherwise provided in this section, each exchange under this section shall be conducted in accordance with—

(A) this Act; and

(B) other applicable laws (including regulations).

(2) **ACCEPTANCE OF CREDITS.**—The Secretary shall accept credits issued under subsection (a) in the same manner as cash for the payments described in that subsection.

(3) **APPLICABILITY.**—The use of a credit issued under subsection (a) shall be subject to the laws (including regulations) applicable to the payments described in that subsection, to the extent that the laws are consistent with this section.

(4) **TREATMENT OF CREDITS.**—All amounts in the form of credits issued under subsection (a) accepted by the Secretary shall be considered to be amounts received for the purposes of—

(A) section 35 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 191); and

(B) section 20 of the Geothermal Steam Act of 1970 (30 U.S.C. 1019).

(e) **WOLF CREEK STORAGE FIELD DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS.**—

(1) **CONVEYANCE TO SECRETARY.**—As a condition precedent to the relinquishment of a Thompson Divide lease, any leaseholder with 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 by the Secretary under paragraph (1)—

(A) shall be held in perpetuity; and

(B) shall not be—

(i) transferred;

(ii) reissued; or

(iii) otherwise used for mineral extraction.

SEC. 305. GREATER THOMPSON DIVIDE FUGITIVE COAL MINE METHANE USE PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) **FUGITIVE COAL MINE METHANE USE PILOT PROGRAM.**—

(1) **ESTABLISHMENT.**—There is established in the Bureau of Land Management a pilot program, to be known as the “Greater Thompson

Divide Fugitive Coal Mine Methane Use Pilot Program”.

(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 promote economic development;
- (C) to produce bid and royalty revenues;
- (D) to improve air quality; and
- (E) to improve public safety.

(3) **PLAN.**—

(A) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall develop a plan—

(i) to 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 clause (ii);
- (iv) interested institutions of higher education in the State; and
- (v) interested members of the public.

(b) **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) **CONDUCT.**—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; or
- (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 including details of measurements taken and the basis for that emissions estimate;

(C) an estimate of the total volume of fugitive methane emissions each year;

(D) relevant data and other information available from—

- (i) the Environmental Protection Agency;
- (ii) the Mine Safety and Health Administration;
- (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; and
- (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 in carrying out—

(A) the leasing program under subsection (c); and

(B) the capping or destruction of fugitive methane emissions under subsection (d).

(c) **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.

(2) **FUGITIVE METHANE EMISSIONS FROM COAL MINES 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 (1) 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—

(I) the capture of fugitive methane emissions for beneficial use, such as generating electrical 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.

(ii) **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.

(E) **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 in this section, notwithstanding section 303, subject to valid existing rights, and in accordance with section 21 of the Mineral Leasing Act (30 U.S.C. 241) and any other applicable law, the Secretary shall—

(i) authorize the capture for use, or destruction by flaring, of fugitive methane emissions

from abandoned coal mines on Federal land; and

(ii) make available for leasing such fugitive methane emissions from abandoned coal mines on Federal land as the Secretary considers to be in the public interest.

(B) **SOURCE.**—To the maximum extent practicable, the Secretary shall offer for lease each significant vent, seep, or other source of fugitive methane emissions from abandoned coal mines.

(C) **BID QUALIFICATIONS.**—A bid to lease fugitive methane emissions under this paragraph shall specify whether the prospective lessee intends—

(i) to capture the fugitive methane emissions for beneficial use, such as generating electrical power, producing usable heat, transporting the methane to market, transforming the fugitive methane emissions into a different marketable material;

(ii) to destroy the fugitive methane emissions by flaring; or

(iii) to employ a specific combination of—

(I) capturing the fugitive methane emissions for beneficial use; and

(II) destroying the fugitive methane emission by flaring.

(D) **PRIORITY.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—If there is more than 1 qualified bid for a lease under this paragraph, the Secretary shall select the bid that the Secretary determines is likely to most significantly advance the public interest.

(ii) **CONSIDERATIONS.**—In determining the public interest under clause (i), the Secretary shall take into consideration—

(I) the size of the overall decrease in the time-integrated radiative forcing of the fugitive methane emissions;

(II) the impacts to other natural resource values, including wildlife, water, and air; and

(III) other public interest values, including scenic, economic, recreation, and cultural values.

(E) **LEASE FORM.**—

(i) **IN GENERAL.**—The Secretary shall develop and provide to prospective bidders a lease form for leases issued under this paragraph.

(ii) **DUE DILIGENCE.**—The lease form developed under clause (i) shall include terms and conditions requiring the leased fugitive methane emissions to be put to beneficial use or flared by not later than 1 year after the date of issuance of the lease.

(F) **ROYALTY RATE.**—The Secretary shall develop a minimum bid and royalty rate for leases under this paragraph to advance the purposes of this section, to the maximum extent practicable.

(d) **SEQUESTRATION.**—If, by not later than 4 years after the date of enactment of this Act, any significant fugitive methane emissions from abandoned coal mines on Federal land are not leased under subsection (c)(3), the Secretary shall, in accordance with applicable law, take all reasonable measures—

(1) 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

(2) if sequestration under paragraph (1) is not feasible, destroy the fugitive methane emissions by flaring.

(e) **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—

(1) the economic and environmental impacts of the pilot program, including information on increased royalties and estimates of avoided greenhouse gas emissions; and

(2) any recommendations by the Secretary on whether the pilot program could be expanded geographically 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 mineral leases, mineral interest, or other property rights wholly or partially within the Thompson Divide Withdrawal and Protection Area, including access to the leases, interests, rights, or land in accordance with applicable Federal, State, and local laws (including regulations);

(2) prevents 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 616/100,485C, 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)(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 section 100101(a), chapter 1003, and sections 100751(a), 100752, 100753, and 102101 of title 54, United States Code.

(2) **DAM, POWERPLANT, AND RESERVOIR 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 Colorado River Storage Project under the Act of April 11, 1956 (commonly known as the “Colorado River Storage Project Act”) (43 U.S.C. 620 et seq.); or

(iii) under the Federal Water Project Recreation Act (16 U.S.C. 4601–12 et seq.).

(B) **RECLAMATION LAND.**—

(i) **SUBMISSION OF 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 may—

(I) approve, approve with modifications, or disapprove the request; and

(II) if the request is approved under subclause (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.**—Administrative jurisdiction over the land identified on the map as “Lands withdrawn or acquired for Bureau of Reclamation projects”, as modified pursuant to clause (i)(II), if applicable, 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.

(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 under subclause (I) for reclamation purposes, including for the operation, maintenance, and expansion or replacement of facilities.

(bb) **MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING.**—The terms of the access authorized under item (aa) shall be determined 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 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 boating, boating-related activities, 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, and establish periods during which, no 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.

(5) **LANDOWNER ASSISTANCE.**—On the written request of an individual that owns private land located not more than 3 miles from 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.

(6) **WITHDRAWAL.**—Subject to valid existing rights, all Federal land within the National Recreation Area is withdrawn from—

(A) entry, appropriation, and disposal under the public land laws;

(B) location, entry, and patent under the mining laws; and

(C) operation of the mineral leasing, mineral materials, and geothermal leasing laws.

(7) **GRAZING.**—

(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 remainder of 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 to access State land for purposes of administering the lease if the use was permitted before the date of enactment of this Act, subject to such terms and conditions as the Secretary may require.

(B) **STATE AND PRIVATE LAND.**—The Secretary may, in accordance with applicable laws, authorize grazing on land acquired from the State or private landowners under section 403, if grazing was established before the date of acquisition.

(C) **PRIVATE LAND.**—On private land acquired under section 403 for the National Recreation Area on which authorized grazing is occurring before the date of enactment of this Act, the Secretary, in consultation with the lessee, 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 enactment of this Act, the continuation and renewal of grazing on Federal land located within the boundary of the National Recreation Area on which grazing is allowed before the date of enactment of this Act, unless the Secretary determines that grazing on the Federal land would present unacceptable impacts (as defined in section 1.4.7.1 of the National Park Service document entitled “Management Policies 2006: The Guide to Managing the National Park System”) to the natural, cultural, recreational, and scenic resource values and the character of the land within the National Recreation Area; and

(ii) retain all authorities to manage grazing in the National Recreation Area.

(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.

(8) **WATER RIGHTS.**—Nothing in this title—

(A) affects any use or allocation in existence on the date of enactment of this Act of any water, water right, or interest in water;

(B) 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;

(C) affects any interstate water compact in existence on the date of enactment of this Act;

(D) authorizes or imposes any new reserved Federal water right; or

(E) shall be considered to be a relinquishment or reduction of any water right reserved or 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 of April 11, 1956 (commonly known as the “Colorado River Storage Project Act”) (70 Stat. 110, chapter 203; 43 U.S.C. 620g), by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the Bureau of Reclamation, 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 Secretary under the program to acquire 26 miles of class I 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 Aspinall Unit under 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 or appropriated funds;

(iii) transfer from another Federal agency; or

(iv) 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 the National Park Service” is transferred to the Secretary, to be administered by the Director of the National Park Service as part of the National Recreation Area.

(B) BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT.—The boundary of the Gunnison National Forest shall be adjusted to exclude the land transferred to the Secretary under subparagraph (A).

(2) BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT 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 from the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to the Director of the National Park Service, to be administered as part of the National Recreation Area.

(3) WITHDRAWAL.—Administrative jurisdiction over the land identified on the map as “Proposed for transfer to the Bureau of Land Management, subject to the revocation of Bureau of Reclamation withdrawal” shall be transferred to the Director of the Bureau of Land Management on relinquishment of the land by the Bureau of Reclamation and revocation by the Bureau of Land Management of any withdrawal as may be necessary.

(c) POTENTIAL LAND EXCHANGE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The withdrawal for reclamation purposes of the land identified on the map as “Potential exchange lands” shall be relinquished by the Commissioner 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) EXCHANGE; INCLUSION IN 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 402(c)(5)—

(i) subject to a conservation easement remaining on the transferred land, to protect the scenic resources of the transferred land; and

(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 Commissioner of Reclamation, shall prepare a general management plan for the National Recreation Area in accordance with section 100502 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:

TITLE 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.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

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 Congressman 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. Every elected official in the 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.

With that said, in anticipation 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

duty to represent these local communities in Congress, and that consensus is vital for success in any public lands bill.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Madam Chair, I have great respect for my colleague from the State of Utah. I enjoy working with him on the Committee on Natural Resources and have enjoyed being able to partner with him on a number of efforts surrounding regenerative agriculture and many other subjects.

I would say that I oppose this amendment. The distinguished gentleman, I believe, mentioned—I hope I am quoting him right—that when his bill passed the Chamber, and I believe the bill earlier this year that passed our committee, that I was proud to vote for, he had the support of conservationists in his State, county commissioners, local elected officials, the Governor, and his congressional delegation.

I would tell the distinguished gentleman that he may not be aware that, in our case, we have the support of conservationists, county commissioners, local elected officials, and our Governor.

The gentleman is correct that the only support that seems to be missing is from Republican colleagues in the State's delegation, and that is a shame. I would hope that a bill that has this volume of support from local communities, as has been well established during the course of this very vigorous and robust debate, would earn the support of my friends on the other side of the aisle who also have the great privilege of representing the State that we love so much.

With respect to the more esoteric point on legislating in areas that an individual may not specifically represent, my understanding—again, I have been in Congress here for only 10 months. But my sense of it thus far is that we take votes literally every day on bills that impact our respective districts and, of course, areas far outside of our districts.

During the 114th Congress, just by way of example—I was not here. I believe my friends on the other side of the aisle who are gathered here today were. They voted to pass H.R. 8, which was the North American Energy Security Infrastructure Act of 2015, out of the House.

This was a bill widely opposed by many Democrats who were concerned that the bill would lead to increased opportunities for constructing natural gas pipelines across Federal lands in their home districts. That, of course, did not stop my colleagues from voting for that bill. They searched their conscience. They made the conclusion that they reached. And that is their right.

I would only say that it is the right of every Member on this particular bill to, again, search their conscience as to whether or not they believe areas like the Thompson Divide ought to be protected. If they believe that those areas should be protected, then they ought to vote "yes."

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

□ 1915

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. And I concur 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 is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS).

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

Mr. CURTIS. 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 Utah will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. BROWN OF MARYLAND

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. 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 27, line 2, insert "and veteran outreach and engagement" before "activities".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to start by recognizing the hard work of Chairman GRIJALVA, and perhaps even more important, Congressman NEGUSE, my good friend, for his work on the underlying bill and the amount of time, energy, passion, and commitment that he devotes to the conservation and, yes, the preservation of Colorado's public lands. They are, in fact, iconic features of our American landscape and crucial engines for its recreational industry and State economy.

It is our duty to protect these treasured lands and to be responsible stewards so that future generations can enjoy them as much as we do today. We recognize how irreplaceable and rich these lands are, not simply for the value they bring to our country's vast ecological diversity but, also, for their contribution to our Nation's history.

One such area is Camp Hale. Decades ago, Camp Hale served as a base for our servicemembers to train in mountain warfare.

I am sure the Chair is excited to know that the training campground gave us the 10th Mountain Division, the famed and heroic mountain fighters, who, through their dedication, service, and sacrifice, helped our country achieve victory in World War II. And, upon returning home, it was these veterans who drew upon their training and experiences to help build Colorado's flourishing outdoor industry.

The legislation recognizes the significance of Camp Hale and, as such, designated it as a National Historic Landscape, the first such designation of its kind.

Yet, to fully honor Camp Hale's legacy, we should take every measure to ensure today's veterans are provided the opportunity to actively participate in the stewardship of this unique landscape.

As I sit here today in the Chamber, I hear a call, a loud call, for a bipartisan amendment that everybody can get their arms around, so, Mr. Chair, I offer mine.

My amendment strengthens the underlying legislation by including veteran outreach and engagement activities as part of the management plan for Camp Hale.

Public lands are important vehicles to connect veterans to our national heritage and history. Many initiatives and programs have demonstrated the unique opportunities that the outdoors offer veterans to reconnect, recover, and heal after they return from the battlefield.

We should ensure today's veterans are a part of the management of Camp

Hale. By doing so, we honor not only the legacy of Camp Hale and the servicemembers who trained there but, also, those who continue to serve this country today.

While I am not from Colorado, I recognize that veterans across the country will flock to this wonderful, historic-designated area and engage in the activities and the outreach for veterans.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to claim time in opposition, although I am not opposed to the 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. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I will agree there is a good amendment here that we can all support.

The underlying bill designated 28,000-some-odd 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 Maryland (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 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 the time in opposition, though 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. NEGUSE. Mr. Chair, the section of the bill that the Representative referenced, in my reading of the bill and in my understanding of the bill, already includes some language that is nearly identical regarding Federal water rights.

But, that being said, I made a pledge to the distinguished gentleman from Utah just a few moments ago in the debate that we would continue working to try to get to consensus. So I will support this amendment, and I will encourage my colleagues on this side of the aisle in good faith to support this amendment as well, and I hope the sponsor of this amendment would take that good faith and recognize the same.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for his support for the amendment.

One of the important points of it, as with some of the subsequent amendments that we have, is to make sure that we are codifying the language so that it is understood.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. 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. TIPTON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. TIPTON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 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 53, after line 15, insert the following:

(c) GRAZING.—The grazing of livestock on covered land, if established before the date of enactment of this Act, shall be allowed to continue subject to such reasonable regulations as are considered to be necessary by the Secretary with jurisdiction over the covered land.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, 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. Chair, I rise today to support my amendment to be able 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.

In my roundtable discussions with local communities affected by Federal public lands, I routinely hear how important ranching is 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 would like to claim time in opposition.

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

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

Mr. Chair, this amendment would add language regarding existing grazing to a public land withdrawal that protects a sensitive landscape and its ranchers from mining.

As a reminder, the CORE Act is supported by many ranchers who have been involved with the Thompson Divide Coalition over the years and by the North Thompson and Coal Basin Cattlemen's Association because the bill would protect their ranching heritage on these lands for future generations.

So, ultimately, I don't think that this amendment is necessary, and I do worry about the potential for unintended consequences. For example, I hope that adding it does not somehow imply that the many withdrawals that Congress routinely enacts without such language would somehow restrict grazing; although, I know that that is not my colleague's intent.

Mr. Chair, I would ask the gentleman—I mean, if the gentleman is

willing to support the underlying bill if his amendment is adopted, then I would be happy to support it.

Mr. Chair, 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 importance of those grazing rights within those communities, something that is important to not only 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 withdrawal that the gentleman is proposing.

Mr. Chair, 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.

□ 1930

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

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 land identified on the map titled 'Curecanti National Recreation Area U.S. Forest Service/National Park Service Inter-agency 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 House Resolution 656, 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.

I appreciate the opportunity to address the Colorado Outdoor Recreation and Economy Act on the floor. We want to be able to ensure that the land being transferred from the Forest Service to the National Park Service management comply with the current memorandum of understanding.

During testimony before the Committee on Natural Resources committee hearing on the CORE Act on April 2, 2019, Acting Deputy Chief of the U.S. Forest Service, Chris French, identified the Soap Creek area within the Curecanti National Recreation Area as appropriate for continued active forest management, including fuel treatments, under the existing memorandum of understanding between the Forest Service and the National Parks Service.

This is a good amendment to be able to support. I would encourage my colleagues to get behind this and hope we can continue to have the continued cooperation that we are finally starting to be able to see on the floor.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chairman, I oppose this amendment. It does not reflect agency recommendations or on-the-ground support of title IV of this bill. Veiled behind the claim of compliance with existing management, this amendment is contrary to a long-standing agreement to transfer 2,560 acres of Forest Service land to the National Park Service, which is reflected in the CORE Act as written.

Both agencies have agreed that the transfer would benefit both the national recreation area and the national

forest, and the proposal has long enjoyed broad public support. This amendment is an attempt to both reduce the acreage included in the national recreation area and to prevent the most effective management of these lands.

And I think it is important, Mr. Chair, because we have talked a lot about stakeholder involvement, community-driven processes, and we have yet to receive any letter opposing a provision of the bill impacting a county in which that county ultimately has acreage involved; any letter of opposition. The only letter, in fact, that we have received of communication is from Gunnison County. Gunnison County strongly opposes this amendment. They were never consulted by the sponsor on this amendment, despite the area in question being in their county.

So ultimately, I would oppose this amendment, and I would encourage all members, respectfully, to vote against it.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, this is a current memorandum of 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 out of 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 communities, 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 purposes of, "managing 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, 2,560 acres, that 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 appreciate my colleague's comments, his passion. I am glad he has been to Montrose to be able to be there. I hope he spent a lot of money while he was there. We would appreciate that.

But it is interesting, going back to a comment that the gentleman made earlier, that just saying it doesn't make it so. We are hearing comments that there is broad-based support, there is no opposition. However, Montrose County, which the gentleman just cited, they may support a provision, but they oppose the CORE Act. So to be able to say there is broad, unanimous support is probably something that I think is not taking into consideration some of the concerns that we have heard.

I have just held round tables throughout our district, and there were concerns. And as I noted in my floor speech earlier, to be able to see some support, there is—because there is a lot of common ground in Colorado. It is just that we have not gone through all of the elements to be able to get this bill to the point where we will have

what I think we would all like to be able to have, and that is unanimous consent to be able to move forward.

When we are looking at this specific amendment—again, this is something that is being recommended, not by me but by the Forest Service, when we are talking about those management provisions to be able to maintain that current memorandum of understanding. This is, I think, something that is probably important for our area, an area where I travel, happen to live, and something that I hope that you will consider, and you will support.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Colorado has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Chairman, I would say, with respect to the technicalities in terms of active forest management and the interagency agreement, I suppose we will have to agree to disagree. And I appreciate the gentleman's point and, ultimately, we have clearly landed on different sides of that issue.

But, again, and I hate to belabor the point, it is important for those, you know, who may be watching these proceedings thousands of miles away back home in our home State for them to just appreciate the facts.

So we are clear, there are nine counties directly impacted by this legislation. There is one county, in my understanding, that my friend from the Third Congressional District is citing when he mentions potential opposition to the bill. But what he is not clarifying, or rather what has not been clarified, is there is no county of those nine that oppose the provision of the bill that impacts their community; not one. We have been here for an hour, and I have yet to hear of a single county, or a town, or a city council for that matter.

Facts matter. This bill has local support, and that local support extends to this title of the bill. The Gunnison County commissioners and the community in Gunnison have made that clear, which is why I would urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

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

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Chairman, we often hear the comment on this floor on public lands bills: These lands belong to all Americans. I appreciate and I do respect the support for the CORE Act in terms of the individual communities, but I think it belies the lifestyle on the western slope of Colorado, in particular. The people that traverse, work within different counties, feel the impacts on their businesses, have the impact of water flowing through those communities coming from another county, those are the issues that I think, unfortunately, are not taken into consideration by this bill.

I urge support of this amendment. It is a good piece of work to be able to

make sure that we are dealing with good forest management.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. CROW

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 6 printed in part B of House Report 116-264.

Mr. CROW. 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 37, after line 19, insert the following:
(g) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that military aviation training on Federal public lands in Colorado, including the training conducted at the High-Altitude Army National Guard Aviation Training Site, is critical to the national security of the United States and the readiness of the Armed Forces.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 656, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. CROW) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

I rise today to highlight the Colorado Army National Guard's High-Altitude Aviation Training Site, or HAATS, a program that all members of the Colorado delegation value deeply and support.

HAATS offers a hands-on experience for helicopter pilots in the science of flying at high altitudes where air pressure is significantly lower, and engines run hotter. Learning these skills is critical to successfully execute military operations and rescue missions in mountain terrain.

Each year HAATS trains over 400 air crews from all branches and components, including the National Guard, the Army, Army Reserves, and allies around the globe.

As a combat veteran, I served three tours in Iraq and Afghanistan, two of which were in Afghanistan where the terrain is rugged, unforgiving, and high altitude. The pilots with whom I served received HAATS training. Their skill, composure under pressure, and dedication is worthy of our praise.

With this amendment we honor the HAATS mission and recognize how crucial that mission is to our national security and the readiness of our Armed Forces.

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.

□ 1945

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 colleague 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 there.

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 and willing 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 relied on this training being conducted and the important mission that HAATS performs every year for all of our services.

But I also learned something else in the Army that—and you don't have to take my word for it—one of the best ways to get information, the best way to figure out what the soldiers and the troops need, is you talk to the folks on the ground, you talk to the folks on the front line.

Mr. Chair, I applaud the work of Senator BENNET and my very good friend and colleague Congressman JOE NEGUSE for doing just that, reaching out to our military commanders.

I want to read, very briefly, a letter that was sent to them by Major Gen-

eral 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 through the diligent efforts of staff within the department, the offices of the bill's sponsors, and the Department of Defense, who have mitigated prior concerns related to military overflight of the potential wilderness areas identified in the bill.

That is our commander. That is our top commander of the Colorado National Guard that manages this facility, the pilots, and 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 may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), my friend.

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 stress 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 with the responsibility to make sure that this mission has to go forward, have blessed this effort and said that their concerns are mitigated and that they are happy to support this effort.

So we, I think, owe it to our generals, to our soldiers, and to our troops to defer to their better judgment on this because they know this better than we do.

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 oftentimes 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 communities.

Although there is no cure or prevention for Downs, 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.

Iceland 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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PAPPAS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentlewoman from Michigan (Ms. STEVENS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Ms. STEVENS. 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 more 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, of 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."

□ 2000

For is it 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 markets before us.

We are closing out 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 cost U.S. 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 have 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 shining, incredible asset, 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 who live in the neighborhoods, 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?

So 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. A trade war 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 banking, insurance, housing.

And the lifeblood of our industrial base and good, bipartisan policymaking, of which I was a 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.

Some 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 nothing short of, an innovation renaissance.

We are waiting for the electric vehicle tax credit bill. We are waiting for

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 manufacturer in Livonia, 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.

Who and how are we paying for it? This is a referendum on our economic policy that is coming from agencies and administrators whom 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 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 mantra has a value for the people because, you see, this tax cut that we passed last Congress, that was passed last Congress without a Democratic vote, 80 percent of it going to the largest corporations, not doing anything for our middle class, not doing anything for our small and midsize manufacturers.

Remember that headline, "Cuts to Research Funding," sending us a generation back on scientific research. It is one of the reasons, as a subcommittee chair for the Research and Technology Subcommittee, we have had over a dozen hearings around how to manifest our country's research and technology agenda for inclusive growth.

Productivity. 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.

What do we do next? How do we reclaim this agenda of economic rights, of economic growth for everybody?

As Mr. Brynjolfsson went on to say in his testimony, for two centuries since 1776, since "The Wealth of Nations" was written, Americans benefited as we created an economic system that generated shared prosperity. But, over the past several decades, the benefits of economic growth have been much more unequal.

Not only has median income barely grown since the 1990s, as I previously stated, but other social indicators, have worsened. Deaths from despair, namely, suicide, drug addiction are skyrocketing. We also know that life expectancy has declined in this country for the third year in a row.

He goes on to say that these challenges, this schism of inequality and lack of productivity can be solved.

I have taken up that challenge and believe that a middle-class economic agenda can reverse course for us, reinvesting in public education, making higher education affordable, on-ramps and pathways to opportunities for the skilled workforce, tax credits for companies that want to do on-the-job training.

For is it not the case that our workforce spectrum, our future, those students being educated for the jobs that they are in demand to fill and those in the existing workplace who are swinging through the jungle gym of opportunities, making their way at their place of employment, they represent who we should be investing in.

They represent a phenomenal opportunity for us to support not the household name businesses, but the businesses that want to train those workers and deserve credit for doing so, the businesses that want to sell—I have a lot of them in Michigan who want to sell their products internationally—giving them the opportunity to do so through good policy that invests in global citizenry, invests in global outlook, and allows us to bring American innovation to the world.

The plight of American greatness in the post-9/11 era has been the plight of 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, 98 percent, and then today, an entirely different internet.

□ 2015

We now talk about the Internet of Things, the interconnectedness of devices through 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 look to revive some of the successful economic policies of 10 years ago, of pieces of legislation like the States' small business JOBS Act that spurred investment of American products into international markets.

We also raised 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 manufactured our way to a new world order, to the ringing notions of freedom that we helped to usher in throughout the West, creating a system of government that was admired and bestowed and that grew our middle class.

We recognize the troubling dilemma that we have with our rare earth minerals. In May, China, frustrated, threatened to cut off supply to the U.S. as part of the U.S. trade war, supply of these rare earth minerals that go into our devices that secure the production of some of our incredible innovations, like our smartphones.

America depends on China for 80 percent of its rare earth imports, and that is not a desirable position to be in. We must reclaim our supply chain. We have to reclaim or categorize an agenda for rare earth minerals.

The global rare earth market is projected to grow in value from \$8.1 billion to \$14.4 billion by 2025, as driven by the demand for electric vehicles, cell phones, and other products.

Here is a story of a manufacturer in Michigan, a company in Northville called soulbrain MI, that develops and delivers quality lithium-ion electrolytes in steel cases—which they are paying tens and tens of thousands more for, not realizing a profit—which is a core component of the lithium-ion batteries that go into our electric vehicles.

It is just one of two producers that we have in the United States, and yet they pay the price because of the policies, the overregulation, and the failure to support the small businesses and the manufacturers. The subsidies have gone to agriculture. And there was not one investment or change for our manufacturers, albeit, the several great pieces of legislation that we have passed out of the Science, Space, and Technology Committee.

Many of my colleagues are paying attention to this. Many of them are working on this, but we need the legislation to come to the floor. We need it to be voted on in the Senate, and we need to usher in a new manufacturing agenda.

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 revive 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 let's get 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 reeling with passion for our manufacturing economy and have profound excitement and only want to see it succeed through an economic agenda that I believe this House majority can usher in, that I believe that this Congresswoman from Michigan's 11th Congressional District can champion the great requests, but I would be remiss to leave out, in these remarks, another moment and marker in time as we will close out session tomorrow and resume our in-district work activity, recognizing that we will be hitting 1 year since this 116th Congress was elected—and how magnificent this year has been.

With so much energy and gusto, we made our way to freshman orientation shortly after that election—less than a week after—meeting our colleagues, meeting our deliberators, meeting those, the small, collective composite of us, the 435 of us in this House Chamber who are charged with making this Federal Government work for the American people.

Let me say, by the way, that this manufacturing agenda has tremendous return on investment should we so choose to embrace it as a nation. We know our House majority is ushering it in. We know we are balancing the equities and advocating for all components of a good trade deal, inspired by the Buy American content, pushing for the enforcement standards, embracing the need for certainty to come to our small and midsized manufacturers, the manufacturers in Michigan's 11th Congressional District, the people who are wondering: How will my taxpayer dollars work for me?

It has been an incredible moment in time to be a part of this 116th Congress. And while we will not be together as a body on both sides of the aisle to look at each other and to recognize what has happened in a year since what sometimes feels like dramatic action with elections, we can reflect on some of the moments that oftentimes don't even make it into news headlines or Twitter feeds or proclamations from Members of Congress, but ways in which we have embraced this new orientation of government in the Democratic House majority of our For the People agenda: bringing up issues for the labor movement, whether you belong to a union or not, for our middle class; the long overdue passage of Butch Lewis, the Butch Lewis Act, bringing the pensions of many to solvency, a classic example of doing nothing is greater than the cost of doing something; solving people's problems,

making their taxpayer dollars work, 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 that embraces 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 mark—without being in one another's presence—that we still have a lot of work to do.

The bipartisan elixir, in my humble opinion, is our manufacturing economy. It is our ability to make things. It is our ability to help the people whom I have spoken to directly, whose factory floors I have walked on, whose office rooms I have sat in looking at that pathway to growth, not disinvestment.

Too many have told me: We have had to invest elsewhere, we have had to remove 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 but for the Federal Government" approach to basic research investment that catalyzes and proliferates new technologies of scale.

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 most serious business 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, who resigned before he faced the judgment of this United States Congress.

Then, in 1998, I happen to have been here in this city, not an elected Mem-

ber of Congress, Mr. Speaker, but I came here into this city as a State senator from Iowa to an allied conference. As I opened up the newspaper, I saw in there that it said that there are impeachment hearings taking place in room 2141 of the Rayburn House Office Building for the dates of December 7, 8, and 9 of 1998.

I concluded that whatever was going on in that conference wasn't as important as me being seated there in that Judiciary Committee as a spectator to be able to witness the unfolding acts of history as the House of Representatives passed judgment upon then-President Bill Clinton.

As I listened to the testimony, and, of course, Mr. Speaker, I had been watching on television many of the other open public hearings that had taken place before the House Judiciary Committee, I was pretty well informed as to the charges that were being brought against Bill Clinton.

□ 2400

As I listened to that debate in those 3 days, December 7, 8, and 9 of 1998, I watched some other things go on around me that I would not have picked up if I had just been watching the committee hearings on C-SPAN. I remember Representative Barney Frank coming into the room. He wanted to ask questions of the witness and make his statement. They advised him that he had to have a tie on before he could be recognized. Then he went out and borrowed a tie from someone and made a big show out of tying that tie before he was recognized to speak before the Judiciary Committee.

I recall also that Democrats, in particular—in fact exclusively—didn't appear to be taking it seriously. When they were off the sight of the camera, they were joking, laughing, and cutting up outside the scenes. I thought that that was not the decorum that we should have when we have the most serious of constitutional issues before us, the very impeachment of a President of the United States and the prospect that that impeached President—relatively soon to be impeached President—would be standing trial before the United States Senate to determine whether the acts that he had been accused of, not convicted of, but accused of in the form of an indictment out of the House of Representatives, whether he was guilty of those violations, which by my recollection were perjury, subornation of perjury, and obstruction of justice.

It seems to me those were the three charges that made their way out the center aisle here in the House of Representatives and over to the United States Senate where Chief Justice Rehnquist presided over a trial in the United States Senate.

The question was: Was President Clinton guilty of the charges that were brought against him right here in this House of Representatives?

And if he was guilty, did those violations that he was found guilty of rise

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 to see how 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 walking 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 my back to 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 on down 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 caisson with President Kennedy's casket winding its way down Pennsylvania Avenue, winding its way out across the Potomac River, winding its way out 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 atrocity of the assassination of John F. Kennedy and what that meant, the blow to our Republic, the blow to the history of America, and the blow to the heart and soul of our country that took place when Lee Harvey Oswald pulled that trigger down in Dallas that day.

I thought about what our country had gone through from 1963 until that year in 1998, when we had gone from grieving for a President lost and aspirations not achieved because of a President lost, to a place where we have a President elected who, I believe, so disrespected the office that he conducted himself in it and next to it in a way that was never imagined by our Founding Fathers and in a way that I won't describe here on the floor of the House of Representatives.

It washed over me on that day, Mr. Speaker, what had taken place and what had been taking place in the Oval Office of the President of the United States and the rooms adjoining the Oval Office, the disrespect and in a way the desecration of that respect for the office that we so embrace and hold so dear.

It was so difficult for us to say goodbye to President Kennedy and not that many years later put our Nation through this impeachment hearing of a President who, I believe, did lie under oath, did direct others to lie under oath, and did obstruct justice along the way.

There were four charges brought to him here on the floor of 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 good personal relationship with him, 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 subornation 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 I believe were committed by President Bill Clinton rose to the level that he should be removed from office.

As I said, my junior Senator walked down that aisle—as did 99 other Senators—and signed the book to do impartial justice under the law and under the Constitution. He walked back up that center aisle, he stepped out those double doors outside the Senate Chamber straight down through the rotunda where we are today, stepped up to the microphones, and he said: I will never vote to remove Bill Clinton from office. No matter what, I will not vote to remove Bill Clinton from office.

The ink wasn't dry on his pledge to do impartial justice under the law and the Constitution, and he already took a pledge not to do impartial justice under the law and the Constitution. He had already drawn his conclusions.

Here is what happened with many of the Democrats that would refuse to vote to remove Bill Clinton from office: they stepped out before those same microphones over and over again and said—because the question was such as: Is he guilty and should be removed from office, all that wrapped up in one. Then the question was, Mr. Speaker, for them, they said: Well, I didn't have to decide whether he had actually committed perjury or obstruction of justice or subornation of perjury, because even if he had, I didn't think it rose 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 the same statement: No matter whether he is guilty or not of perjury, obstruction of justice, or subornation of perjury, so what? It didn't rise to the level that he should be removed from office.

So they voted 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.

But they held that ground, I believe, for partisan reasons, Mr. Speaker. Now, the legacy of that history echoes back over here to the House of Representatives and may echo back to the United States Senate again, if whatever a President is charged with, no matter whether he is guilty or not, doesn't rise to the level that he should be removed from office, then I guess the Senate is not going to remove him from office by a two-thirds vote margin which is required by the Constitution.

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 subornation of perjury?

The biggest thing they have charged him with is collusion, and that is a laugher. 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 never 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 I just signed 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 politicized operation and organization.

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, this is a partisan 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 be, 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 wiretapping 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. Once he was advised of that by an admiral, 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 wasn't being bugged 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.

□ 2045

They tried to do so with their undercutting 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 or so later—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 12, 2016, 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 God-given freedom and liberty that we are trying to restore, protect, or advance, wherever it might be. George Soros was the headliner.

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 launched 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, D.C.

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 understood—they, in the Mandarin Hotel—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 names, 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 supremacist.”

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 none” really means 100 to 200 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. The LexisNexis 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,” and that is the term that is most weaponized. All the rest of these are weaponized also.

So when you weaponize the term, it changes the meaning of it, and they know that. They turn it into a pejorative term. I asked a couple of more senior Members who have served in this House of Representatives just last weekend: What do those terms mean?

They said: They don’t belong in our language. I never heard that language.

I sat down here this morning with a gray-haired Member of the House of Representatives who grew up in a similar era that I did, from the South, and

he said: We never used those terms. We don’t know what they mean in common language.

Well, they were weaponized, and the definitions that the people wanted them to have in that Mandarin Hotel November 12 through 15 of 2016 are the definitions that have been applied to those terms, and they are using them against people.

That is just one thing. But they also determined that there were going to be demonstrations across America. These demonstrations ensued in city after city, all over the country. They had to be funded. People didn’t have anything to be aggrieved about until they were told that they weren’t going to be happy with President-elect Trump. So they began to demonstrate.

It culminated here in this city, June 20, 2017, Mr. Speaker. That is when we came together to celebrate the inauguration of President Donald Trump.

I traveled around this city. I was here for the inauguration, and I traveled to the events that it was important that I attend. Everywhere I went, the city was jam-packed full of these ladies in their silly pink hats. I won’t describe for the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD what they called them, Mr. Speaker, but they were everywhere. They had posters and signs just replete with all the obscenities that one could imagine.

I believe there were more people here protesting the inauguration of Donald Trump than were here celebrating the Presidency and the inauguration of Donald Trump. They jammed the streets. They stood in front of our car, and they blocked our traffic. They descended upon me in a McDonald’s over there in a part of town.

I thought I actually ought to have something to eat that day, and I ended up with about 200 of them in pink hats surrounding me. I thought, I will just debate them down to the last one. I kept asking them, “Why are you here?”

“We are here to demonstrate for women’s rights.”

So I just kept asking them, “What rights do men have that women don’t have?”

That stumped every one of them. They didn’t have a single answer to that question, out of 200 or so that approached me in that McDonald’s that day. But I saw what they did in this city, and I asked them.

They complained they didn’t have enough money to pay for their health insurance, the Affordable Care Act. The un-Affordable Care Act is the more accurate way to describe it. But they had been able to buy a plane ticket from Phoenix to Washington, D.C., and a couple of hotel rooms so they could be there to demonstrate in their pink hats.

Who funded that? It wasn’t out of their pocket, Mr. Speaker. I would suspect it was out of the pockets of George Soros and his subordinates. But that bill is the foundation for what is going on here. It gets us into this new year. That was January 20, 2017.

Shortly after Donald Trump was inaugurated President of the United States, he had a meeting with James Comey. James Comey was interviewing for the job as Director of the FBI. There was also an interview with Robert Mueller, who I believe did not tell the truth, even though he was under oath. But the record showed that he was interviewing for the job of Director of the FBI as well.

James Comey went outside his meeting in the Oval Office with President Trump, sat down, and typed up from his memory what he believed was the exchange between Donald Trump and James Comey. In short order, he took it up to Columbia University and handed it over to a law professor, who was a friend of his, with either the direct or the implied, explicit or implied directions: Leak this information in the private meeting with Donald Trump to The New York Times.

The objective is to upset this country in such a way that they 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, who 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 wished he hadn’t accepted that advice, 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 falling 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 you 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 comes 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 and his lover, Lisa Page, it 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.

□ 2100

So, surely, James Comey gave us good advice that Robert Mueller will be the man who can pull this information out and document the transgressions of Donald Trump so that we can impeach him and remove him from office because of that animosity that exists when a person steps up and tells the truth and tells America first and says we are going to restore the respect for the rule of law and we are going to restore our border security and we are going to restore our American strengths.

All of these points that come forward—America first—all of that was apparently anathema to the people in the Department of Justice and the FBI and other departments—the CIA, for example.

So we saw, as this unfolded, this great anticipation that the Mueller report was going to bring forth these items, multiple items, that would be just cause to impeach Donald Trump. And it landed with a big thud because we had open hearings, and the testimony of Robert Mueller fell flat for a number of reasons.

Some said that he wasn't astute enough to be able to deliver the Mueller report effectively. That may or may not be true.

But I will make the argument that the real reason was lack of substance. If there had been substance there, someone on the Democrat side of the Judiciary Committee—maybe several, and most likely several—would have pulled that substance out and brought that forward so that we would know what it was in the Mueller report that they thought should be worthy of impeaching the President of the United States.

Well, if you remember, Mr. Speaker, when the Mueller report landed and Robert Mueller testified before the committee and his testimony came out to be very empty and vacant and vacuous, there was a silence out of the Democrats for, oh, a couple of weeks like: What are we going to do? We are still determined that there must be something in the Mueller report that we can use to impeach the President, but we don't know what. We don't know what we can make stick with the American people.

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 eventually.

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 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 I take you back to 1974 and we talk about the Nixon impending impeachment—not the actual, but the impending impeachment—and we 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 reelect 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 that they 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.

We were involved in the Vietnam war at the time. We had Vietnamization. Peace with honor was the message that President Nixon was involved in. And we were having success; I would say, from my memory, significant success.

But President Nixon decided that the violations of the law that took place in the Watergate break-in, he made a decision to try to cover it up. Rather than stepping forward and saying these people need to be frog-marked into justice and we are going to clean this up and it never was anything that was commanded from on high out of Nixon's office, instead, he set about trying to cover it up, which was a dramatic mistake in judgment by the President of the United States.

Had he been successful and we had never heard about this, the Vietnam war may have had an entirely different result, Mr. Speaker.

So, President Nixon had a number of things, a number of responsibilities to weigh 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 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 in the beginning as 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 trail, 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 a choice on who they wanted to be 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 messages 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, and, after having excoriated them for their effort to upset our elections here, their response was: So 13 of our Russian hackers were in a building in Russia and they created this much chaos in the United States of America for \$100,000 worth of ads and 13 of them working in 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 to give 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. Thirteen Russians, and we were all tied in knots for 2 years, \$25 million to maybe as high as \$30 million of the Muller 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 is reflected within the 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—and I have heard him in his own voice and person say this—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 \$50,000 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 dangled 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 not coming back." And he said—and I can't say these words here on the floor, but it was son of 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 enforce a shutdown of an investigation 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 is not a political rival right now, Mr. Speaker. He is a candidate in a Democratic primary for President of the United States that started out with, I

don't 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 of 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 for corruption, and he has an obligation 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. And I have read the language. 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 good judgment and leadership, but following the law that compelled him to ensure that corruption was being cleaned up in Ukraine before U.S. aid could go into Ukraine.

□ 2115

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 make the motive stick, and 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 impeachment 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 to protect and preserve. 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 kicked 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 Richard M. Nixon, President of the United States of America. The committee shall report to the House of Representatives such resolutions, articles of impeachment, 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. The chairman, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them (or, with respect to any deposition, answer to interrogatory, or affidavit, any person authorized by law to administer oaths) may administer oaths to any witness. For the purpose of this section, "things" includes, without limitation, books, records, correspondence, logs, journals, memorandums, papers, documents, writings, drawings, graphs, charts, photographs, reproductions, recordings, tapes, transcripts, printouts, 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.

Sec. 3. For the purpose of making such investigation, the committee, and any sub-

committee 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 or without the United States, whether the House is meeting, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings, as it deems necessary.

Sec. 4. Any funds made available to the Committee on the Judiciary under House Resolution 702 of the Ninety-third Congress, adopted November 15, 1973, or made available for the purpose hereafter, may be expended for the purpose of carrying out the investigation authorized and directed by this resolution.

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 William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States of America. The committee shall report to the House of Representatives such resolutions, articles of impeachment, 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. The chairman, or ranking minority member, or any member designated by either of them (or, with respect to any deposition, answer to interrogatory, or affidavit, any person authorized by law to administer oaths) may administer oaths to any witness. For the purposes of this section, "things" includes, without limitation, books, records, correspondence, logs, journals, memorandums, papers, documents, writings, drawings, graphs, charts, photographs, reproductions, recordings, tapes, transcripts, printouts, 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, when you lay them down side-by-side and you read them, they come out and say, "Authorizing and directing the Com-

mittee on the Judiciary to investigate whether sufficient grounds exist for the impeachment of William Jefferson Clinton, President of the United States." The committee—this says, "Resolved, that the Committee on the Judiciary"—this is Nixon—"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 of Impeachment, and other recommendations as it deems proper."

This is substantively the same. The provisions in here, the language varies a little bit in the preambles, but the provisions in here are identical, because they had an understanding that they needed to be in conformance with the constitution. Mr. Speaker, with history, with the sense of fairness and trust and knowing that antiquity would look back on this and see how did they conduct themselves in the House of Representatives when they were faced with this question of whether or not to impeach a President of the United States.

Well, I have this other resolution here, Mr. Speaker. This is H. Res—it's before the Rules Committee tonight, it doesn't have a number on it now as I have it, it is not at all like the resolutions, the identical resolutions of Richard Nixon and Bill Clinton.

And it is also curious that in modern times we have gone back to this impeachment over and over again where the only other impeachment up until Richard Nixon was Andrew Johnson shortly after the Civil War.

But here is what we have. This is I think the ADAM SCHIFF resolution. It says: "The chair . . . shall designate an open hearing or hearings pursuant to this section."

Well great, we went down to the SCIF and shined sunlight on that, and now they have capitulated to the pressure that 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, one. It is 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 room and conduct their secret hearings with their secret rules and the public can't see in, 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 the body language and determine the demeanor and veracity of the witnesses. That is not going to happen

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 says 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 ADAM SCHIFF can decide if he wants to question a witness for beyond 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 but the time, “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 it, “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.

“ . . . 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 . . . subpoena. . . .”

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, oh, he is free to 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 speaker on a question of a subpoena 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 the report would go to 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 this 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 Affairs 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, too bad, 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.

“ . . . Judiciary is authorized 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 CONTINUE 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

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, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

BILL PRESENTED 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.

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, 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

	2020	2021	2022	2023	2024	2025	2026	2027	2028	2029	2020-2024	2020-2029
Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Effects	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	2	3

Components may not sum to totals because of rounding

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.

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. 926); 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. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(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 Bureau 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 18-074, 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 18-111, 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 19-027, 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.

2799. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of

State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 18-099, 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.

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 19-033, 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.

2802. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 19-013, 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.

2803. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting Transmittal No. DDTC 19-024, 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.

2804. 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.

2805. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of

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 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2806. 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.

2807. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administration for Regulatory Programs, NMFS Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Subsistence Taking of Northern Fur Seals on the Pribilof Islands [Docket No.: 190926-0046] (RIN: 0648-BH25) 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 Natural Resources.

2808. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Visas: Ineligibility Based on Public Charge Grounds [Public Notice: 10922] (RIN: 1400-AE87) 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 the Judiciary.

2809. 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 Thiafentanyl 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. 868); 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 of Representatives inquiry 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 Social Security Act to require PDP sponsors of a prescription drug plan under part D of the Medicare program that use a formulary to include certain generic drugs and biosimilar biological products on such formulary, 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. RUSH (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KING of New York, Ms. BASS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COOPER, Mr. COX of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. MOORE, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. ROUDA, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi):

H.R. 4914. A bill to provide for the issuance of the Diabetes Prevention Semipostal Stamp, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. CROW):

H.R. 4915. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide loan guarantees for the acquisition of cybersecurity technology and services by eligible small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Ms. LOFGREN (for herself, Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. SIMPSON, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. COX of California, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BAIRD, Mr. HARDER of California, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. COLE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. CURTIS, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. GIBBS, Ms. SLOTKIN, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. CORREA, Mr. MITCHELL, Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico, Mr. NUNES, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. REED, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. STIVERS, Mr. SCHRAEDER, Mr. UPTON, Ms. CRAIG, Mr. YOUNG, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. VELA, Ms. SPANBERGER, Mrs. TORRES of California, Ms. SCHRIER, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 4916. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for terms and conditions for nonimmigrant workers performing agricultural labor or 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 Ms. GABBARD (for herself, Mr. KIM, Mr. COOK, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. ROUZER, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma):

H.R. 4917. A bill to direct the Secretary of Defense to conduct a study on the renovation, repair, or expansion needs of certain elementary schools and secondary schools that educate dependants of active duty military personnel; to the Committee on 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 emerging growth companies but for the 5-year restriction on emerging growth companies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. CRAIG (for herself, Mr. SMUCKER, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GIBBS, 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. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee, Ms. MENG, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mrs. WALORSKI, Ms. FOX of North Carolina, Mr. PENCE, and Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma):

H.R. 4920. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for an exception to certain small business contracting requirements applicable to the Department of Veterans Affairs procurement of certain 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 and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 4922. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide a tax credit for angel investors in start-up businesses, to provide a credit for wages paid by start-up businesses to their first employees, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mrs. DINGELL:

H.R. 4923. A bill to amend part E of title IV of the Social Security Act to require States to follow certain procedures in placing a child who has been removed from the custody of his or her parents; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. ESHOO (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. COSTA, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. TORRES of California, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. PORTER, Mr. CORREA, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. LEVIN of California, Mr. PETERS, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 4924. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to conduct research on wildfire smoke, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, 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. HUIZENGA:

H.R. 4925. A bill to require the Secretary of Health and Human Services to award grants to support community-based coverage entities to carry out a coverage program that provides to qualifying individuals health coverage and educational and occupational training, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Education and

Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. LEVIN of California (for himself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. SCHRIER, and Mr. TURNER):

H.R. 4926. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow for a credit against tax for sales at retail of safe firearm storage devices; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCEACHIN (for himself, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. CRAIG, Ms. NORTON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. VAN DREW, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. HAALAND, Mr. SOTO, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN):

H.R. 4927. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reduce the applicable percentage under the premium assistance tax credit for households with young adults; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MENG (for herself, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. HAALAND, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Ms. OMAR, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. TITUS, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 4928. A bill to establish the National Office of New Americans, to reduce obstacles to United States citizenship, to support the integration of immigrants and refugees into the social, cultural, economic and civic life of our shared Nation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committees on Education and Labor, House Administration, Foreign Affairs, and Homeland Security, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MOULTON (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. TRONE, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. CISNEROS, and Mr. FITZPATRICK):

H.R. 4929. A bill to improve communication from executive agencies to individuals by requiring clear instructions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 4930. A bill to amend the Federal Lands Recreation Enhancement Act to provide for a lifetime National Recreational Pass for any veteran with a service-connected disability; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, 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. RYAN:

H.R. 4931. A bill to establish a competitive grant program within the Department of Commerce to support nationwide growth and success of business incubators; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on 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. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. WELCH, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, and Ms. MATSUI):

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. BRENDAN F. BOYLE 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. HICE of Georgia, Mr. ABRAHAM, Mr. GAETZ, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. GIANFORTE, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. CONAWAY, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. BABIN, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KING of Iowa, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. LATTA, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. SPANO, Mrs. WAGNER, Ms. GRANGER, Ms. CHENEY, Mrs. MILLER, Mrs. ROBY, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mrs. HARTZLER, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. BUCSHON):

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 of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. HICE 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 Agriculture.

By Mr. GREEN 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. SWALWELL of California):

H. Res. 664. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of October as "National Domestic Violence Awareness Month"; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KEATING:

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. TLAIB, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, and Ms. LEE of California):

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 providing for bipartisan subpoena authority during the 116th Congress; to the Committee on Rules.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

143. 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.

144. Also, a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, 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

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

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 4915.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Ms. LOFGREN:

H.R. 4916.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 4 provides Congress with the power to establish a "uniform rule of Naturalization."

By Ms. GABBARD:

H.R. 4917.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The United State 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

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 4920.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, authorized by Congress' power to "provide for the common Defense and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. BERA:
H.R. 4921.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, 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 1 of the United States Constitution

By Mrs. DINGELL:
H.R. 4923.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By 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 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LEVIN of California:
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. MCEACHIN:
H.R. 4927.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. MENG:
H.R. 4928.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the Constitution

By Mr. MOULTON:
H.R. 4929.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. RUIZ:
H.R. 4930.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 18 of section 8 of article I 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.

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. THOMPSON of California:
H.R. 4932.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I

By Mr. VEASEY:
H.R. 4933.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Sec. 8.

By Mrs. WALORSKI:
H.R. 4934.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The Supreme Court's Commerce Clause precedents and under the Constitution's grants of powers to Congress under the Equal Protection, Due Process, and Enforcement Clauses of the Fourteenth Amendment.

By Mr. WRIGHT:
H.R. 4935.
Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:
Article 1, Section 8

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 3: 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. 463: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H.R. 486: Ms. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 511: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 587: 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. GOODEN.

H.R. 832: Mr. CARTWRIGHT.
H.R. 906: Mr. STIVERS, Mr. CRENSHAW, Mr. LAMB, and Mr. PETERSON.
H.R. 912: Mr. NADLER, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SANCHEZ, Ms. OMAR, Mr. CLAY, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. SCANLON, Mr. COHEN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. SHERRILL, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. SLOTKIN, Ms. BARRAGÁN, 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: Mrs. AXNE.

H.R. 996: Mr. FLEISCHMANN.
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'HALLERAN, and Mr. DOGGETT.

H.R. 1137: Mr. EVANS.
H.R. 1152: Mr. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 1161: Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 1175: Mr. WRIGHT, Mr. BURCHETT, Mr. PALAZZO, Mrs. TRAHAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ROUZER, Mr. FULCHER, Mr. FLORES, Mr. CUELLAR, 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. 1367: Mr. RUSH, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 1380: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.
H.R. 1418: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Mr. VISCLOSKEY.

H.R. 1450: Ms. WATERS, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, and Ms. SCHRIER.
H.R. 1468: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. MENG, and Ms. SANCHEZ.
H.R. 1479: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Ms. STEFANK.

H.R. 1597: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. CISNEROS, Mr. CROW, Mr. OLSON, and Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 1642: Mr. GUEST.
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. 1819: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 1869: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. PETERSON, and Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 1873: Mr. COOK and Mr. CASE.
H.R. 1923: Ms. ESCOBAR, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. BEYER, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mrs. AXNE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. SANCHEZ, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. ENGEL.

H.R. 1959: Mr. DIAZ-BALART.
H.R. 1962: Mr. GALLAGHER.
H.R. 1978: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 2013: Mr. QUIGLEY.
H.R. 2117: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.
H.R. 2146: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2153: Ms. BASS, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Mrs. DINGELL.
H.R. 2166: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 2178: Mrs. BEATTY and Mr. JEFFRIES.
H.R. 2208: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 2214: Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 2261: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 2328: Mrs. MILLER.
H.R. 2339: Mr. MCNERNEY and Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 2402: Mr. PAPPAS.
H.R. 2417: Mr. RASKIN.
H.R. 2419: Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 2467: Ms. NORTON.
H.R. 2508: Mr. FOSTER.

H.R. 2664: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 2669: 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: Mrs. TRAHAN.
H.R. 2863: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 2895: 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: Mrs. AXNE.
H.R. 2986: Ms. HAALAND and Mrs. LURIA.

H.R. 3073: Mr. COOPER.
H.R. 3077: Ms. KENDRA S. HORN of Oklahoma.
H.R. 3107: Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. DAVIS of California, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 3113: 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. BARRAGÁN, Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. LATTI, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. EMMER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mrs. RODGERS of Washington, and Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 3119: Mr. LUJÁN.
H.R. 3131: Mr. ROGERS of Alabama and Ms. STEFANK.
H.R. 3157: Ms. TITUS.
H.R. 3165: Mrs. LEE of Nevada.
H.R. 3215: Mr. SOTO.
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. 3243: Mr. SPANO.
H.R. 3328: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. MEEKS, and Mr. GRIJALVA.
H.R. 3350: Mr. CHABOT.
H.R. 3437: Mr. RUSH.
H.R. 3446: Mr. LARSEN of Washington.

H.R. 3451: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Ms. WEXTON.
H.R. 3452: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
H.R. 3479: Ms. MUCARSEL-POWELL.

- H.R. 3509: Ms. WATERS.
H.R. 3524: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Ms. SPEIER, and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3529: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.
H.R. 3598: Mr. GALLAGHER, Mr. STIVERS, and Ms. SLOTKIN.
H.R. 3668: Ms. DELAURO and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.
H.R. 3702: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 3708: Mr. BERA and Mr. CRENSHAW.
H.R. 3735: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 3742: Ms. SCANLON.
H.R. 3794: Mr. BACON.
H.R. 3798: Mrs. NAPOLITANO and Ms. MOORE.
H.R. 3817: Ms. HAALAND and Ms. JACKSON LEE.
H.R. 3829: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 3836: Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 3846: Mr. NEGUSE.
H.R. 3849: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 3884: Mr. CÁRDENAS and Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 3951: Mr. LYNCH and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3957: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, and Ms. LEE of California.
H.R. 3973: Mr. MALINOWSKI and Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.
H.R. 4031: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 4056: Mr. TRONE.
H.R. 4096: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 4098: Mr. RIGGLEMAN.
H.R. 4100: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 4104: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
H.R. 4193: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Ms. STEVENS.
H.R. 4228: Mr. RUTHERFORD and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 4230: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. CASE, and Mr. POSTER.
H.R. 4232: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 4304: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. YOUNG.
H.R. 4348: Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. HASTINGS, and Ms. DEAN.
H.R. 4429: Mr. RYAN.
H.R. 4519: Mr. KILMER, Ms. WILD, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Ms. LOFGREN, and Ms. DEGETTE.
H.R. 4527: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 4540: Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. MOORE, Mr. STOZZI, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. EVANS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. LEWIS, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BEYER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. KEATING, Mr. VELA, Mr. GOODEN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mrs. TRAHAN, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Mr. GOLDEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 4550: Ms. BARRAGÁN.
H.R. 4621: Ms. UNDERWOOD.
H.R. 4639: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 4640: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 4667: Mr. MALINOWSKI and Mr. CROW.
H.R. 4671: Mr. PASCRELL.
H.R. 4679: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, and Mr. CASE.
H.R. 4708: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SOTO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. MENG, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 4709: Mr. PAYNE, Mr. SOTO, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 4730: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 4732: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 4754: Ms. GARCIA of Texas.
H.R. 4794: Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.
H.R. 4828: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 4862: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. MEEKS.
H.R. 4864: Mr. GRIJALVA and Ms. HAALAND.
H.R. 4868: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. SPANO, Mr. WALKER, and Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.
H.R. 4886: Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 4910: Mr. ROUDA.
H. J. Res. 2: Ms. JACKSON LEE and Mr. CLEAVER.
H. J. Res. 38: Mr. ROSE of New York.
H. J. Res. 72: Mr. CORREA.
H. J. Res. 76: Mr. SERRANO.
H. Con. Res. 20: Ms. HOULAHAN.
H. Con. Res. 37: Mr. HICE of Georgia and Mr. WRIGHT.
H. Res. 69: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
H. Res. 230: Mr. KEATING.
H. Res. 277: Mr. KILMER.
H. Res. 349: Mr. CICILLINE and Mr. MEEKS.
H. Res. 410: Mr. MEEKS and Mr. CICILLINE.
H. Res. 538: Mr. TRONE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. CORREA, and Mrs. FLETCHER.
H. Res. 621: Ms. GABBARD, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. SABLAN, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.
H. Res. 628: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Res. 633: Mr. KELLER and Mr. BUCK.
H. Res. 649: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LEVIN of Michigan, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, and Ms. GARCIA of Texas.