

Wasserman	Wild	Wittman
Schultz	Williams (GA)	Womack
Weber (TX)	Williams (NY)	Yakym
Webster (FL)	Williams (TX)	Zinke
Wenstrup	Wilson (FL)	
Westerman	Wilson (SC)	

NAYS—23

Blumenauer	Jayapal	Takano
Bowman	Lee (PA)	Tlaib
Bush	Massie	Torres (NY)
Carson	McGovern	Underwood
Frost	Ocasio-Cortez	Velázquez
Garcia (IL)	Omar	Waters
Huffman	Pressley	Watson Coleman
Jackson (IL)	Ramirez	

NOT VOTING—14

Arrington	Jackson Lee	Phillips
Boebert	Joyce (OH)	Scanlon
Castro (TX)	Lesko	Sessions
DeSaulnier	Napolitano	Wexton
Garbarino	Newhouse	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1756

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: “A resolution condemning the support of Hamas, Hezbollah, and other terrorist organizations at institutions of higher education, which may lead to the creation of a hostile environment for Jewish students, faculty, and staff, condemning anti-semitism on college campuses, and supporting the right of Jewish students to exercise their First Amendment rights.”.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. TORRES of New York. Mr. Speaker, on rollcall No. 578, I voted “nay” when I intended to vote “yea.”

□ 1800

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2024

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 838 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4821.

Will the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MEUSER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1801

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. 4821) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, with Mr. MEUSER (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today,

amendment No. 78 printed in House Report 118-261 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MR. BURLISON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 79 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the final rule of the Environmental Protection Agency titled “Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act” and published December 15, 2009 (74 Fed. Reg. 66496).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which would prohibit funds to implement the final EPA rule titled: “Endangerment and Cause or Contribute Findings for Greenhouse Gases Under Section 202(a) of the Clean Air Act.”

Mr. Chair, on December 7, 2009, this rule was signed by the EPA Administrator, and it found that six greenhouse gases endanger both the public health and the public welfare of humans, specifically emissions from motor vehicles.

Since this rule has been implemented, we have seen some of the most radical and asinine decisions and regulations come from the executive branch. This includes strict regulations on car emissions and the Big Government attempt to dismantle the gas-powered vehicle. It includes power plant regulations that have shut down coal plants, killing thousands of jobs along the way. It includes the use of taxpayer dollars to bribe people into buying electric vehicles and solar panels with someone else’s money. It includes the Paris climate accord, a terrible deal that sold America’s sovereignty to international bureaucrats in exchange for energy poverty here at home, all while China and India get to continue increasing their emissions for decades.

What have the American people gotten from these policies? Nothing.

These policies cost hundreds of billions of dollars, and the American people are left scratching their heads, looking for what their benefit is.

The worst part is that these policies do more harm than good because the radical environmentalists have gotten their way in the past decade, and the American people are left dealing with the fallout.

In California, we have seen brown-outs and blackouts as a result of the closure of coal plants. We have seen skyrocketing prices at the pumps because this administration won’t expand drilling or fracking in United States territory.

In Texas, during Winter Storm Uri, we saw a horrible blackout 2 years ago because of its dependency on unreliable sources of energy. To think that, in the 21st century, Americans would have to face these challenges and, in the case of Texas, that Americans would freeze to death—over 150 people froze to death—is unacceptable. It is all because we want to prevent the use of energy that creates carbon emissions.

News flash: We depend as a nation on coal, natural gas, and oil. Without it, we are a poor nation.

The benefits of using our resources outweigh the potential cost of emitting carbon dioxide into the atmosphere.

The regulation that this amendment defunds is the root of the environmental insanity we have been dealing with for the past decade. It is time to show the American people that we have their backs and that we are done appeasing the radical environmentalists.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, we are now only 15 days away from a government shutdown, and instead of focusing on keeping the government open, we are working on a bill that is going nowhere.

The draconian cuts proposed in this bill violate the agreement reached by former Speaker MCCARTHY and President Biden that were memorialized in statute in Public Law 118-5, the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023.

We would not be teetering on the brink of a government shutdown if my Republican colleagues had held up their end of the bargain.

Furthermore, we are here to protect the welfare of the American public. We cannot close our eyes to the impacts of climate change, such as the drought, flooding, severe storms, and wildfire events we are experiencing.

As of October 10, the United States has experienced 24 confirmed weather climate disaster events with losses exceeding \$1 billion each. This is a new record.

This amendment seeks to prohibit funding to further understand greenhouse gases, which will result in more resilient communities, mitigate the impacts of climate change, and protect our world for future generations.

Not investing in strategies that minimize and prevent the acceleration of climate change and instead paying billions in disaster relief shows my Republican colleagues are not thinking about what is best for the American

taxpayer. Our economy, health, livelihoods, food security, and quality of life all depend on healthy ecosystems.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and focus instead on addressing climate change and making our Nation stronger.

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

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Chairman, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle argue that greenhouse gases are an endangerment that we need to eliminate. This is a one-sided view that completely ignores the enormous benefits that fossil fuels have had while only focusing on the rise in temperatures.

Their climate hysteria assumes that any warming is caused by these gases and that it is a catastrophe. That is simply not accurate and ignores the destruction that is caused by their agenda.

Just ask the hundreds of people, many of whom lost their lives in Texas during Winter Storm Uri. Just ask the energy-poor nations around the world that have a much lower standard of living than us.

The endangerment rule, which my amendment defunds, is based on a narrow, one-sided view that refuses to look at the ramifications of banning fossil fuels.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I will point out one thing that my colleague said in what I thought was a very misguided argument.

He said the benefits of using our resources outweigh the costs. He said we ignore the benefits of fossil fuels by only focusing on rising temperatures and that this is our agenda. I want to be perfectly clear. Climate change is not my agenda. It is not the Democrats' agenda. It is the majority of all scientists' agenda around the world. It is the majority of facts based on what is going on with adverse weather, warming oceans, warming temperatures, and the hottest summer on record.

To say we are just looking at our agenda completely denies the challenges that we are facing today. There are plenty of benefits of fossil fuels. In fact, we have benefited from fossil fuels for generations. We have become an incredibly wealthy Nation. I don't deny that.

For all of us, we would rather continue with the status quo, but the fact is that we know how to create renewable energy, how to reduce our dependence on fossil fuels, and how to reduce the warming of our planet. It is our responsibility. It is not an agenda or sort of a whim or a fad. It is our responsibility.

That is what we are here to do, to protect the American public, to protect it for future generations.

I don't know about my colleague, but I have three children and seven grand-

children. Each one of those grandchildren, if not today, if not tomorrow, then when they are old enough to talk, are going to say: Grandma, what were you doing when the planet was melting? What did you do when you had the resources, ability, and scientific knowledge to convert to renewable resources? Yet, you decided to say: I am just going to stick my head in the sand and pretend the science doesn't exist. I am going to pretend that none of this matters and is some kind of an agenda or a fluke. I am just going to put my faith in the fossil fuel industry.

We know what to do here and know what our responsibility is here. To neglect that and not continue to do what we are supposed to do to reduce the impact and mitigate the influence of climate change is completely going against our responsibility to the American public and to future generations.

Mr. Chair, I ask my colleagues to reject this amendment. I ask my colleagues to continue to support the work that we are currently doing in this country to mitigate the impact of climate change.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 80 OFFERED BY MR. BURLISON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 80 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement Executive Order 14057 (relating to Catalyzing Clean Energy Industries and Jobs Through Federal Sustainability) (86 Fed. Reg. 70935; Dec. 8, 2021).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. BURLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment, which would prohibit funds to Executive Order No. 14507, "Catalyzing Clean Energy Industries and Jobs Through Federal Sustainability."

□ 1815

This executive order is another example of how this administration is more than willing to waste the taxpayers' time and energy in furthering a radical climate agenda. It manipulates the Federal Government that they must achieve a carbon pollution-free electricity sector by 2035 and net zero emissions no later than 2050.

The text of the order declares that the Federal Government will lead by example and cut out carbon emissions.

However, is this administration really leading by example?

Has John Kerry stopped using private jets?

Has Pete Buttigieg?

Of course not. This hypocrisy is exactly why I filed this amendment.

The amendment defunds an executive order that wastes taxpayer dollars and continues our country down a path of dangerous energy policies. Unfortunately, this administration knows this is the result of the order, and they are more than willing to place these burdens on the American people. They are willing to waste money in reconfiguring buildings and buying fleets of new electric vehicles all on the backs of our taxpayers. They are also in favor of new regulations that will suppress our energy industries.

Nonetheless, do you know what, Mr. Chairman?

They will be fine because they don't have to feel the repercussions of their policies. It will be everyday Americans who will see their utility bills go up. It will be our constituents who are left unable to pay their bills or afford gas. It will be the average person who is experiencing blackouts because we have shifted towards unreliable sources of electricity instead of reliable baseload energy sources.

Again, those who drafted this executive order won't have to feel the pain. They only care about furthering a radical agenda that is impossible to achieve.

The attempt to reach a 100 percent carbon-free America can only happen after our reliable energy sectors are dismantled and our way of life is destroyed. The energy sector that they want to dismantle is what made America a rich and prosperous nation. Coal, natural gas, and nuclear energy are the answers to the future which demands more electricity than we can ever fathom today, not the types of reforms that the other side calls for.

We only need to look at California or winter storm Uri in Texas as examples of why traditional energy sources are so vital. This executive order only hurts the American people and pushes us down a road that leads to a weaker, poorer, and less prosperous country.

Mr. Chairman, I call on my colleagues to pass this amendment and defund this executive order, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, this amendment blocks an executive order that seeks to reestablish the Federal Government as a leader in sustainability and improve the Nation's preparedness and resilience to the effects of a changing climate.

We are here to protect the welfare of the American public, and we cannot close our eyes to the impacts of climate change such as the drought, flooding, severe storm, and wildfire events we are experiencing.

The Federal Government is the single largest landowner, energy consumer, and employer in the Nation, and it is appropriate that it would lead the Nation on a path to achieving net zero emissions by transforming how the government builds, buys, and manages electricity, vehicles, buildings, and other operations to be clean and sustainable.

Not investing in strategies that minimize and prevent the acceleration of climate change and instead paying billions into disaster relief shows my Republican colleagues are not thinking about what is best for the American taxpayer.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and focus instead on addressing climate change and making our Nation stronger, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BURLISON. Mr. Chairman, instead of focusing on a misguided climate policy, we should instead focus on sources of energy that help our society grow and flourish. Energy sources such as wind and solar claim to be sustainable, but they are often backed up with the more reliable sources of energy such as coal, natural gas, and nuclear.

Wind and solar also use vast amounts of raw materials and land and have their own environmental issues. The cost of using these energy sources and abandoning fossil fuels is simply misguided. Fossil fuels help humans flourish, and we should protect these fuels by defunding this executive order.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MRS. CAMMACK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 81 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be made available to finalize any rule or regulation that meets the definition of section 804(2)(A) of title 5, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment which would restrict funds at the Department of the Interior and Related Agencies from being used to finalize any rule or regulation that have an annual effect on the economy of \$100 million or more.

Under the current administration, the regulatory landscape has never

been worse. Regulatory agencies within the Department of the Interior have been able to exert an extraordinary amount of power and influence with very little oversight and very little authority to do so.

My amendment seeks to change this by requiring that any major rule proposed by these agencies be approved by both Houses of Congress before they can take effect. This means that the elected Representatives of the American people here in the people's House would have a direct say in shaping the regulations that affect our natural resources and our public lands and that have a tremendous impact on our everyday lives.

It means that the individuals who are closest to their constituents, who understand the needs and concerns of their communities, will be at the forefront of decisionmaking as our Founding Fathers intended.

By including my amendment into the Interior-Environment appropriations bill, we send a very powerful message that we are committed to accountable and transparent governance. We are standing up for the principle that significant regulatory decisions should not be made behind closed doors but rather in the open Halls of Congress where the voices of the American people can be heard.

Since President Biden took office, the regulatory climate has added hundreds of billions with a b of dollars in fresh regulatory costs which are eventually passed down to consumers—our constituents.

We have seen the Biden administration's waters of the U.S. regulation create confusion and uncertainty for landowners, farmers, and businesses across the Nation, not to mention how expensive these regulations have been. As American families and businesses continue to suffer under the economic crisis caused by the disastrous Biden policies, this administration has decided to move the country back towards more costly and burdensome WOTUS regulations of the past—needlessly in the process raising housing costs by hundreds of millions of dollars when it is already in a housing crisis.

Under this administration, we have seen a proposed greenhouse gas emission standard for heavy-duty vehicles directly impacting our Nation's trucking by forcing costly, unachievable mandates on enterprise fleets with thousands of trucks to small mom-and-pop family businesses.

We have seen the regulatory overreach regarding mandatory reporting of greenhouse gas emissions from manure management systems and permitting requirements for livestock emissions under the Clean Air Act. I could go on and on and on. It is clear that overreach under this administration has been extreme and it has gone too far.

It is simple. Congress should have oversight over the EPA and other agencies like this because this agency was

established through executive action rather than explicit congressional authorization.

Let me say that for the people in the back and the people at home. The EPA is not even a congressionally authorized agency, and yet we fund it.

By subjecting the EPA to congressional oversight, we ensure that decisions made by the agency are accountable to the elected Representatives of the people. This oversight allows for a more transparent and balanced approach to environmental regulation allowing for a thorough examination of policies and their potential impacts on various stakeholders.

My amendment has the potential to reshape the way our government operates and ensure that the power of decisionmaking is in the hands of those who are elected to represent the interests of the American people. It is time to become transparent and accountable to the people whom we serve.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I want to be clear. Congressional funding and inclusion in the annual appropriations bill is congressional oversight of the EPA. That is what Chairman SIMPSON, I, and the other members of the committee do every year so there is oversight of the EPA, and it is congressionally authorized funding.

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

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Florida has 1 minute remaining.

Mrs. CAMMACK. Mr. Chair, I agree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle. We want to exert more transparency and more accountability. That is what we are doing here. This amendment furthers our ability to do just that, to hold Members of Congress accountable for the actions that are impacting our constituents' everyday lives. That is exactly what we are designed to do. That is Article I authority.

We cede that authority to an unelected, nameless, and faceless bureaucracy through the regulatory regime. These agencies have run away with their rulemaking authority so that Congress has very little power to roll back or claw back.

This amendment is a commonsense amendment. Earlier this year, the same language was passed in a bipartisan manner, so there is no excuse as to why both Republicans and Democrats cannot support these commonsense, accountable, and transparent measures on behalf of the American people.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CAMMACK).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 82 OFFERED BY MR. CLYDE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 82 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the cancellation or suspension of oil and gas leases in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge or the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment No. 82, which would simply prohibit funds made available by this act to be used for the cancellation or suspension of oil and gas leases in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge or the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska.

On September 6, 2023, the Biden administration's Department of the Interior posted a press release announcing Secretary of the Interior Haaland's cancellation of seven oil and gas lease permits covering 365,000 acres in the coastal plain of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, also known as the ANWR.

The former dean of our House, Congressman Don Young, once told me that his mission in Congress—a mission that he worked for for decades to accomplish—was to allow drilling in the ANWR. That was his passion. This mission was finally accomplished during the Trump administration with the passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Now, just 1½ years after Congressman Young's passing, the administration is reversing his important work.

President Biden's disastrous America last energy policies and his embrace of the radical Green New Deal agenda have jeopardized American energy independence and have cost hardworking Americans significant inflation, both at the gas pump and in their utility bills.

First, the Biden administration halted construction of the Keystone XL pipeline. Then President Biden froze all oil and gas lease permits on Federal lands, and later he drained our Strategic Petroleum Reserve to boost political capital while putting American national and energy security at risk.

Previously under President Trump's America first agenda, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act established an oil and gas leasing program in the coastal plain of

ANWR, increasing our Nation's energy security and lowering oil and gas prices for hardworking Americans. However, on President Biden's first day in office, he issued a disastrous executive order, Number 13990, titled: Protecting Public Health and the Environment and Restoring Science to Tackle the Climate Crisis, and it imposed a temporary moratorium on the statutorily mandated oil and gas lease activities in the coastal plain.

So now President Biden is waging his latest battle in his war on American energy independence, the outright canceling of these oil and gas leases in the coastal plain of the ANWR while citing a dubious source of statutory authority and potentially losing out on 7.7 billion barrels of recoverable oil according to the U.S. Geological Survey. This action by the Biden administration is blatantly circumventing the democratic process and subverting the will of Congress.

□ 1830

My amendment to the fiscal year 2024 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies appropriations bill would prohibit funds from being used to implement the Biden administration's cancellation of the statutorily mandated oil and gas leases in the coastal plain of the ANWR.

Therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this amendment to prevent the cancellation of oil and gas leases in the coastal plain. Vote to unleash American independence and vote to lower your constituents' gas prices and utility bills.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment. My colleague proposes that we don't allow the cancellation of lease sales in a pristine environment that is already suffering from the impacts of climate change. The Arctic is warming more than twice as fast as the rest of the planet.

It shows that my Republican colleague and so many others are not thinking about what is best for the American taxpayer. He should be focused, instead, on investing in strategies that minimize and prevent the acceleration of climate change.

He invoked one of my favorite colleagues, our dear departed colleague Don Young. I remember several years ago when Don Young came to visit me in Maine to an Arctic conference, and we discussed climate change. He said: I haven't decided yet if this is man-made, but I do believe climate change is happening.

None of us can expect to share the words of Don Young, who is not with us here today, but I think he witnessed the warming that is going on in the Arctic in his State, the glacial melting.

I recently visited Alaska, and I met with Tribal communities. There are 31 communities, most of them Tribal communities, that currently have to be moved because of the glacial melting, because of the permafrost melting. The cost of that, I have heard some people estimate, is about a million dollars a person to move a community, not to mention the cultural loss, the economic loss.

The challenges that people are facing, what is going on in the Arctic today is unfathomable. Nothing we could have ever predicted. Nothing that the scientists could have predicted. Yet, my colleague wants us to continue drilling for oil. My colleague wants us to deny the importance of renewable energy.

We are talking about an area where it is expensive to drill. The fact is, most of the oil companies don't often want to be up there anymore, and it is not practical for us to be drilling for oil. To be doing it in the very places that are experiencing the losses because of climate change in such an extreme way makes absolutely no sense.

It is a misguided policy. To go against this cancellation of these lease sales is wrong. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and focus instead on addressing climate change, making our Nation stronger, and investing in renewable energy.

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

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Chair, I concur with my colleague on the other side of the aisle that climate change actually does happen. It happens four times a year—spring, summer, fall, and winter. Congressman Don Young represented Alaska. He knew Alaska better than anyone did, and he knew what was best for the ANWR. It was his passion that ANWR be open for drilling for the security of America, the entire country, for energy independence.

Mr. Chair, I encourage 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 Georgia (Mr. CLYDE).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 83 OFFERED BY MR. CLYDE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 83 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule titled "Management and Protection of the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska" and published September 8, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 62025).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman

from Georgia (Mr. CLYDE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong support of my amendment No. 83 to the FY24 Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies appropriations bill, which halts the funding for the Bureau of Land Management's misguided proposed rule on energy development in the Alaska National Petroleum Reserve.

In these times of global upheaval, record-high gas prices, and economic instability, restricting American energy production would be unwise to the point of recklessness. It undermines the pillars of our national strength, our national security, fiscal health, and the prosperity of the American taxpayer. Yet, the Biden administration seeks to drastically limit access to responsible energy production on our own soil—resources that rightfully belong to the American people.

The Alaskan reserve holds the potential to supply hundreds of thousands of barrels of oil per day, lessening our reliance on untrustworthy foreign sources. Yet, this administration seeks to negligently barricade access to our invaluable domestic resources.

The Bureau of Land Management rule plainly defines the clear intent of Congress within the National Petroleum Reserves Production Act, which is to responsibly harness these resources through competitive leasing. The rule imposes arbitrary restrictions and redundant regulations that serve no purpose other than obstructing energy development. We cannot allow Washington bureaucrats to override the legislative mandate from this Congress and push a radical anti-American energy agenda down our throats.

Utilizing the Alaskan reserve's resources is crucial for our energy security and the operational viability of the Trans-Alaska Pipeline. Leaving this vital infrastructure stranded would weaken America's strength on the world stage amidst looming threats from adversaries like Russia, China, and Iran. Our energy independence must stand resolute.

In short, my amendment wisely prevents the squandering of taxpayer dollars on stifling our tremendous American energy potential. I urge my colleagues, those who cherish our working families, fiscal prosperity, and national security to rally behind this necessary course correction.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, once again, I remind everyone, we are here to protect the welfare of the American public. This amendment would prohibit the Bureau of Land Management from balancing oil and gas development with

protection of lands that harbor significant subsistence uses and resources throughout the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska.

My colleague is describing the Willow Project, an oil drilling project by ConocoPhillips that is located on the plain of the North Slope of Alaska in the National Petroleum Reserve. This amendment would prohibit the administration from stopping that project for all of the reasons we have previously discussed.

My colleagues are always talking about if we don't do this drilling, if we don't do this drilling in significantly critical areas like the North Slope of Alaska, like places where climate change is already having an unreasonable impact, we will have to go to untrustworthy foreign sources. Why is it they always use that argument, that somehow we have to go to untrustworthy foreign sources? Our goal is to convert to renewable energy, to have all American energy, whether it is wind or solar or tile or so many of the other opportunities that we have out there to make sure we do invest in America and American jobs instead of misguided projects like this.

This amendment also prohibits the BLM's ability to respond to changing conditions in the Arctic while providing transparency and conservation and development decisions.

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

Mr. CLYDE. Mr. Chairman, it is vital that we unleash and support American energy, fossil fuel energy, and pursue pro-American energy policies. I am deeply concerned that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to put the needs of Americans first.

Given the current state of affairs globally, we should not be relying on energy supplies from foreign powers. Therefore, I again urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which defunds this disastrous BLM rule.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I have just one more thing to say about this project, just to know what we are talking about. It is not a hypothetical. As we have mentioned, we have already talked about the excessive warming that is happening in the Arctic, the changes they are already experiencing in places like Alaska. This project is likely to produce 287 million tons of carbon emissions plus other greenhouse gases over 30 years. It would adversely impact Arctic wildlife and Native American communities. This would damage the complex local tundra ecosystem. According to another government estimate, it would release the same amount of greenhouse gases annually as half a million homes.

We know how to do this in another way. We don't have to do this project. We don't have to drill for oil in sensitive areas, and we don't need to do this particular project.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MR. COLLINS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 84 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end, before the short title, insert the following:

NORTH ATLANTIC RIGHT WHALE

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule titled "Amendments to the North Atlantic Right Whale Vessel Strike Reduction Rule" (87 Fed. Reg. 46921; published August 1, 2022).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chair, my amendment prohibits any funding from being used by the EPA to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce NOAA's vessel speed limiter rule.

This is a misguided rule that would require any vessel over 35 feet to go 10 knots or less all along the Eastern seaboard from Maine all the way down through Florida. They claim they are doing this in order to protect the North Atlantic right whale.

Well, let's review some of the facts.

Approximately 15 whales have been killed by boats in the last 18 years. You have got better odds of hitting the lottery than this.

The right whale population has been consistent since 1980.

The right whales used to calve every 3 to 5 years, but now they are only calving every 7 to 9 years.

What is this rule going to do for the economic impact? It has a \$84 billion economic impact on the East Coast. It will jeopardize 340,000 East Coast jobs, and there are 63,000 registered boats that will be impacted with this new rule.

There is a better way to track these whales, but NOAA just refuses to do it. We tag horses, cows, pets, many other animals. Why can't we tag these whales as well? There is no reason that we can't use some commonsense solutions such as this. Tagging the whales would allow the boats to avoid any whales that are in the area without the need to put some burdensome speed restrictions all along the East Coast.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I am opposed to this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Chairman, I urge all my colleagues to adopt this commonsense amendment and prevent the EPA from enforcing this job-killing rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. CRANE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 85 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. The salary of Brenda Mallory, Chair of the Council on Environmental Quality, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CRANE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which utilizes the Holman rule to reduce the salary of the CEQ chair.

CEQ, in how it operates and what it prioritizes, is not doing its job properly, especially regarding its implementation of NEPA. The Council only focuses on the negative side effects of certain types of energy production without considering cost-effective energy.

The Trump administration introduced reforms to remedy some of the worst elements of this hyperpoliticized regime at CEQ and to facilitate more efficient and timely permitting reviews.

Having unwisely reversed those reforms, President Biden and Ms. Mallory are now grappling with regulatory barriers that hinder critical infrastructure. As a result, the public will be deprived of much-needed energy infrastructure.

□ 1845

Affordable and abundant energy is essential for a secure and prosperous country. NEPA is now out of sync with current environmental, political, social, and economic realities, with Ms. Mallory spearheading its exacerbation and failures.

The average American family is now spending about \$2,400 more today than when President Biden took office. I have constituents who can barely pay their energy bills solely because the administration chose to raise their electric rates to pay for its Green New

Deal agenda, almost doubling some Arizonans' bills.

If Congress doesn't act to reverse Biden's energy crisis now, it may not be long before more Americans can't afford soaring energy costs.

Ms. Mallory's incompetence has shown that Congress should reduce her salary.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, this amendment is petty and punitive.

Rather than pursuing grudges against public servants, my colleagues across the aisle should focus their energy on negotiating with the Senate on a bill to fund the government.

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chair, the bottom line is that the American people are tired of bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., affecting a policy that is destroying their lives. That is why we are doing this.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MR. CRANE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 86 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end, before the short title, insert the following:

PUBLIC LAND ORDER NO. 7923

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce Public Land Order No. 7923 (88 Fed. Reg. 37266; published June 7, 2023).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CRANE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support my amendment, which defunds Public Land Order No. 7923.

In June, the Biden administration issued this public land order banning over 300,000 acres of Federal mineral es-

tate surrounding the Chaco Culture National Historical Park for 20 years. This would effectively prevent all private landowners and Navajo allottees from mineral leasing land in this area.

The ban will have significant negative economic impacts on both the Navajo Nation and American taxpayers, severely limiting Tribal revenue, economic development, self-sufficiency, and American energy production.

Chaco Canyon carries both cultural and historical significance for communities in the region. The development of this land should be determined by those with lawful sovereignty, not out-of-touch Biden administration officials hellbent on imposing their radical agenda on Tribal communities.

In July, the House Natural Resources Committee held a hearing on the ban, and we heard from Navajo Nation citizens who expressed disappointment with Interior Secretary Deb Haaland and the Bureau of Land Management for stripping away their mineral rights. The government of the Navajo Nation has called on Congress to oppose any buffer zone in the area.

The Biden administration's decision to move forward with this ban makes it clear that they only care about Tribal voices so long as they are in line with the approved Biden agenda.

Interestingly, Interior Secretary Deb Haaland, when serving in Congress, worked on a lease sale that was ultimately deferred. She had complained that the Trump administration failed to fulfill its legal and moral obligation to consult with Native Americans.

The Biden administration, of which Secretary Haaland is a part, is now opposing an unprecedented blockade on Native mineral rights and has refused to listen to the Navajo Nation's concerns.

Mr. Chair, this administration likes to talk about their supposed support of Tribal communities but has no problem implementing a destructive choke hold on Tribal revenue and economic prosperity. Secretary Haaland and President Biden are throwing the Navajo Nation under the bus, driven by extremists with no concern for Native interests or the energy needs of all Americans. I am proud to stand with the Navajo Nation and offer this amendment that defunds this ban.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, this amendment prohibits the withdrawal for 20 years of public lands surrounding the Chaco Culture National Historical Park from mineral leasing in order to protect these lands and the greater connected landscape in New Mexico with a rich Puebloan and Tribal nation legacy from the impacts associated with oil and gas development activities.

It does not impact valid existing rights nor non-Federal interests in the area that will be withdrawn.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment, and I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ).

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chair, I, too, rise in opposition to amendment No. 86.

As noted, this amendment would roll back protections for Federal lands and Federal lands only within a 10-mile area around the World Heritage Site, Chaco Culture National Historical Park, in New Mexico, in my district, and only from new oil and gas drilling.

I stand here on the second day of Native American Heritage Month, and what we are doing on the second day of Native American Heritage Month is not recognizing, honoring, and protecting Native American heritage. Instead, what this amendment is doing is destroying Native American heritage. It is destroying the ability of Native Americans who hold these lands and these sites sacred to continue to practice their spiritual and religious beliefs.

Let's remember that what you are doing is undermining the ability of people to practice their historic spiritual and religious beliefs because not only is Chaco County a World Heritage Site, but it remains to this day a place of cultural and religious significance to the descendants of the Greater Chaco region.

We need to remember that Chaco Canyon is unique. Between A.D. 900 and 1150, Chaco was the heart of ceremonial, trade, and political activity for the Ancestral Puebloans. The sweeping ceremonial center you need to go visit is unlike anything constructed before or since.

However, for the Native Americans who come from this area, Chaco is not an old place. The sacred nature of Chaco continues unbroken in its importance to them today.

Given its history, you can imagine the importance of protecting this land and its people's ability to truly practice their faith.

It is true that there are different points of view within the Navajo Nation, but let's remember how this bill and how these protections that have been put into place came to be.

It was the former Navajo Nation president who first approached the Pueblos in an effort to protect these lands. The advocacy for these protections began in 2013 when the Eastern Navajo Agency Council passed a resolution calling for a moratorium on new fracking activities within their agency.

Navajo Nation's advocacy continued, and in 2017, Navajo Nation President Russell Begaye, Vice President Jonathan Nez, and the All Pueblo Council of Governors joined together in a statement opposing new fracking in the Greater Chaco region.

Protecting Chaco then became a collaborative process. It resulted eventu-

ally in the Chaco Cultural Heritage Area Protection Act, which passed this body in the 116th Congress with the support of every Democrat and 17 Republicans.

The secretarial withdrawal this amendment attacks only happened after an extensive process of public engagement that included consultation with all the Tribal nations, including the Navajo Nation, the Pueblos, and those people who live in Arizona as well who are actually constituents of the sponsor of this amendment.

Mr. Chair, 100,000 public comments is not ignoring the people. That is listening to them. It was years of Tribal collaboration that made these protections possible.

Mr. Chair, let me correct the record. This does not affect in any way Navajo allottees' land. It does not affect in any way Navajo Tribal lands. It does not affect in any way rights-of-way or any infrastructure that is needed.

The existing oil and gas activity can continue, and new oil and gas activity can continue, but just not on Federal lands.

The existing royalties that are presently going to the Navajo allottees will continue in force, but we must admit that these withdrawals and protections are difficult. You must weigh the cultural and spiritual significance of an area that could be lost forever against the value of mineral development.

One molecule of gas is the same wherever it is extracted, but once you destroy a sacred site, you will never get it back.

I believe, even though I recognize the importance of the economic value of withdrawal, that we must err on the side of protection.

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

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

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Chair, I represent the Navajo Nation in my State. The Navajo Nation does support this amendment.

One of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle talked about protecting the lands. What she didn't talk about, however, was protecting the economy of the Navajo people and how this would impact them, which is, once again, why they support 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 Arizona (Mr. CRANE).

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

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 87 OFFERED BY MR. FALLON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 87 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to reduce the number of oil and gas leases issued by the Secretary of the Interior.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that prohibits funding in this bill from being used to reduce the number of oil and gas leases issued by the Secretary of the Interior.

Americans saw the impact on the global oil supply when Russia decided to illegally invade Ukraine. Of course, we know that Russia is a world exporter of oil. Gas prices rose over 40 percent. It is a world commodity.

Now, with the uncertainty in the Middle East and another war beginning, we are facing more potential energy shortages. This is what happens when we allow ourselves to be dependent on foreign oil.

The fact of the matter is, like it or not, the world consumes 100 million barrels of oil a day. That is not going to go away anytime soon. We put ourselves and our great Nation's security at the mercy of foreign countries' stability, something that we have little to no control over.

This is not only precarious and foolhardy, but it is also dangerous. Despite the obvious dangers and national security pitfalls, the Biden administration continues to cut oil and gas leases in America and forces us to be more reliant on foreign oil.

Since taking office, the Biden administration has gravely undercut America's ability to become energy independent by canceling gas and oil leases continually from even his first day in office until now.

In September, the Biden administration announced they were canceling the remaining seven oil and gas leases in Alaska. For comparison, the Trump administration proposed a plan that included 47 new potential lease sales.

Energy independence is crucial to our Nation's security. Democrats will have you believe we can survive just fine without oil and gas, but that is simply not reality. In fact, I didn't come to work today on my unicorn, and I wasn't talking to my mermaids in my swimming pool, and the leprechaun next door didn't pay for it all. It is just not a reality that we live in right now.

I think many Republicans, including me, are for an all-of-the-above approach—wind where it is practical, solar, and oil and gas, but if we are going to have a serious discussion about zero emissions or reducing emissions in this country, we need to talk about nuclear energy, as well.

□ 1900

I urge my colleagues to help their constituents by voting for lower energy costs and increased national security by voting in favor of this amendment and in favor of American energy production.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I am pleased to see my good friend on the other side of the aisle, and sorry that I so violently disagree with him on this particular issue, maybe not violently, but strongly disagree with him on this issue.

This amendment seeks to force the Secretary of the Interior to issue more oil and gas lease sales instead of allowing for the transition to clean energy that will result in more resilient communities, mitigate the impacts of climate change, and protect our world for future generations.

To not invest in strategies that minimize and prevent the acceleration of climate change instead of paying billions in disaster relief shows that my colleague is not thinking about what is best for the American taxpayer. Our economy and health and livelihood, food security, quality of life all depend on us making progress on climate change and renewable energies.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

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

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chair, you talk about being an environmentalist, which I honestly think all 435 Members of Congress are, and not throwing partisan bombs, which haven't been thrown right now, but you hear about them in these Halls, unfortunately. Think about what the United States has done in the last 20-plus years. We have reduced our carbon emissions by, now, nearly 25 percent, more than any other Nation in history.

What has China done? They have increased their carbon footprint by 300 percent in that same time.

Why don't we see some of our leftist activists, mostly young people, protesting outside the Chinese Embassy or the consulates.

The United States, as great a country as we are, we are not a planet, and, as an environmentalist, we should be wanting the United States to fulfill the needs of the world.

Again, fact: 100 million barrels a day. How is the wind and solar industry going to be developed? Well, largely based on the energy that oil and gas produce.

In the United States, we have an independent judiciary. We are a rule-of-law nation. We have strong environmental laws. We have an expertise in oil and gas that has been perfected over more than a century.

The fact of the matter is we have to produce oil and gas, and I would rather

have the United States do it, rather than Venezuela or a China or a Saudi Arabia, for that matter. I trust our abilities more.

As an environmentalist and someone who wants to protect this Nation and the planet for future generations, my 17- and 14-year-old sons, and, hopefully, their children someday, this is the best path forward.

It is the realistic path forward, and nobody says, because we drill and produce oil and gas in this country, that clean energy can't be developed synchronously. Of course it can, and it has been, but the free markets have to come into play as well to benefit this country and humankind.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, my colleagues are always saying we have to reduce our dependence on foreign oil, and I wholeheartedly agree. In fact, the United States is still a major producer of oil and gas, but we have to make the investments and force ourselves to move forward on renewable energy.

We have done that through bills like the IRA. We continue to do that, and I just want to continue to support that and make sure that we are opposing expanding our oil and gas leases and just investing in renewable energy.

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

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, I think this is a really good amendment. It is common sense, and I believe that every Member of Congress that votes for it will feel better about themselves.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 88 OFFERED BY MR. FALLON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 88 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency for community-scale ambient air monitoring.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FALLON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chair, I rise today to offer an amendment that prohibits the use of Federal funds for community-scale ambient air monitoring.

In simple terms, ambient air monitoring is the long-term assessment of pollutant levels by measuring the surrounding outdoor air. Now, on the surface, that doesn't sound like that much

of a big deal at face value. However, the EPA already monitors this.

The EPA has extensive systems and sensors in place that monitor air quality and emissions, regulated primarily by the Clean Air Act. Now, that is at the Federal level.

Let's think about this, too. Having served at the State and local level, they can also monitor their air quality, and, in fact, they do. When I was on city council in Frisco, Texas, we had a battery recycling plant in the middle of the city. The city had kind of grown around it.

We took local action. We didn't ask the Federal Government to do squat. We paid \$45 million to buy that plant. We closed it down. That is at the local level. I trust folks at the local and State level far more than I will ever trust the Federal Government. The Federal Government has a role in roads, military, and other things, but these kinds of things, I really do trust the local entities.

What is this program doing, if not to be redundant, because this is already happening at the Federal level with the EPA? Simply put, it is another attempt by some on the left to push a Green New Deal and push their narrative that pollution is somehow racist. I have been in these Halls for 3 years, and I learned crazy things. People claimed that COVID was racist, that the weather is racist. Now, maybe pollution is, too.

They are pushing funding for this program so they can send untrained individuals who they choose with unknown equipment to cities they choose to further a narrative that pollution is somehow skewed towards someone's pigmentation.

As I said, I support science. However, there are insufficient guidelines surrounding third-party individuals or groups that would be conducting the air monitoring, the equipment they will use, or even the data matrix that they will utilize, so we would have these untrained individuals doing this monitoring.

It is kind of seeming to me like putting your thumb on the scale and having a predetermined outcome before the testing even takes place.

Democrats want to allow for these untrained individuals to operate this equipment. The Biden administration continues to push nonsense and their radical agenda and fund them with taxpayer dollars, and this isn't acceptable.

At a time when our country is trillions of dollars in debt, I refuse to stand idly by while this administration continues to waste money in this fashion, and there is no justification for allowing Federal dollars for a program like this.

I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment and to stop the mismanagement of even more taxpayer dollars.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, this amendment seeks to block air quality monitoring. So often, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle start their speeches by saying, We believe in clean air, we believe in clean water, but apparently they don't, and certainly, in this case, this amendment does not.

Now, I come from a State with one of the highest rates of asthma. Asthma is directly attributed to not having clean air. One in nine people in Maine is experiencing asthma. Those are children. Those are adults. Those are people who have serious health impacts because of that, so why we would ever deny the opportunity to do more air quality monitoring to make sure our citizens are safe, to make sure our children don't have asthma, it is just beyond me.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

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

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chair, to my good friend from Maine, I was raised in New England, and Maine is a lovely State.

Again, Mr. Chair, this is already going on. The EPA already does air quality monitoring, and this is an additional program that is simply unnecessary.

I do trust the great people of the great State of Maine. If they want to monitor their air quality at the State level, they are certainly welcome to do so, as well as at the local level, as we did in Texas, and as we took a proactive approach to an issue that was very important to the citizens in the city that I now represent in Congress that I used to represent on the city council.

I, again, have yet a second amendment that, if Members vote for it, they will feel really good about themselves, as my good friend, MATT GAETZ, just told me.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. FULCHER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 89 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, apply, enforce, or carry out section 216 of Executive Order 14008 (86 Fed. Reg. 7627, relating to tackling the climate crisis at home and abroad).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER) and a Mem-

ber opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Chair, thank you to my seatmate, Congressman SIMPSON, for his overall work on this larger appropriations package. It is not a simple thing to do right now.

My amendment will restrict funds to implement section 216 of Executive Order No. 14008, which aims to supposedly conserve 30 percent of our Nation's lands and waters by 2030.

Over the last 2 years, my colleagues and I on the Committee on Natural Resources have introduced legislation to reverse President Biden's land grab and environmental extremism through this 30 by 30 initiative. My constituents in Idaho are tired of interference and overreach by the Federal Government as it tries to place more use mandates on land.

Sixty-three percent of Idaho's landmass is federally controlled. If it is truly the goal of this administration to increase federally controlled land by another 30 percent, in that case, States in the West, Idaho included, already disproportionately share in the economic distress associated with this federally controlled land.

If the lands in Maryland, Pennsylvania, Maine, and other eastern States were locked up by federally run bureaucracies like those in the West, I am sure more of my colleagues from those States would share the same desire that I have to restrict further expansion on the Federal Government's land footprint.

In addition, there is a direct correlation between the percentage of Federal landmass with increased budget costs, and, as we continue to face record-breaking deficits, debt, and debt financing, we certainly don't need to expand our cost centers.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and stop this land-grab effort through this 30 by 30 initiative by the Federal Government.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to reclaim my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Idaho?

There was no objection.

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Chair, I point out that the amount of federally controlled lands is nowhere equal across our country. In Idaho, it is 32.8 million acres, and, to my good friend from Maine, it is 301,000.

You can't possibly contemplate the ramifications that has when it comes to local governance and land management for your entire State.

When it comes to federally controlled land, enough is enough. Our Federal resources are overwhelmed, and they are not in a good position to manage this landmass, and so oftentimes they don't, and more Federal use mandates reduce our overall wise land management.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. 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 Idaho will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MR. GAETZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 90 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end, before the short title, insert the following:

CRAB ISLAND AREA COMMERCIAL SERVICES STRATEGY

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize or implement a Commercial Services Strategy for the Crab Island Area of the Gulf Islands National Seashore.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

□ 1915

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chair, there is an eclectic attraction in my district in northwest Florida. It is called Crab Island but is actually not an island at all. It is a sandbar where people go and enjoy swimming, snorkeling, fishing, maybe a refreshment or even a hot dog or boiled peanuts.

Right now, we have a system with our local governments and our State government working in concert to manage Crab Island. It is all going really well, and my amendment would prohibit the Department of the Interior from playing, perhaps an excessive role, in the management of commercial services. It is a wonderful place, and as we say in the south, y'all come.

I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I appreciate my colleague's invitation for us all to come visit. I am sure it is a wonderful place. And, of course, being from

Maine, we like anything that has the word crab in the title.

Unfortunately, this amendment blocks the National Park Service from complying with the 1998 Concessions Act, which sets up the framework for evaluating commercial services and parks. It stops the Park Service from being able to complete its existing process to remain in compliance with the Act.

The amendment would effectively grandfather in all permit holders from the prior year, regardless of whether the services are necessary and appropriate. The amendment also limits the National Park Service's ability to ensure public safety of commercial services.

Currently, all vendors undergo public health, fire, and permit condition inspections throughout an operating season. These inspections have documented significant concerns such as food being cooked, held, or served at temperatures or conditions that do not meet public health standards; refueling processes that place workers and patrons at risk; lack of basic safety, and fire protection; and operating in violation of permit conditions.

The amendment eliminates the ability to manage the issuance of a permit based on current or past performance, which creates conditions that place workers, visitors, and park resources at risk from some commercial services. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chair, I appreciate the gentlewoman's great interest in what is going on in Florida. Though we don't know each other well, I can only assume that if there were a small patch of land in Maine, I would be highly deferential as to what a local community in that congressional district might think about it.

I would inform the House that I have a resolution from the City of Destin where they speak to some of these concerns, but instead reflect on the value of the existing State and local cooperation to achieve those safer objectives.

With all due respect to the Concessions Act of 1998, which I am sure we would never want to violate the sanctity of, the result of what the Department of the Interior is trying to do in my community is going to put a lot of mom-and-pop local businesses out of business, and instead, it is going to constrain this to a Federal contracting requirement that no one in our community believes is going to enhance safety, but instead is going to limit the ability of folks to be able to enjoy the park in the manner in which they are doing safely now. So that is why I would ask for adoption of the 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 Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 91 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule titled "Reconsideration of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter" and published by the Environmental Protection Agency in the Federal Register on January 27, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 5558).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, 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. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment 91, which prohibits funds to finalize, implement, or enforce the proposed rule by the EPA titled: "Reconsideration of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter."

The EPA's proposed rule will lower the particulate matter or PM standards to a level Maricopa County and other counties in Arizona could never meet. The PM present in Arizona is not due to manufacturing. It is naturally occurring. There is no way to lower the PM in the desert.

Approximately 50 percent of Arizona is a desert. As a desert, it is prone to accumulations of frequent dust, including frequent dust storms. Maricopa County, for example, records one to three massive dust storms called haboobs every year. The current ambient air quality in southern Arizona rarely meets the EPA PM 2.5 standards due to the widespread naturally occurring dust particulate matter throughout the area. During a dust storm, the PM levels increase dramatically. Over 100 times the non-dust storm days, and it is well-documented by the National Weather Service.

The proposed rule is unreasonable, incomprehensible, and it is not based on environmental science. The proposed rule would have substantial impacts on large swaths of the Western United States, not just Arizona.

For example, if the standard were set to the proposed levels, populated areas of Utah, Colorado, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, and New Mexico would be designated as nonattainment and subject to stringent regulatory requirements and penalties.

The Clean Air Scientific Advisory Committee, which made its recommendations to the EPA, failed to account for the naturally occurring and ambient PM concentrations throughout the Western United States.

The EPA must consider the world in its natural state. In Arizona, and even in Michigan, particulate matter in comparatively high levels exist in the natural state.

Without any contribution from mankind, there will be dust and particulate matter in Arizona that exceeds the proposed and current regulations adopted by the EPA.

How an agency that is supposed to be based on science can ignore the National Weather Service data and the data from Maricopa County is perplexing.

We expect better from our agencies, and we certainly expect an agency to reconsider the differences between a rainforest and a desert. For these reasons and more, I ask my colleagues to support Amendment 91 prohibiting funding to finalize or enforce the EPA's proposed rule titled, Reconsideration of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Particulate Matter.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, this amendment once again attempts to block the administration from ensuring that the air we breathe is clean. I truly think we can all agree that breathing clean air is a basic right. For that reason, I oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Yeah. Obviously, the young lady does not understand the desert. She hasn't been in the desert. You can't just water the desert. That is why it is the desert. Particulates are in the air. And so, if you are an asthmatic, if you have got problems breathing, you don't belong in the desert. But you can't lower those standards without going through extraordinary circumstances.

You know, we do a lot of watering in the desert anyway, but the particulates are in the air. It is naturally occurring. So I think this is just ridiculous that there would be opposition from anybody in regard to this. If you doubt me, come out to Arizona. I will be happy to show you a haboob, show you the ambient quality.

This is by far an amendment that we need to adopt. I implore my colleagues to adopt 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 Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 92 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce Presidential Proclamation 10606 of August 8, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 55331, relating to the establishment of the Baa' Nwaavjo I'tah Kukveni-Ancestral Footprints of the Grand Canyon National Monument).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, 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. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment 92, to prohibit the Biden administration from implementing, administering, or enforcing the recent Grand Canyon National Monument designation and corresponding mineral withdraw for almost a million acres.

The monument designation flies in the face of multiple-use doctrines for public land. Further, it creates no new revenue, and neither creates nor empowers any employment. Make no mistake, the Grand Canyon National Park is already protected under the Grand Canyon Protection Act, Clean Air Act, Clean Water Act, and multiple other regulations and laws.

Further, the roughly million acres of newly designated land is far outside the actual Grand Canyon, believe it or not.

I am also a proud sponsor of the Northern Arizona Protection Act, which nullifies Biden's designation of corresponding mineral withdrawal.

The almost million acres of designated land fall within my district and my colleague from Arizona, Mr. CRANE's. But at no point were we consulted. And our constituents' opposition was ignored. Arizona already boasts more national monuments than any other State. We do not want any more monument designations.

The Federal Government already controls far too much land in Arizona, and this restriction is unacceptable.

Despite repeatedly expressed concerns and questions from my constituents, county supervisors, local groups, and the House Committee on Natural Resources, the Department of the Interior has refused to address any of them.

Instead, without consultation with my constituents or their Representative in Congress, Biden and Secretary Haaland have permanently withdrawn more than a million acres from its intended multiple-use doctrine.

Under House Rule X, the Committee on Natural Resources has general over-

sight of any matter relating to its jurisdiction, including the management of Federal lands and the development of mineral resources. As chairman of the Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, I have made repeated inquiries to the Secretary of the Interior regarding this proposed designation. Yet still, the Secretary of the Interior has not responded to repeated inquiries from my Subcommittee on Oversight and Investigations, further bypassing Congress and the legislative process. Biden's designation is nothing short of a full-scale attack on the livelihoods of many of my constituents. It sets back our Nation's national security and even strengthens Russia.

Biden's proclamation imposed a nearly million-acre land grab permanently banning mining in an area almost the size of Delaware. Some falsely frame the designation as an effort to protect the Grand Canyon, which of course is completely disingenuous. No one wants a mine within the Grand Canyon. The designated area is miles away from the boundaries of the buffer area—let me repeat that—the buffer area of the Grand Canyon National Park. The area in question is home to the highest grade and largest quantity of uranium deposits in the United States. So this amendment does not just effectively affect Arizona, it harms our national security for the entire country.

The designation plays right into the hands of Russia, who along with Kazakhstan and Uzbekistan are literally trying to corner the global uranium market.

China is also joining in on this game, buying up uranium mines in Africa. Everybody knows that in order to go green, you have to use nuclear. We better get on board.

There is no question this designation will hurt local revenues, kill jobs, and undermine American energy security. It does not protect the Grand Canyon. It is opposed by the people of my district, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposition.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, this amendment would prohibit the use of any Federal funds to implement, administer, or enforce the Presidential proclamation that establishes the ancestral footprints of the Grand Canyon National Monument in Arizona, an area significant to many Tribal nations.

The Antiquities Act provides the President with the authority to designate national monuments in order to protect objects of historic or scientific interest. This amendment inappropriately restricts the President's ability to declare national monuments in specific parts of the country.

Both Republican and Democratic Presidents have used this authority to

increase the protection of special Federal lands. It goes against 100 years of American tradition to protect the nation's cultural and natural resources.

The Antiquities Act represents an important achievement in the progress of conservation and preservation efforts in the United States. Congress should not stand in the way of these achievements.

I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chair, you know, I love the fact that we have individuals from across this country, it is a beauty, but it is also detrimental to us here in this aspect. No one has taken an airplane over this general area. They don't know what they are talking about.

So number one, being ancestral, anything can be that way. Teddy Roosevelt set this thing up called public lands. And in due process, what he did is he established also at the same time the multiple-use doctrine, the Taylor Grazing Act requiring these lands to be not just used but to be improved and to be used for multiple purposes. That is mining. That is energy development. It is not conservation. Let me repeat, not conservation.

So when people start talking about these monuments, you got to come out to Arizona. We have got more than any other State combined. So let's get after this. But this is very important for national security, and this designation does not need to go through. I ask that people vote for 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 Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1930

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MR. GRAVES OF LOUISIANA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 93 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end, before the short title, insert the following:

RICE'S WHALE

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Director of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management or the Director of the Bureau of Safety and Environmental Enforcement to implement the terms of the "Stipulated Agreement to Stay Proceedings" (July 21, 2023; Docket No. 8:20-cv-03060-DLB) entered into by the Sierra Club, Center for Biological Diversity, Friends of the Earth, and Turtle Island Restoration Network and the National Marine Fisheries Service and the Assistant Administrator for Fisheries of the National Marine Fisheries Service, including the "Notice to

Lessees and Operators of Federal Oil and Gas, and Sulphur Leases in the Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf; Expanded Rice's Whale Protection Efforts During Reinitiated Consultation with NMFS" (BOEM NTL No. 2023-G01; August 17, 2023).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, this amendment is a funding restriction. Let me give you a little bit of background. What happened is the Federal Government was sued by a group of extreme environmental organizations claiming that a new species of whale was in the Gulf of Mexico and that its habitat needed to be restricted in order to ensure the survivability of the species.

Mr. Chair, it sounds like a reasonable approach. The problem is that what happened is that they didn't provide any opportunity for public comment, and they did not provide any opportunity for peer-reviewed science. As a matter of fact, the sensors that are supposed to be detecting these species did not even detect species in the area where they are trying to impose restrictions.

Mr. Chair, as a result of this sue-and-settle operation by the Federal Government, by the Biden administration, 6 million acres of the Gulf of Mexico have been taken effectively offline or put with significant restriction in the Gulf of Mexico.

What this does is this further complicates U.S. energy security. It further restricts opportunities to produce energy domestically.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I am opposing this amendment which would block the Bureau of Energy Management from implementing the terms of a stay agreement between NOAA and several NGOs related to mitigation measures to protect the Rice's whales in the Gulf of Mexico.

I guess my confusion here is that this amendment has already been overtaken by events. On October 27, NOAA announced that it had denied the petition from several NGOs to establish a mandatory 10-knot speed limit and other vessel-related mitigation measures to protect the Rice's whales in the Gulf of Mexico. Further, NOAA stated that it will not be proceeding with the rulemaking at this time.

I guess I would ask the gentleman, now that he is aware of this development, since this happened just on October 27, would he consider withdrawing this unnecessary amendment from a bill that is already bloated with riders? It seems to have no purpose.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, the Biden administration has been quite focused on destroying the American energy industry. This entire insane focus on allegedly protecting a species of whale in the Gulf of Mexico has been used by the Biden administration to attempt to deeply restrict oil and gas actions in the Gulf of Mexico.

Whales. Mr. Chair. They wanted to stop vessels from moving at night. They wanted to stop vessels from moving over 10 knots. It is insane.

Americans are struggling. Inflation is crushing us. The American energy industry should be unleashed, not oppressed.

I rise in support of Representative GRAVES' amendment, and I urge all Members to support this amendment in support of an American energy industry that should be dominant worldwide.

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, once again, I would say I understand we have disagreements on energy policy, and I understand that my colleagues often like an opportunity to criticize the Biden administration because they don't agree with their stand on energy policy.

I just want to be clear. Again, the Biden administration didn't do this, as he said in his remarks and I clarified. This was an NGO that sued to have this happen, but NOAA stated it is not proceeding with the rulemaking at this time. The Biden administration is not doing this. It is not slowing down boats. It is not stopping boats at night. None of the things that he said were actually true. In fact, they have backed off on this.

I know we all have moments in our own State. I represent a coastal State. We have all kinds of disagreements on lawsuits that are filed against current practices, but that didn't happen.

Could he just withdraw this? Because he has got an amendment about something that isn't happening. Believe me, we have got enough disagreement and misinformation and there are enough harmful riders in this bill. I would respectfully request that he just withdraw this and acknowledge that none of this actually happened.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, I certainly do appreciate the gentlewoman from Maine's concerns, and I appreciate her understanding of one of the two components of what we are discussing today. The component that my friend from Maine is discussing pertains to recreational vessels and port traffic. That is one component, and the gentlewoman is correct.

However, the component that my friend from Louisiana and I are raising concerns about is the energy component that has impacted 6 million acres

in the Gulf of Mexico. This is actually a bifurcated decision or approach. One component was rejected, the gentlewoman is correct. The component that we are discussing actually is very much alive and very much relevant.

I certainly share the concerns that the gentlewoman has recognized. I appreciate that component, but that is not what this amendment pertains to; therefore, I again insist upon this amendment.

Madam Chair, I urge adoption, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman's thoughts. I continue to disagree. I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Madam Chair, once again, as the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS) and I have noted, we have watched as this administration has carried out energy policies that are some of the most inexplicable, incomprehensible energy policies I have ever seen, policies that are resulting in a 40 percent increase in energy costs for American families, making one in every four families choose among costs like groceries, utilities, rental payments, and other things that are simply false choices.

We can continue down this path that allows Iran to profit \$60 billion above the amount they were making before the Biden administration took office, allowing Venezuela to profit \$65 billion above the amount that they were making prior to the Biden administration, or we can simply produce American energy, some of the lowest carbon-intense barrels in the world, and actually have American energy security, returning us to American energy security as we saw under the previous administration, rather than these policies that are so punitive on American families, especially those that can least afford it.

Madam Chair, I urge adoption of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR (Ms. TENNEY). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. GRAVES).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MS. GREENE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 94 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to remove any monument on land under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Georgia.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Speaker, my amendment prohibits funds from being used to remove any monument on land under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior.

For too long, communist Democrats have been hell-bent on erasing our culture, way of life, and our history, whether we agree with it or not.

As George Orwell wrote in "Nineteen Eighty-Four," they want a future in which "every record has been destroyed or falsified, every book has been rewritten, every picture has been repainted, every statue and street and building has been renamed, every date has been altered. And the process is continuing day by day and minute by minute. History has stopped. Nothing exists except an endless present in which the Party is always right."

In 2020, nearly 168 Confederate symbols were removed across the United States, many of which were violently torn down by radical BLM antifa activists who burned American cities to the ground.

Most recently, the statue of Confederate General Robert E. Lee, that stood for nearly a century in Charlottesville, Virginia, was dismembered and melted down in a 2,250-degree furnace.

The news media was quick to flood social media with video posts of the statue's head melting down in fire. This was the message: The communists in our country have made it clear that they will not stop with Robert E. Lee and will continue to do this until George Washington's statue is burning in fire.

Whether we agree with the monuments, whether we agree with the history, our history is our lessons now for this generation and for future generations to come.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, this amendment is one more controversial poison pill policy rider that sadly shows that the Republicans are not interested in bills that can gain bipartisan support and become law.

The amendment would prohibit the Department of the Interior from removing any monument on land under their jurisdiction.

There can be many reasons a monument would need to be removed, such as the health and safety of visitors and staff. This amendment provides no latitude for the Department to steward the land and resources they are responsible for.

In 15 days, the government will shut down, yet we are spending time on a bill that will never become law and on this superfluous partisan poison pill rider.

We should be focused on creating a bipartisan bill that abides by the

agreement reached in the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023.

Let's do the job we were elected to do, ensure the American people receive the benefits and services they are entitled to.

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

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Madam Chair, I rise in support of this amendment, and I thank my colleague for introducing it.

Madam Chair, our history is our history, all of it. We live in an era wherein my Democrat colleagues across the aisle seem to fail to recognize the simple fact that if you are rewriting history, you are rewriting history of this body, and the American people have lost all trust in any kind of sanity coming out of my Democrat colleagues.

From sea to shining sea, taking down statues. How is that working? How is that going, Madam Chair?

Do we have peace in our time? Is our border okay? Is the world not on fire? Do we have more or less racial problems in America today than we did 20 years ago?

It is insane, again, what my Democrat colleagues push.

The confederate soldiers buried in Arlington, shall you remove their bones?

Madam Chair, I support the amendment.

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ZINKE).

□ 1945

Mr. ZINKE. Madam Chairman, the gentlewoman from Maine may have mentioned that this affects all monuments. In fact, it does not.

As a former Secretary, monuments are under the Antiquities Act, and there are about 163, as I recall. This only pertains to monuments that commemorate the Founding Fathers of the United States on land under the jurisdiction of the Department. I don't recall how many monuments are to the Founding Fathers, but there are not many. I don't recall any being a safety issue.

As a matter of fact, I recall all of them being a part of our history and an important part of our history for all to learn. This does not affect all monuments or the safety. What it affects is the very essence of the country, and I support this amendment.

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I appreciate the thoughts of the former Secretary of the Interior, and I thank him for his service, but I want to be clear. Let me read this back. There may have been an earlier version of this, but this one says: "None of the funds made available by this act may be used to re-

move any monument on land under the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior."

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. GREENE of Georgia. Madam Chair, actually, there should be no funds allocated to remove any monument, and there is no necessary reason to remove the monuments. This is the Democrats' and the Biden administration's effort to erase our history just as they have done to the statue of Robert E. Lee. This is an outrage.

This is exactly what they do in communist countries. The Democrats want to accuse us of book burning while we try to get pornography books out of our children's schools. The Democrats will do nothing to stop their attempts to destroy our Nation's history, and we must protect it.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote for my amendment, and I urge its passage. I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, just to clear up a couple of things. My colleague mentioned the Founding Fathers. Robert E. Lee was not one of the Founding Fathers. He was a general of the Confederacy. That was in the city of Charlottesville. That wasn't a national monument when that statue was removed.

I have to say, I find it rich that the party that has supported book banning in our libraries, rewriting curriculum, and not talking about our history over and over again is the very one that is saying that we have to often keep painful monuments in places where they do damage, where they interfere with people's ability to enjoy the particular area that they are in, and leave it to the Department of the Interior to have that discretion.

If we are going to get into talking about book banning and rewriting history, let's have an honest debate about it and talk about the differences between our two parties on this.

Madam Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 95 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 96 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to develop, finalize, issue, or use assessments under the Integrated Risk Information System (IRIS).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Chair, my amendment No. 96 prohibits funds to develop, finalize, issue, or use assessments under the EPA's Integrated Risk Information System, or IRIS program.

The IRIS program has never been authorized by Congress and was created by the EPA out of thin air in the 1980s. It has been heavily criticized by everyone from former EPA officials, the National Academy of Sciences, Federal agencies, and the Government Accountability Office. Despite that, the EPA spends \$20 million to \$40 million of taxpayer money per year on the program.

IRIS has a demonstrated history of conducting low-quality chemical risk assessments that failed to utilize the best available scientific data and establish very real regulations for private citizens and private companies.

EPA has targeted a number of important chemistries, including formaldehyde; uranium; vanadium, a critical mineral; ethylene oxide, for sterilization of medical equipment; naphthalene, to shut down oil production; as well as others.

IRIS risk assessments have been put forth at the expense of American jobs and cost public confidence in chemistries that are critical to activity across many sectors of the U.S. economy, from agriculture to furniture making to transportation and national security.

Bipartisan concerns have been raised repeatedly in Congress about the failure of the IRIS program to utilize sound science and broad input in its evaluations. These concerns have been largely dismissed or ignored.

Recently, IRIS has indicated that they intend to use the formaldehyde IRIS rule, which is below the level in human breath and from natural background levels, as the basis for their high-priority risk evaluation and risk management rule for formaldehyde over the next 2 years.

It should be obvious that these bans on formaldehyde, certain formaldehyde-based products or conditions of use, and unachievable workplace standards orders of magnitude below OSHA or European Union requirements will be very damaging mandates for Americans.

This would include direct negative impacts on the manufacturing community, including on manufacturing of resins, wood products, adhesives, fer-

tilizers, roofing, coating materials, electrical products, lubricants, fabrics, and other construction materials as well as energy, transportation, and agriculture end uses.

There needs to be a change in the way EPA conducts its business around scientific integrity and accountability and the way in which the Federal Government conducts chemical risk evaluations.

My amendment is in the interest of protecting American safety and jobs and ensuring chemical risk assessments conducted by the EPA are driven by the best available science rather than political and ideological agendas.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, the EPA's Integrated Risk Information System identifies and characterizes the health hazards of chemicals found in the environment in an impartial manner. IRIS assessments are critical in understanding the environmental risks we face.

This amendment would deny Americans a valuable tool in understanding the health effects resulting from chronic exposure to chemicals. This includes cancer descriptors that help us better understand which chemicals are most likely to cause cancer.

Madam Chair, I support the work done by the EPA. I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Madam Chair, I will point out one more time that we are in a situation here in which our tolerance is well under that of European or other countries. One more time, we are going put ourselves in a position which manufacturing is much more expensive, if not impossible, in the United States compared to other countries.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MS. HAGEMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 97 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, revise, implement, administer, or enforce the notice of interim guidance entitled "National Environmental Policy Act Guidance on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change" published by the Council on Environmental Quality in the Federal Register on January 9, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 1196).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment, which prevents any funding from being used to finalize or implement the CEQ's "National Environmental Policy Act Guidance on Consideration of Greenhouse Gas Emissions and Climate Change."

Earlier this year, the CEQ issued interim guidance for agencies to analyze greenhouse gas and climate change effects of their proposed actions under the National Environmental Policy Act.

Madam Chair, for decades, radical environmental groups have weaponized NEPA to attack and block natural resources development. They have done so through a variety of techniques, including by colluding with various Federal agencies in sue-and-settle schemes that have poured massive amounts of money into their coffers while doing very little to actually protect the environment or ensure that we can access and use our Federal lands and projects to produce oil and gas, coal, hydropower, and nuclear energy.

These are just some of the reasons as to why Republicans in Congress have prioritized the passage of H.R. 1, the Lower Energy Cost Act, which is intended to streamline, improve, and expedite the NEPA process while also ensuring that we are protecting our environment. We can do both, and in fact, we have been doing so for decades.

I have had multiple constituents reach out to me over the last year seeking assistance in getting various Federal agencies to move important projects along in the process.

In one such case, a constituent described being stuck on his fourth and final solicitors review, a do loop that had been going on for literally years. Although they had completed every single task and done every single thing asked of them multiple times, the agency refused to move forward.

My staff has since met with the Office of Surface Mining only to be told that there is a queue, as though that is an adequate answer. To date, there has been no movement on this review.

This situation represents a failure of the system, and allowing the CEQ to unilaterally impose radical GHG and global warming requirements on these agencies will not make the situation any better.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Madam Chair, we simply have no accountability, no taking of responsibility, and no consequences for these agencies that fail to carry out their responsibilities. What that means in the long term is that there is ultimately no more gas for our cars, oil to heat our homes, or energy to power our First World economy.

What is my point? We do not need to add any more roadblocks under NEPA making it even more uncertain and difficult for these agencies to process applications. We don't need any more steps, reviews, analyses, or guidance documents to make NEPA more burdensome to our producers, small businesses, ranchers, and manufacturers. We don't need to make it any more difficult to properly manage our national forests or to maintain our water infrastructure.

We have reclamation projects that need to be constructed and maintained. We have forests in dire need of management. We need these things now, not 10 years from now.

My amendment defunds the CEQ's and this administration's efforts to use global warming hysteria to further delay such projects that are subject to NEPA.

My amendment is also critically important to block CEQ's illegal attempt to avoid compliance with the APA's rulemaking requirements. CEQ doesn't have the authority to issue guidance documents with the force and effect of law, yet that is exactly how this guidance document will be interpreted—as imposing new requirements on project proponents as part of the NEPA review process.

We must, therefore, stop CEQ from implementing a so-called guidance document that is, in reality, no such thing. CEQ should be forced to go through the public rulemaking process to adopt such wide-ranging changes to NEPA procedural requirements.

The reality is that NEPA was designed to address reasonably foreseeable impacts of a particular project, not to allow agencies to try to guess what temperature it will be a thousand miles away 75 years from now.

I read an article a year ago assessing the global warming hysteria that we are living through. This gentleman who wrote the article made an excellent observation that I believe is worth repeating here: “The notion that government should impoverish actual human beings as a means of promoting the welfare of humanity is a pagan superstition on par with sacrificing individuals to the sun god.” I couldn't have said it better.

□ 2000

We must block the CEQ from pursuing an agenda of impoverishment and government imposed wretchedness. We must no longer tolerate their bowing to the sun god, and we must return common sense and rational thinking to our permitting and NEPA processes.

Please join me in supporting my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MS. HAGEMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 98 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the final rule of the Environmental Protection Agency, titled “Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification Improvement Rule”, and published on September 27, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 66558).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Wyoming.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my amendment which prohibits the implementation and enforcement of the EPA's final rule entitled: Clean Water Act Section 401 Water Quality Certification Improvement Rule.

The U.S. EPA published in the Federal Register its revised Clean Water Act Section 401 certification rule on September 27 of this year. This proposal was made in direct response to the 2021 Biden executive order that directed agencies to tackle the so-called climate crisis.

This rule applies to 401 certifications, which are water quality certifications issued by State or Tribal authorities that verify compliance with water quality requirements. The CWA allows States a great deal of discretion in reviewing and conditioning 401 certifications to ensure compliance with the CWA and State surface water quality standards.

This final rule returns to the broader scope of review that was in place prior to the 2020 rule and requires States and Tribes to evaluate the water-quality-related impacts from an entire activity as a whole, including construction and operation, rather than doing what it should, which is solely focusing on the aspect of the activity directly authorized by a given Federal license or permit.

The final rule also includes a broad definition of the term “neighboring jurisdiction” which means that it can include any jurisdiction other than the one in which the discharge originates.

The EPA's proposed rule is too broad, is contrary to the clear intent of section 401 of the Clean Water Act and is

outside of the EPA's authority and jurisdiction.

My amendment would prohibit the implementation of this broad, wrong-headed rule.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I rise to oppose this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, this is another policy rider designed to block the EPA from doing its work to protect our air, our water, and public health. I know my constituents. They look to me to make good decisions because they want to have clean water to drink, to cook, and to bathe in, and the EPA working alongside the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency ensures that we have the best water quality standards around.

So, Madam Chair, on behalf of the Fourth District of Minnesota, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Madam Chair, we all want clean water. This rule has nothing to do with that. This has to do with the EPA controlling and dictating matters that they have no business being involved with.

This proposal will put many pending projects at risk, including mining projects, and it will force the courts to make the final determinations with regard to such projects by interpreting and applying two extremely vague and ambiguous provisions included in the new rule.

This situation will ultimately result in a significant loss of investment in mining projects throughout the country, and it will cause greater regulatory uncertainty and inefficiency.

My amendment will block the EPA from implementing this wrongheaded rule, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of it.

Not only does this rule broaden reviews and jurisdiction for permit requirements, but it substantially expands the jurisdiction of States to regulate even those waters that are not considered navigable waters of the United States as required by the Clean Water Act.

The Wyoming Department of Environmental Quality had this to say about the rule:

We are deeply concerned with EPA's blatant claims in the preamble of the rule to use the section 401 certification process as a mechanism to expand Federal jurisdiction in waters that are not waters of the United States.

Wyoming DEQ also highlighted the burdens that would be imposed on entities due to broadening the scope of activities measured under this certification to include conditions unrelated or only speculatively related to water quality.

I will say it again: We all want clean water. This rule has nothing to do with that.

EPA's new interpretation of section 401 and its efforts to broaden States' authority over water bodies and features that are outside of the jurisdiction of Clean Water Act must be stopped.

We are fed up with the EPA using the Clean Water Act as part of its effort to implement this administration's radical environmental agenda and land grab. My amendment is designed to stop this nonsense, to block the EPA's misinterpretation and application of section 401 of the Clean Water Act, and to force the EPA to follow the law.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. JACKSON OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 99 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end, before the short title, insert the following:

TEXAS KANGAROO RAT

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of the Interior to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule titled "Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Texas Kangaroo Rat and Designation of Critical Habitat" (88 Fed. Reg. 55962; published August 17, 2023).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. JACKSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment which will stop the Federal land grab happening in my district by the Fish and Wildlife Service.

My amendment will prohibit funds from being used to implement the horrible, proposed rule to list the Texas kangaroo rat as endangered.

Under its proposed rule the Fish and Wildlife Service will designate 600,000 acres as critical habitat across five counties in my district.

This decision is a massive overreach by the Federal Government that will simultaneously harm the farmers and ranchers in my district which, by the way, is the number one ag district in the State, and it will simultaneously crush the struggling oil and gas industry.

The State of Texas has long been committed to promoting and protecting our wildlife and natural habi-

tats through voluntary conservation efforts that balance responsible stewardship and economic development.

This horribly flawed rule proposal is a completely unnecessary action from the Biden administration as the State of Texas has already taken the initiative to preserve the Texas kangaroo rat.

Action has already been taken to address the conservation needs of the species while accounting for the unique needs of landowners in north Texas, which results in thousands of acres of land already being utilized to conserve the species without punishing private citizens or the ag and energy sectors.

Unfortunately, the always radical Biden administration decided to ignore the ongoing efforts and impose unnecessary and aggressive Federal interference. The Fish and Wildlife Services endangered listing of the Texas kangaroo rat will have drastic ramifications on the farming and ranching industry in Texas. If this proposed rule goes into effect, agriculture producers in my district could be subject to civil and criminal penalties handed out by radical Biden administration officials who will stop at nothing to advance its Green New Deal agenda, meaning farmers and ranchers could face up to 1 year imprisonment and tens of thousands of dollars in fines for accidental or even perceived injury of a Texas kangaroo rat or its habitat.

The Texas kangaroo rat can only thrive when there is sparse, short grasses and small stubble which is exactly what our farmers and ranchers provide when grazing cattle.

The farming and ranching industries are the backbone of our unique Texas history, heritage, and economy. Unfortunately, the heavy hand of the Federal bureaucracy, once again, is looking to destroy that.

If this proposed rule goes into effect, it will significantly restrict the way our ranchers can use their land, setting a dangerous precedent of Federal overreach into agriculture production that will have far-reaching consequences for not only Texas but our entire Nation.

The agriculture industry is already being hit with rising costs due to the historic inflation caused by "Bidenomics", and this new rule will only intensify these struggles.

Texas has a proud history of responsible land management and conservation, and for any effort to succeed, it must be driven by local communities rather than bureaucrats in Washington.

Madam Chair, I urge every Member in this body to support my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, ecosystems are in distress, and they are declining globally at rates we couldn't

even have imagined. Human history will have more than 1 million species directly currently threatened with extinction within many decades. It will happen within some of our lifetimes.

This amendment seeks to legislate species rather than providing species with the protections that are afforded under the Endangered Species Act. The species live somewhere. The Endangered Species Act protects the habitat.

Madam Chair, think of the bald eagle and what we did to protect that, and how proud we all are of what we did to protect that. Those were other Members of Congress. Now we have the responsibility to do the same thing for the next generation.

This law would also potentially increase litigation regarding the government's responsibility to implement the statutory requirements under the Endangered Species Act. So that means more litigation and more taxpayers' dollars spent in litigation.

The best available science and commercial information, not politics, should determine whether a species is listed, threatened, or endangered. This amendment circumvents the rigorous process that is put in place to make those scientific determinations as well as the role of public input. There is public input that goes into this.

The primary factor influencing the viability of the Texas kangaroo rat is loss of its habitat largely related to historical land use changes. Human activities threaten to diminish animal habitats. They pollute nature. They accelerate global warming which is driving species to extinction and creating more unhealthy ecosystems. When we lose a species it impacts and reverberates throughout our ecosystem and we all suffer because our economy, our public health, livelihoods, food security, and quality of life all depend upon ecosystems working together.

Defunding the service's ability to list a species would work against the clear intent of the Endangered Species Act and would, as I said before, cause more litigation by outside groups, not less, but more litigation costing taxpayers more money.

Most importantly, Madam Chair, it would also undercut the service's ability to work collaboratively with Tribes who seek help on ecosystem protection, other Federal agencies, States, and local communities, and landowners who wish and want to work cooperatively to conserve species.

So, Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and to protect vulnerable species so that future generations can benefit from a world with healthy ecosystems and robust biodiversity just as previous generations did for us, and the best example is the American bald eagle.

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

Mr. JACKSON of Texas. Madam Chair, there are no better stewards of the land and the animals in Texas than the farmers and ranchers in Texas' 13th

Congressional District. We do not need the Federal Government telling us how to accomplish this.

Madam Chair, I appreciate having the support of all of my colleagues. I urge everyone to vote “yes” 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 Texas (Mr. JACKSON).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. LAMALFA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 100 printed in part A of House Report 118–261.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the Draft Resource Management Plan or Draft Environmental Impact Statement referenced in the notice titled “Notice of Availability of the Draft Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement for the Redding and Arcata Field Offices and an Associated Environmental Impact Statement, California” (88 Fed. Reg. 67344; published September 29, 2023).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, my amendment would stop the latest in a series of land grabs in the West by the Biden administration.

Many of the Presidential proclamations and the executive actions enabling these land grabs stem from section 216 of Executive Order 14008 signed by President Biden just a week after taking office.

This order started the 30 by 30 plan which seeks to restrict and lock away roughly 30 percent of this Nation’s public lands by the year 2030.

“30 for 30” is a nice series on ESPN about sports figures, but 30 by 30 is very dangerous for us in the West.

In support of this executive initiative, the Bureau of Land Management published a new resource management plan for northwest California at the end of September. Much of the BLM plan area overlaps with my own congressional district.

□ 2015

In total, the so-called preferred alternative detailed in BLM’s draft management plan would designate 42,000 acres as protected for the environment or for conservation.

Under the Bureau’s current management plan, just 100 acres of land are labeled suitable for wild and scenic river designations, but this draft plan would see the number would explode to nearly

34,000 acres. The difference between 100 acres is one-sixth of a square mile, and 34,000 acres is 53 square miles.

In Shasta County, 33,000 acres would be labeled areas of critical environmental concern. Concern. We can be concerned about just about anything around here, can’t we? Several thousand more will be removed from eligibility for livestock grazing. Grazing, which is known to be very helpful in fire suppression and actually stirring the land and having things grow.

The same interest groups that are supportive of this management plan are also behind a continuous push to remove hydroelectric dams now on Butte Creek, as well as the ones we are suffering up on the Klamath River. This would prevent recreational fishing on Butte Creek.

Madam Chairman, the 30 by 30 plan is indicative of how much environmentalists just don’t understand real life for rural Americans and certainly life for the people in my own congressional district. If environmentalists actually lived in the Churn Creek Bottom or up in Magalia, they would understand that my constituents who do live there want to take care of the natural resources.

The folks in Churn Creek Bottom don’t just graze without regard to the health of the land. They know, because they live there, that they will need to graze this land again in a few months, in a few years, in 10 years, and on, as many families have been doing for six generations in my district.

In my life, I am really a rice farmer. I would fight to protect our rivers from pollution because it is bad for my crops and for my neighbors. This isn’t rocket science, folks. Beyond my farm, the waterways in the Sacramento Valley need to be clean because people like to recreate, like to fish, and just have a nice environment. No, we are not bad stewards of the land. We certainly don’t need Biden coming in and setting aside 30 percent of all lands in just 7 scant years.

Bureaucrats with orders from D.C., however, should not be telling Americans to stay away from the public lands. They already know how to take care of their lands and their rivers. Most of these resources are the lifeblood of each and every rural town, anyway.

I urge adoption of this amendment in order to keep just a little more freedom, a little more possibilities in the economy and a lifestyle that was once normal in rural America.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I claim time in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, this is just another more controversial poison pill rider that sadly shows some of the extremes that Republicans will go to.

Now, we need to be interested in laws that can gain bipartisan support and become law because people want us to work together and move forward. The draconian cuts proposed in this bill violate the agreement that was reached by Speaker McCarthy and President Biden that were memorialized in Public Law 118–5, the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023. I voted for that in good faith and thought we, as a Congress, were going to honor that commitment to those spending levels.

Now that I have said that, I want to get back to the amendment. In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act and the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, the BLM drafted a proposed draft resource management plan, an environmental impact statement that is currently open for a 90-day comment period. The public has been asked to comment. Your constituents can comment, and we have asked them to do that. This amendment would prohibit the BLM from providing an updated, comprehensive, and environmentally adequate framework for managing the uses of its public lands and resources.

We are here to protect the overall welfare of the American public and to preserve our lands and resources for future generations. Unfortunately, this would be disregarding the law and trying to circumvent the rigorous process that is in place to update the management plans to better address larger, higher intensity wildland fires, for example, something I know the gentleman and I have both worked on and both agree that we need to do so much more on to protect our public lands from wildland fires and private lands from it as well.

This amendment nullifies that public comment I was talking about before, 90 days public comment. We have invited the public in to make comments. We are currently collecting them. This amendment would say, you know, we asked you to comment, but we are just going to totally disregard it. We are not going to even look at it.

I believe we cannot close our eyes to the impacts of climate change we are experiencing. Our economy, our health, our livelihoods, food security, and quality of life all depend on healthy ecosystems and so does reducing and suppressing wildland fires, for example.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and focus instead on work we can do together to address climate change and together being good stewards of our public lands and resources for the benefit of future generations.

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Madam Chair, I have been hearing all day, we need more plans that can gain bipartisan support, yet the people I represent, especially in the northern part of my district, don’t believe there is bipartisan support when the Federal agencies come in and take away their water, make it where they can’t access their land, they can’t

get grazing permits anymore. It is crammed down their throats by an administration that is listening to somebody else rather than them. That doesn't sound very bipartisan.

It is putting these people out of business who have been successful for five, six generations on being good stewards of the land, yet now it is not good enough because of something called climate change, which CO₂ only represents 0.04 percent of our atmosphere. That is hardly measurable. Yet we are going hell-bent on ruining our economy, ruining people's lives, ruining legacies because of something that people who fly in their private jets to Davos like to talk about and put upon us.

Madam Chair, 30 for 30 does not do anything for climate change. It just makes it just about impossible to produce domestic food, domestic energy, et cetera, in this country. That is why I am bringing this amendment, and I appreciate an "aye" vote.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MR. MCCORMICK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 101 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ The salary of Matthew Tejada, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Environmental Justice, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MCCORMICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Madam Chair, I rise to offer my amendment No. 101 to H.R. 4821, the Interior-Environment appropriations bill for 2024. My amendment reduces the salary of Matthew Tejada, the deputy assistant administrator for environmental justice at the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, to \$1.

As the deputy assistant administrator, he often propagates divisive rhetoric and pushes the Biden administration's disastrous environmental justice initiatives onto American communities.

While in his position, Matthew Tejada has made divisive and inflammatory remarks, attributing the disinvestment in some areas, like East St. Louis, to racism and referred to this as the genocide of communities. This sort of rhetoric is a tool used by the radical left to create a greater divide across the Nation.

Matthew Tejada has even said that he wants to use millions of Federal tax dollars to fix environmental racism. As a conservative, I support protecting the environment. One of my favorite Presidents—as a matter of fact, my favorite President—Teddy Roosevelt was a Republican and one of the greatest champions of environmental conservation.

However, I do not support taking a benign policy topic and twisting it into a controversial issue used by the government to further its own political agenda.

This year the EPA received \$108 million to go toward funding environmental justice programs and projects, such as the Biden administration's Executive Order 13985, which instructs the EPA to enact an equity action plan.

I am strongly opposed to wasting American taxpayer dollars on issues that will further divide the country. Investing in our communities is important. However, incorporating race into an unrelated issue is simply virtue signaling, which is unhelpful and divisive.

The Biden administration should focus on unifying the country rather than dividing us so that we can combat the real issues our country is facing, like the emergency at the southern border, rising inflation, and the multiple crises happening overseas.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I know the gentleman doesn't see it this way, but I see this amendment as petty and punitive—the EPA and environmental justice. I live in a corridor, it is called I-94, and there was a thriving African-American community there. Absolutely thriving—undertakers, dentists, doctors, dry cleaners, grocery stores. It was an amazing place. However, it was the place of the least political resistance to put a highway through rather than over by the cathedral, which got a different speed limit and some other things that happened, or the mansions on Summit Avenue hill just a couple blocks away.

Snelling Avenue in my district has some of the worst air quality for the homes that are located around there because of the freeway. I can give example after example, and I just used transportation, but I can use other things.

I grew up in South St. Paul, a river town with a meatpacking plant. Swift Armour could just throw their waste right into the Mississippi River. The State of Wisconsin sued us not only for that waste but for the waste of our municipal waste plant that was there. That was in the poorest neighborhood around between Dakota and Washington County.

You can say it is about race, but it is about people who were taken advan-

tage of because it was the most expedient thing to do. Now the Biden administration and other administrations have said, you know what, we have a responsibility to clean that up. We have a responsibility to do better, and that is a role that the environmental pollution control agency should be involved in because the water, the air, and the soil in many of these places is not anyplace where we would make an investment or where you would want to buy something.

I understand the gentleman has his viewpoint on what is going on. I just want you to hear from myself and on behalf of my constituents who are working to rectify a wrong. We are doing it in a positive way that moves forward; that is not dividing our communities, but it is uniting our communities. I don't think when we are mad at something or a policy that we should be going after individual public servants.

I would like to move forward, Madam Chair, and negotiate with the Senate a bill to fund the government and to move the EPA forward so we have clean air, clean water, and we protect our soil.

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

Mr. MCCORMICK. Madam Chair, I actually appreciate the gentlewoman's comments. As a former student body president at Morehouse School of Medicine, a minority university, I appreciate the diversity that our country represents. The problem I have is that when we are trying to save the environment, which I have no problem with—I have already stated, my dad was a forest ranger. I have already stated that Teddy Roosevelt was my favorite President—I want to protect the environment. I just don't want to make it an issue about race. I believe we should protect all people, regardless of their skin color. I believe in equal opportunities. I believe that if it is the right thing to do, we do it regardless of what race, what religion, what gender. No matter what the people are, they are Americans, and they deserve the very best from their government. The fact is, we are literally using the government to call the government racist. The very people who are put in charge by President Biden are calling people who are put in charge by the same governmental people racist. It is an inconsistency of thought, and it is divisive.

Therefore, I humbly ask my colleagues to support my amendment to hold Federal bureaucrats accountable, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

□ 2030

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR. MCCORMICK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 102 printed in part A of House Report 118–261.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. ____ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, apply, enforce, or carry out Executive Order 14037 of August 5, 2021 (86 Fed. Reg. 43583; relating to strengthening American leadership in clean cars and trucks), Executive Order 14057 of December 8, 2021 (86 Fed. Reg. 70935; relating to catalyzing clean energy industries and jobs through Federal sustainability), or Executive Order 14096 of April 21, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 25251; relating to revitalizing our Nation's commitment to environmental justice for all).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MCCORMICK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Madam Chair, I rise to offer my amendment No. 102 to H.R. 4821, the Interior-Environment appropriations bill for 2024.

My amendment would prohibit funds from this act from implementing President Biden's burdensome and irresponsible Executive Order Nos. 14037, 14057, and 14096.

Executive Order Nos. 14037 and 14057 are just more examples of the Biden administration's overreach and out-of-touch energy regulations.

The idea that the American people want the consequences of 100 percent of their electricity being carbon pollution-free by 2030, 100 percent of the government vehicles to have zero emissions by 2035, and 50 percent of all new passenger cars and light trucks sold in the United States to be electric by 2030 shows just how ignorant this current administration is to the challenges of everyday Americans who are facing these problems.

Everyone needs to pay attention. EV popularity is waning, and it is expensive. Every day, Americans are worried about the skyrocketing costs of groceries and gas prices or whether their next paycheck will cover all their bills, including their electricity bills.

The last thing they are thinking about trying to afford is an electric vehicle that meets the Biden administration's strict standards and, on average, costs \$17,000 more than a gas-powered vehicle.

By the way, for a guy who owns a Tesla and who just had to replace a

battery, that is another \$17,000 on top of that. Your battery will go bad. Anybody who has a cell phone understands that.

These executive orders will hurt low-income Americans most of all. The Biden administration claims to protect those people.

As we look at Executive Order No. 14096, we see a pattern as the Biden administration chooses to focus on programs that divide the American people rather than unite us.

Madam Chair, instead of simply promoting conservation efforts, which most Americans agree are important, this administration continues to use divisive rhetoric behind environmental justice, which does not benefit the poor.

Examples of this divisive rhetoric in the executive order include "remnants of discrimination continue to persist today"—we are talking about EV vehicles—or that "communities with environmental justice concerns face entrenched disparities." I will tell you that the disparities will be from those who cannot afford these very vehicles that are required.

Our country needs unifying language and leadership. The Biden administration fails that test.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on my amendment No. 102 to ensure that American taxpayer dollars are not being spent on frivolous and polarizing initiatives.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I am a little confused. I serve on this committee, and one of the debates that we had when we were doing the markup—and the Chair probably remembers—is how, in the base bill, all the money that he is talking about was stripped out. It is gone. We couldn't find offsets to put it back in, but it is gone. The money that the gentleman is referring to is gone.

Madam Chair, \$1.4 billion was taken from EJ in the Inflation Reduction Act. It was taken away, so it is gone.

However, just getting into what we tried to do, Democrats did try to make historic investments in environmental justice, and the EPA has been able to put some of those dollars to use.

As I said, there is no EJ funding. There is zero in the base bill. It is unfortunate because I think environmental justice, as I said earlier, makes sure that everybody gets the same degree of protection from environmental health hazards.

Our rural communities and the community that I grew up in, which is an older suburb but at the time was very rural, were targeted by corporations, regulatory agencies, and local planning boards because the land was cheap and had been polluted. Then, they just kept

siting more pollution around it like landfills or a waste transfer station. They thought it was a good place to put an incinerator, a garbage dump.

The amount of concentration of pollution in some of these areas is really mind-boggling because the mindset is that because it is already polluted, we can just put a little more there.

I know my colleague mentioned that he is a doctor, so I know he knows that when someone is exposed to a lot of chemicals, when someone is exposed to a lot of toxins, they have higher health disparities and shorter lifespans. That is all documented. In these populations, there are higher cancer rates.

As I said, the money is gone, unfortunately. I hope we can work with the Senate to put some things back, but I want my colleagues to just think for a minute that some of these communities started out with one waste facility or one toxic plant and then another one and another one and another one came. House values went down, and pretty soon, no one wanted to live there. In my case, in my community, it was right on the Mississippi River.

Like I said, I am a little confused by talking about the funding in this bill that no longer exists, and I am going to reserve the balance of my time because I think, Madam Chair, Members of this House know how I feel about this. I strongly oppose this amendment.

Mr. MCCORMICK. Madam Chair, I appreciate my colleague pointing out the equity of environment and her concerns for the people. I know myself when I grew up having to supply my own insurance, supply my own gas, supply my own car, which I bought for \$1,295 for a 1971 Datsun 510 with 141,000 miles on it, I couldn't afford anything other than that. I couldn't afford any better insurance. My mom didn't have an insurance policy. Can you imagine a 16-year-old nowadays having their own insurance policy not on their parents' plan?

I was in survival mode, which a lot of these people that she is talking about in these communities are in. That is all they can afford—a used gas vehicle to get to their job, to be independent, to live a dignified life where they can sustain themselves, not because they were told by the government, "You will do this because I am protecting you," but they had a choice. They had a choice because we trust people more than we trust government.

Isn't that what this whole argument is about? Do we trust the government to know what is better for our family and our choices, whether it be what we drive, where we work, or what our emissions are? Do we trust the American people no matter what the color of their skin is, or do we trust the American Government to be the moral standard of who we are and what we represent?

Who do you trust? What is equity? Is equity when the government decides everybody will be equal, or when a person had the choice, based on their God-

given right to self-determine, regardless of the color of their skin, regardless of their gender, regardless of their religion, that they have the freedom of choice to decide their fate based on their own challenges?

That is what this argument is about. Do we self-determine, or do we let the American Government become our moral standard of what is right and wrong, of what is good for me?

I choose the individual over the government. I believe that is the foundation of our government. I believe that is the foundation of our Constitution. I believe that that is the unalienable right that God gave us.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 103 OFFERED BY MRS. MILLER OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 103 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. The salary of Ya-Wei Li, Deputy Assistant Administrator for Pesticide Programs, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Chair, I rise in support of my amendment that would reduce Deputy Assistant Administrator Jake Li's salary to \$1.

Mr. Li oversees all pesticide programs at the Biden EPA. The Biden EPA has consistently politicized crop reduction tools, creating uncertainty for farmers.

In their most recent attack on farmers and ranchers, the Biden EPA released a new herbicide strategy at the request of the radical climate cult lobby. This program would force farmers to implement costly mitigation measures, likely forcing them out of production entirely.

According to the Biden administration's own estimates, this program

could cost more than \$5 billion for all corn acres in Illinois, Iowa, and Nebraska alone. This is just one more example of how the Biden administration puts the leftwing political agenda ahead of farmers who grow food to feed America and the world.

Madam Chair, please join me in supporting this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, here we go again. We are attacking the salary of a person who is doing their job, Mr. Li.

Mr. Li has a really important job. Mr. Li's job is to regulate pesticides. Pesticides can be toxic. One of the things that got me involved in politics back when I served on the natural resources and agriculture subcommittee in the State of Minnesota was all the reading that we were doing about the accumulation of pesticides on food that children were ingesting because all the studies had been done for pesticides on an adult healthy male and how it could affect their development.

The more I learned about pesticides—and they are important. They are an important tool for our agriculture. We feed the world. We feed our folks here. If a pesticide isn't regulated—and I don't have the names right in front of me. Madam Chair, I will get them submitted for the record. Some of them are water-soluble.

We learned a lot about how pesticide companies would come in and target local farmers to have them use this pesticide, saying it was great, but it didn't break down in water. It would get into well water. It would get into streams. It would do terrible things to the ecosystem and streams.

In Minnesota, our farmers didn't want that, but they weren't scientists on a lot of that, so who do they turn to? They turned to scientific experts to do the due diligence, to check these pesticides out so when and if they are used, they are used properly so they do no harm. They only do good.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and to support the EPA in its work to protect our public health and environment.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 104 OFFERED BY MRS. MILLER OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 104 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Solar For All competition of the Environmental Protection Agency.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Madam Chairwoman, I rise in support of my amendment that would prohibit funding for the Solar for All program.

During an Agriculture Committee hearing earlier this year, the EPA Administrator told me that the EPA does not incentivize solar panels. This program clearly demonstrates he was not being truthful in his testimony.

Under the Biden administration's Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, the EPA has announced a \$7 billion subsidy for solar panels. China completely controls the solar panel industry, and we should not be using taxpayer money to subsidize our adversaries in the name of a leftwing political ideology.

□ 2045

According to the EPA's own website, solar panels contain hazardous materials that are harmful to humans.

In my home State of Illinois, a school roof lit on fire due to excessive heat generated by solar panels on the roof.

The Biden administration needs to stop prioritizing the left's radical climate agenda over the energy needs of the American people.

Please join me in supporting this amendment.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. We are now only 15 days away from a government shutdown, and instead of focusing on keeping the government open, we are working on a bill that is going nowhere.

The draconian cuts that I talked about earlier in this bill violate the agreement reached by former Speaker McCarthy and President Biden that were memorialized in statute and Public Law 118-5, the Fiscal Responsibility Act of 2023.

We would not be teetering on the brink of a government shutdown if my

Republican colleagues had upheld their end of the bargain and funded at the levels we had agreed to and there was a vote that I did take in this body, so I feel I had a vested interest in thinking that we were going to honor that agreement.

We are here to protect the welfare of the American people, and we cannot close our eyes to the impacts of climate change, drought, flooding, severe storms, wildfires events that we are experiencing.

As of October 10, the United States has experienced 24 confirmed weather/climate disaster events with losses exceeding \$1 billion each. This is a new record.

I could talk about the money that the Department of Defense, in the billions of dollars, is having to spend to make buildings resilient and to try to prevent buildings from collapsing due to these extreme weather events.

The Department of Defense sees climate change—the Department of Defense sees climate change, I want to stress this—as a national security issue. The Department of Defense invests in solar, and the EPA should not walk away from it.

When we have solar available, it is something that is a strategy that will help us in preventing the acceleration of climate change, instead of paying billions of dollars in disaster relief. I don't think that is what is best for the American taxpayer.

Our economy, our health, our livelihoods, our food security, our quality of life all depend on how the planet is a healthy ecosystem and doing what we can to mitigate climate change.

I state again that we have been working to bring wind and solar and bring the costs down, and many States, including Texas, are embracing a lot of this, and a lot of small businesses are coming forward.

I agree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle. I don't want to be purchasing solar panels from China. I want to manufacture them right here in the United States as part of a full energy embrace mix.

I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment and focus instead on addressing climate change, making our Nation stronger, and agreeing with the Department of Defense that climate change is a national security issue.

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

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. I would like to remind my friends on the other side that China controls the mining of rare earth minerals used to produce solar panels.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 106 OFFERED BY MR. NEHLS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 106 printed in part A of House Report 118–261.

Mr. NEHLS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the shooting of cattle in the Gila National Forest or any other National Forest.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NEHLS. Madam Chair, my amendment would simply prohibit funds to be used for the shooting of cattle in the Gila National Forest or any other national forest.

Folks, let me tell you why this issue is so important.

I am offering this amendment to ensure that the voices of the concerned residents of New Mexico and cattle grazers across the country are heard. The Forest Service has been using your hard-earned taxpayer dollars to issue and execute aerial kill orders for feral cattle in the Gila National Forest due to environmental concerns.

The Forest Service defines feral cattle as cattle without brands, ear tags, or other signs of ownership. However, it is oftentimes difficult to tell the difference between a feral cow and a non-feral cow. My staff and I tried it. We couldn't tell the difference.

Even if the cows are feral, under New Mexico State law, feral cows are the property of the New Mexico Livestock Board, which opposed the actions taken by the Forest Service to shoot these cattle in the first place.

Cattle grazers are rightfully concerned that their own branded cattle could have ventured into the area in question due to fences being burned down by wildfires or damaged from an unusually strong monsoon season.

The area in question in the Gila National Forest comprises over 500,000 acres, and only 19 of the estimated 50 to 250 feral cattle were killed.

After the aerial shooting of cattle takes place with high-powered rifles, the Forest Service leaves the cattle carcasses to decompose without removal. They don't care.

The Forest Service is clearly appeasing radical environmentalists and is not taking in the concerns of local landowners and cattle grazers. Even New Mexico Governor Grisham, the very liberal Governor, said that the Federal Government needed to do a better job of listening to residents about this issue.

To my colleagues in Congress: Whether it is local landowners, cattle grazers, the New Mexico Livestock Board, the New Mexico Farm Bureau, or Grant County cattle growers, they have all voiced their support for my amendment.

To my colleagues on the left: Even prominent animal rights organizations, such as Animal Wellness Action, the Animal Wellness Foundation, and the Center for Humane Economy have all come out in support of my amendment.

With that, I believe I should be able to sit down.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NEHLS. Madam Chair, I don't believe I have to say anymore.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 107 OFFERED BY MR. NEHLS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 107 printed in part A of House Report 118–261.

Mr. NEHLS. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Clean School Bus Program of the Environmental Protection Agency under section 741 of the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (42 U.S.C. 16091).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. NEHLS. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of my amendment before us today, which would prohibit funds for the EPA's Clean School Bus Program.

Let's get right to it, folks. Every Member of Congress and their staff searching for a pay-for, here it is. Cite this worthless program.

There is no need for the American taxpayer to continue to foot the bill for activities like this. This program provides \$5 billion, with a b, over 5 years to replace existing schoolbuses with zero-emission and low-emission models.

While everybody knows that schools are failing our students, the Biden administration would rather facilitate the transition of schoolbus fleets to zero-emission, low-emission, and electric bus alternatives when we have perfectly capable buses now that work every day.

A majority of eighth graders in our Nation are at basic and below proficiency levels when it comes to math and reading, yet we are focused on electrifying our bus fleets. Help me make that make sense.

With limited government funds and a national debt out of control, pet projects for this radical environmental ideology are not functional and has no place in a Republican-controlled House of Representatives.

Furthermore, EPA's top watchdog also said that he is not confident in the way the Agency has been handing out billions of dollars under this new program. He said: "We have seen this before: the equation of an unprepared agency dispensing an unprecedented amount of money times a large number of struggling recipients equals a high risk of fraud, waste and abuse."

I urge my colleagues to support my amendment to prohibit funds for EPA's so-called Clean School Bus Program and to prioritize the most immediate needs of the American people.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, I am just sad about this. I really don't understand why my colleague would want to roll back this great program on clean schoolbuses. I just don't understand. I mean, first off, you have to deny that climate change is real in order to say we shouldn't be doing significant things like this, converting our transportation system—which is an enormous part of climate change challenges, converting our transportation system to electric vehicles.

We have had this program since the IIJA, which was actually a bipartisan program. Perhaps you didn't vote for it. You may not have agreed with it, but it was a bipartisan bill, and this was in that bill, so this funding is already out there.

I have had the good fortune of talking to someone who works in one of the school programs where they have the clean schoolbus program. He couldn't say enough good things about it. He couldn't say enough about how good it has been for their district.

Number one, I don't know if you know this about electric vehicles, but your maintenance costs go way down. For most communities who have big schoolbus fleets, they have to have a maintenance barn. They have to have maintenance members who work in there, and this has reduced greatly their costs for maintaining the vehicles because there are not a lot of component parts in an electric vehicle.

He also told me that they have a little competition with the bus drivers. Each one is trying to figure out how long can I go on a charge? How does my bus work? They are all very engaged in this process.

Also importantly, there are no emissions from this bus. I don't know if you heard me earlier, but I was talking about the high asthma rate in my State. We are one of the top 10 in the country in asthma rates, and that means asthma in kids. So for kids to be

able to ride on a bus that has no emissions, it is just that much better for their health and well-being.

There are no good reasons to want to eliminate this. We have already funded it. There is no funding in this bill. You are just talking about this as sort of a grudge match against electric schoolbuses, which, frankly, there are more important problems to deal with in this country.

We have already funded this. School districts are already implementing this, applying for this. It is reducing their maintenance costs. They feel very good about these buses.

I suggest you talk to a school district, maybe one in your own district, your congressional district, and ask them how they feel about this, how it is working for their community.

You are opposing something that has gone very well. You are trying to prohibit a program that runs on clear fuel, that reduces the impact schoolbuses have on climate change. We are doing something good for America in this program, good for our schools, good for the health of our kids. There is no possible reason to want to do this, that is why I said it just makes me sad.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. NEHLS. Madam Chair, buses are a mode of transportation to get our prized possessions to the school.

Now, my colleague mentioned about the kids talking with the bus driver saying, How far can the bus get? They are trying to do some math. I would probably figure the kid probably doesn't even know the math, because our schools are failing, so the point is it is prioritizing the need.

We have to help educate our kids. The school system is failing. They are failing in States across our country, mostly in these very, very large cities run by liberals, mayors and city councils, so let's get our priorities straight and let's help the kids and not worry about the mode of transportation we have to get them there.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam Chair, if my colleague is so concerned about the challenges that students are facing in our schools, and I admit many schools are facing challenges because kids have been home during the pandemic, they have had a lot of setbacks, we are in a very difficult time in our world, kids have a lot to worry about, I would suggest that he debates another bill in support of encouraging more funding for the Department of Education. That would be a good place to put his concerns, but I would have to say there is no reason to be concerned about the schoolbuses.

□ 2100

In fact, we should be happy about the schoolbuses because we are imple-

menting electrification of our fleet. We are helping the well-being of our students by making sure there are less emissions from those buses, and they can ride on buses with cleaner air. We are reducing the cost of schools who are able to use these electric buses. I am in strong support of making sure that we have more electrification of our schoolbuses. I encourage my colleagues to reject the amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Madam 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 Texas will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 108 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 108 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the American Climate Corps.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Madam Chair, I have been sitting here for about an hour listening to the debate back and forth on amendments. The amendments the Republicans are putting up are wanting to put some fiscal sanity back in this House. My good friends on the left are wanting to spend more money. The priorities and the cancer in this country is the bankruptcy of America. The amendments I have will offer to cut programs that need to be cut.

Amendment 108 prohibits funding for the American Climate Corps. My amendment would prohibit funding for the American Climate Corps that the Biden administration recently established through executive order. This costs, by the way, \$30 billion. The Biden administration describes the American Climate Corps as a workforce training and service initiative for careers in clean energy and climate reliance economy. As part of the administration's Justice40 goal, the Corps will focus on equity and environmental justice. The American Climate Corps will cost, as I mentioned, \$30 billion.

Instead of funding Democrats' woke climate agenda, why don't we focus on

a pro-growth agenda that spurs the economy and prioritizes American energy independence?

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

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. GIMENEZ). The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, first I have to say, I am perplexed that anyone would not want to provide good-paying jobs that will help our Nation tackle the climate crisis and build a stronger country. The goal of the American Climate Corps is to put more than 20,000 young people on career pathways in the growing fields of clean energy, conservation, and climate resilience.

In launching this effort, President Biden is calling on Tribal, State, and local governments, labor unions, not-for-profit service allies, the private sector, and philanthropy to collaborate with the Federal Government to build on current relationships and expand skills-based training partnerships to ensure our workforce is ready to meet the climate crisis.

We have seen the devastation to coastal communities impacted by hurricanes and tropical storms. Why would we not want to train our youth to restore coastal wetlands that can protect communities from storm surges. We know the damage and loss that accompanies wildfires across our Nation. So why would we not want to train youth to manage forests, to improve health, and prevent catastrophic wildfires?

We know the power of skills-based training as a tool to expand pathways into good-paying jobs. Let's not deny our youth this opportunity. I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment.

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I met a lot of the young people in the Corps. They are good people. They build bridges. They build roads in our national forests. Now, to task them with stopping storms and stopping hurricanes, that is preposterous. They do active work. To say they can effect that is just, it is laughable if it wasn't so serious.

Democrats want to focus on social movements and further entrench environmental justice in the bureaucracy. These priorities are misguided and harmful. I urge my colleagues to support my amendment and ensure that we don't waste more valuable taxpayer dollars and resources to fund the Biden administration's radical climate agenda.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I don't remember mentioning social movements or environmental justice, although I do think environmental justice is very important. I was talking about skill training and making sure our youth are prepared for the jobs of the future. I don't anticipate that they can stop

storms. That would be Herculean, and I don't think anyone can stop climate change at this point, but I think they can help us deal with catastrophic wildfires, with coastal resilience. We can train people with skills of the future. This is a wonderful opportunity for our young people. I oppose 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 South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 109 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 109 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement or enforce the final rule titled "Control of Air Pollution From New Motor Vehicles: Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle Standards" published in the Federal Register by the Environmental Protection Agency on January 24, 2023 (88 Fed. Reg. 4296).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, this is another spend-a-thon by my friends from the left. My amendment would prohibit funding for the rule titled, "Control of Air Pollution from New Motor Vehicles: Heavy-Duty Engine and Vehicle Standards."

My good friend, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER) and her family are big time farmers in Illinois, and anybody that farms the land—let me tell you what this is going to affect. As far as the actual vehicles, it affects all models in model year 2027.

EPA last tightened the NO_x emissions standards for heavy-duty vehicles in 2001. The new standards are 80 percent more stringent than the current rules. The examples of heavy-duty trucks, it is going to affect every farm in this country. It applies to engines used and a broad spectrum of heavy-duty vehicles, including trucks from class 2b. That is the Ford F-250 through the class 8. These are semitrucks. It affects mobile homes. It affects schoolbuses. It affects pickup trucks and vans. The cost is from \$2,568 per vehicle up to \$8,304 for new equipment on semitrucks.

The American Truck Dealers estimates it is more likely a \$42,000 increase. That is per truck. Talk about putting people out of business. Talk about attacking farmers and everyday

Americans. This overreach of government could reach over \$55 billion in the lifetime of the program.

I urge my colleagues on the left to reconsider this vast overreach of government.

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

□ 2110

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, the compliance cost is unbelievably high. Owners and operators of trucks will be forced to leave the market or keep less safe trucks on the road.

According to the Truckload Carriers Association, the rule outpaces available technology and would worsen the already tight equipment market.

I hope everyone that is tuning in tonight listens to what this amendment will do to every American in this country, regardless if you are a farmer. If you just own a pickup truck, this is what we are talking about.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 110 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Department of the Interior's Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Civil Rights.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, my amendment would prohibit funding for policies that advance the Biden administration's radical diversity, equity, and inclusion agenda.

Specifically, my amendment would prohibit the use of funds for the Department of the Interior's Office of Diversity, Inclusion and Civil Rights. This office's goal is to promote equity and justice for all Americans. What does that mean? I think what they mean is they want equal outcomes instead of equal opportunity. What this does is further entrenches environmental justice in the bureaucracy in and of itself.

From the military to corporations to Federal agencies, we have seen time and time again that the DEI mission fosters tribalism in the workplace, undermines our shared American identity, and distracts from the missions of our Federal agencies.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, one of our greatest strengths as a Nation is our diversity. The American experience is not a singular experience, and diversity programs exist to recognize this.

The fact is, and business leaders agree, having a diverse and inclusive culture in the workplace is critical to performance. Attempting to defund or block the implementation of these efforts only takes us back to a time when our Nation's diversity was not seen as an asset.

Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, I encourage my colleagues to do the same, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I close out by saying the cancer in this country is the \$33 trillion in debt. Companies have to expend funds for this, which the interest alone is over \$20,000 per second. Woke programs have got to be dealt with. The only way you deal with them is cut their funding.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

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

Ms. PINGREE. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 111 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 111 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Interagency Working Group on the Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, my amendment would prohibit funding for the Interagency Working Group on the Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases. This is another bureaucratic nightmare that businesses are having to put up with.

This amendment would prohibit funds from being used by the Interagency Working Group on the Social Cost of Greenhouse Gases. This group was originally convened by the Obama administration before being disbanded by the Trump administration and reimposed through Biden's radical climate Executive Order No. 13990. Democrats use the social cost of greenhouse gas metrics to justify sweeping climate policies and strict regulations that are vague and have no ending to the cost.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I close by saying that by boosting the climate cost of projects, regulators can use the social cost of carbon to derail everything from energy to infrastructure projects. Agencies can also use a higher value to justify new regulations on everything from power plants to appliances in the home. This administration has attacked every appliance known to man, including the gas stove.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 112 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 112 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. The salary of Tracy Stone-Manning, Director of the Bureau of Land Management, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, what my amendment does is it reduces the salary of Tracy Stone-Manning, director of the Bureau of Land Management, to \$1.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from

Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE), my good friend.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, I thank Representative NORMAN, my good friend from South Carolina, for introducing this amendment and for yielding me time.

Mr. Chair, I submitted an identical amendment to this one, and I am glad to see it is being considered today.

This amendment would hold the BLM director, Tracy Stone-Manning, accountable for her disastrous policies and rightfully reduce her salary to \$1. Ms. Manning has been using the Bureau to push her own radical environmentalist agenda at the expense of Montanans and all Americans.

Director Manning has repeatedly and intentionally violated Federal statute by issuing rules that are completely at odds with the Taylor Grazing Act.

The Taylor Grazing Act lays out best range management practices and clearly states that the purpose of the law is to: "provide for the orderly use" of public land in order to "stabilize the livestock industry."

Earlier this year, the BLM issued a Conservation and Landscape Health Rule that clearly violates the letter and the spirit of the law by designating multiple use public land under conservation leases for bison. Allowing bison to graze on allotments that should be leased for cattle grazing has been a severe blow to Montana's ranching industry.

Director Manning has also continuously ignored the concerns of local landowners and those most affected by her harmful policies by failing to hold public hearings outside of the large cities.

Director Manning flagrantly dismissed Montana agriculture groups' concerns in the decision-making process for American Prairie Reserve's bison grazing proposal and granted special provisions for one lessee that no one else in the country has experienced. Her Bureau also refused to collaborate with the relevant State agencies and declined to hold sufficient opportunities for local engagement.

□ 2120

This is a process we have seen far too often with the Bureau of Land Management under her leadership, creating harmful rules and refusing to take input or provide engagement opportunities for those who are most impacted by those rules.

Director Manning has also refused to follow the congressionally mandated quarterly requirements for Federal land leases. Under this administration, we have seen the fewest acres leased for oil and gas since World War II, with only one of those lease sales taking place in Montana. This directly contradicts Congress' directive and a Louisiana district court's reversal of the administration's leasing moratorium.

At the same time, Americans continue to face rising energy costs and persistent inflation. Intentionally

stalling onshore and gas production is a dereliction of duty and a slap in the face to hardworking Americans, especially those who rely on these public lands to keep their economy afloat.

This climate of zealotry and blatant disregard for the rule of law has been evident with Director Stone-Manning for a long time. She collaborated with tree-spiking ecoterrorists at the start of her career, and there is no reason to believe that her views have substantially changed.

Mr. Chair, for all of these reasons and many more, Director Stone-Manning needs to be held accountable. Congress cannot stand by idly while these climate extremists use our Federal agencies to destroy local economies and the livelihood of everyday Americans.

This amendment will put all of Biden's disastrous energy heads on notice and force them to finally follow the rule of law that Congress passed nearly 90 years ago.

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

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chair, I guess it is time I got off my rear-end here and talked a little bit.

I want to let people know why I have opposed all the Holman rule amendments that have come before us. I think I screwed up on one and voted the wrong way, but I have opposed all of them for a number of reasons.

The Holman rule was originally put in place and then it was kind of repealed over the last couple of Congresses and then put in place. If you look back at the history of it, through the whole appropriations process, I can only remember one or two times when the Holman rule was actually used. It was used because the individual had committed criminal activity. That is why they cut the salary. Obviously, it didn't pass, but that was the intent behind it.

The second reason is that I question the constitutionality of the Holman rule altogether. We don't have the authority to fire someone in the administration. We don't have the authority to fire them. This is a way to get around that by reducing someone's salary to a dollar. You have essentially fired them unless they can live on a dollar for a year. I don't know many people who can do that. This is a way to get around what our constitutional responsibility is, I believe.

Believe me, I don't always agree. In fact, I seldom agree with the Bureau of Land Management's decisions on a lot of things. Elections have consequences. If you disagree with them because of a policy, why do you think they were hired? They were hired to carry out the policies of this administration. Maybe you don't like those policies. I don't like some of those policies. That is a good reason to get off our rear-ends and make sure that we eliminate this administration about 12 months from now.

It is not a reason to reduce someone's salary because they are implementing a policy for the administration that hired them. That is why I haven't supported any of the Holman rules because nobody stood up here and said they believe they have engaged in criminal activity. I haven't heard it. Until I do, I will continue to oppose these amendments.

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I will add that you are not firing anybody. You are just reducing their salary to what, in the minds of this body, they believe that it is worth. A dollar is plenty of money for what this lady does. By the way, she makes \$148,500.

In the words of Bob Abbey, who was the first BLM Director under President Obama, he said that Stone-Manning's involvement with tree spiking should disqualify her from leading the agency.

Mr. Chairman, I urge support for my amendment.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chair, all I know is if you reduce my salary to a dollar, you effectively fired me.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

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

Ms. PINGREE. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 113 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 113 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. The salary of Michael Regan, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will reduce the salary of Michael Regan, Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, to the large sum of \$1.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER), my good farmer friend.

Mrs. MILLER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, in April, EPA Administrator

Regan testified before the House Agriculture Committee and told me the EPA doesn't incentivize solar panels, that they are a regulatory agency. His statement to the committee was blatantly false.

The EPA does incentivize solar panels, which is why I introduced an amendment to strip all funding from the EPA's Solar for All program.

The Biden administration wants to cover rich, fertile farmland that we use to grow food with Chinese solar panels.

Mr. Chair, I support this amendment because we must send a message to the EPA to leave the farmers alone and never mislead Congress when testifying.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I don't know that I could say it any better than the chair of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee did about the reason that it never makes sense to use this amendment to reduce somebody's salary. Reducing somebody's salary to \$1 is basically firing them.

When it comes to Michael Regan, the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, my colleagues are talking about a hardworking public servant. I think we are very fortunate to have him there and to have him dealing with some of the biggest challenges our country is facing, whether it is climate change or environmental pollution, and moving our country forward in a very difficult time. We are grateful to have him there.

To ask a public servant to take \$1 for their hard work in carrying out this administration's goals is ludicrous.

□ 2130

To my colleague on the Agriculture Committee, we serve together and have many areas that we work together on, and to have sort of a grudge match about this consideration about solar panels on agricultural land, frankly, doesn't make any sense to me. Of course, his mission is to make sure we incentivize solar panels, absolutely, of course.

However, to say that he is trying to do this on rich, fertile farmland goes against the mission of the USDA, and it goes against the mission of this administration.

It is always a difficult balance to figure out where to put solar panels. I know in my State we have found some projects where we have dual use where some kinds of agriculture actually can accommodate solar panels and also have grazing land and blueberry land. We have a variety of things going on. Nobody thinks we should use rich farmland—in a time when we are losing farmland all too fast—for solar panels, and I am sure Administrator Regan doesn't either.

Nevertheless, incentivizing solar panels, yes, that is absolutely the mission

of the EPA. I am thrilled they are doing that and moving us faster and faster towards renewable energy.

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

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I just take issue, a dollar is—we are providing a person an opportunity to volunteer, which is a tremendous opportunity. Mr. Chairman, if you want to be serious about combating emissions and supporting good environmental policies, why don't we start with getting countries like India and Communist China to reduce their pollution? Nobody says anything about that from the left.

This administration is only interested in creating unfair, costly, and burdensome regulations that will kill American jobs. I am a developer. The gentlewoman mentioned solar panels. We priced them.

Mr. Chairman, guess where most of the components of solar panels are made?

China, which is not exactly a friend.

Mr. Regan's salary is a whopping \$183,000. Like I said, we are promoting volunteerism and doing good work for mankind.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, just to respond to a couple of concerns that my colleague on the other side of the aisle raised, if we are about to promote a culture of volunteerism, I think it is very hard to ask the hardworking administrators of the EPA to serve for a dollar when we all get paid \$175,000 a year which is a lot of money in my home State. I am very grateful the taxpayers of this country support us to that tune, but until all of us are willing to take a dollar for our work, it is hard to ask the hardworking members of the administration to do the same.

To say that Members on the left somehow don't want India or China to reduce their impact on climate change and their use of fossil fuels, that is ludicrous. I know that Secretary Kerry has spent a lot of time meeting with those countries trying to reduce things that they are doing that impact climate change. I agree. Those countries have to reduce it just as we are reducing it in this country.

To say that solar panels somehow should be not used in this country because we are dependent on buying them from China, well, that is based on the shortsightedness of Republicans who have consistently blocked our involvement in renewable energy.

Had the gentleman voted for the IRA, he would have seen that we are incentivizing American manufacturing and doing our best to return the manufacturing of those solar panels to this country, and if we are going to consistently oppose renewable energy and oppose the manufacture of renewable energy, then we are just going to fall further and further behind in making sure

that we are making those components here in the United States.

So, once again, I reject 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 South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

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

Ms. PINGREE. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 114 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 114 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act made be used to fund the Justice, Equity, Diversity and Inclusion Workgroup of the Environmental Protection Agency.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, my amendment would prohibit the funding for EPA's Justice, Equity, Diversity, and Inclusion Workgroup. This group is, in their own words, committed to fostering an inclusive and respectful culture and improving justice, equity, diversity, and inclusion. It commits to training and educating members on the implicit biases and historical environmental injustices.

Mr. Chair, you can look on their website to a page of resources with hundreds of woke documents. I will read just a few for my colleagues: The Whiteness of America, "Remaking Manhood: The Battle Against Dominance-Based Masculine Culture," and Greed's Not Good: 10 Movies That Expertly Criticize Capitalism.

This is the one thing that has made America the greatest country in the world.

Another one is 23 Movies for Those Days When the Patriarchy's Got You Down. Another one is Inclusive Scientific Meetings. I don't know what that is.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I just urge my colleagues to accept my amendment. If there were a salary I could cut, I would cut every bit of it. Taxpayers don't deserve this type of supposed work encouraging these types of things that are being done in this country.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to adopt 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 South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 115 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 115 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. The salary of Deb Haaland, Secretary of the Interior, shall be reduced to \$1.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, my amendment gives another member of the Biden administration's paid employees a chance for volunteerism and doing well for mankind.

It reduces the salary of Deb Haaland, who is the Secretary of the Interior, to a dollar. She is currently making \$221,400. She holds extreme land and energy views, like support for the Green New Deal and opposition to the Keystone XL pipeline.

We are being forced to buy from OPEC countries that hate America that are funding Hamas now, and that is what this lady was for, doing away with the Keystone XL pipeline.

She has used the power of the Department of the Interior to implement her radical agenda at the expense of hardworking Americans.

Under her leadership she has shut down pipelines, delayed federally mandated onshore and offshore leases, repealed commonsense regulations, shuttered mining projects, and much more with no regard for how these actions have and will continue to raise energy costs, eliminate American jobs, and harm our national security and increase reliance on foreign energy sources.

We should not spend another dollar of taxpayer money funding her salary.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chair, I have listened very carefully so far. So far I

haven't heard anything that is not a policy difference. Again, I will repeat: Elections have consequences. Again, I will tell you I don't think this is constitutional. I don't believe it has ever been litigated, but it is a way of getting around the fact that we don't have the ability to fire somebody within the administrative branch of government.

Now, if this had been someone like the EM director who was caught stealing suitcases at airports and that kind of stuff, I have got no problem with that. He needs to be fired, and he was fired.

Nevertheless, so far I haven't heard anything that would indicate that the Secretary is doing any more than carrying out the policies for which she was hired.

Again, elections have consequences.

Instead of doing these types of amendments, why don't we get busy and try to elect a new administration in about 14 months?

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

□ 2140

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE), my good friend.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, possibly we will shed some light on some allegations and problems that would raise to the level that the gentleman would support for removing the salary from Ms. Haaland.

Prior to joining the current administration, Secretary Haaland had close ties with the Pueblo Action Alliance, a New Mexico-based organization known for its involvement in environmental and social justice extremism.

The Pueblo Action Alliance argues that America's economic and political systems must be dismantled and believes that America is irredeemable because there is no opportunity to reform a system that isn't founded on good morals or values. That is who she associated with.

However, we are not done yet. Secretary Haaland's daughter is now employed with Pueblo Action Alliance, participating in lobbying trips to Washington, D.C., and protests, calling for the stop of all oil and gas development. This relationship raises questions about the influence this organization may have on the Secretary's decisionmaking within her role.

In January, the Department received a FOIA request for all communications between Secretary Haaland's daughter and the Department of the Interior officials describing her lobbying efforts. The Department has still not produced the requested information, failing to meet their statutory obligations.

Secretary Haaland's husband has also consulted for and previously been employed by an organization that receives a significant portion of its funding from the Bureau of Indian Affairs. The Bureau of Indian Affairs falls under Secretary Haaland's purview as Sec-

retary of the Interior, presenting another clear conflict of interest. Extremely convenient.

In light of these alarming factors, it is my firm belief that Secretary Haaland is ill-suited for the position of Secretary of the Interior, and I hope that this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Chair, so far, I have heard accusations, but I haven't heard anything. Has she been convicted of any of this kind of stuff? I don't know. I haven't heard of any of that. Believe me, I disagree with the Secretary on a lot of issues. So far all I have heard is policy.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE).

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman for yielding. I just say that, again, this idea of asking public servants to be volunteers, to serve for \$1, actually carries no weight until all of the Members of Congress are also willing to serve for \$1. It is completely impractical, and it would mean that only a few people would have the opportunity to serve as Members of Congress or to be in the executive branch.

Also, to criticize Deb Haaland, a woman who I was very proud to serve with in the House of Representatives, who we were very pleased to have here as one of the first Native American women elected to Congress, but then to go on to lead the Department of the Interior as a Native American woman who also has oversight of the Bureau of Indian Affairs, who has had so much personal experience but also experience within her own community, who has a deep love of our public lands, of our natural systems, and in my opinion, has done a fantastic job, this is insulting. It is petty. We shouldn't even be here standing at this hour of the night talking about such a highly regarded and well-respected public servant.

Mr. Chair, I thoroughly oppose this amendment.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from South Carolina has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE), my good friend.

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Chair, just to shed a little bit more information on the subject that I was speaking of, it is very difficult to prove wrongdoing when the person who has committed the wrongdoing will not provide the documentation for which the oversight can be conducted.

You can't see the documents, so you cannot see exactly what arrangements have been made between her daughter, the lobbying efforts that took place. We certainly can track, though, that her husband is working for the Bureau of Indian Affairs, being compensated by them. If we don't do anything except create the perception around this place of integrity, we have to do a better job, and that has not even been created.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

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

Ms. PINGREE. 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 South Carolina will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 116 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 116 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to carry out additional monument declarations proclaimed by the President under section 320301 of the title 54, United States Code (commonly referred to as the "Antiquities Act of 1906"), as of October 13, 2023.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, my amendment prohibits funds from being used to provide for additional funding for national monument designations under the Antiquities Act. The Antiquities Act, passed in 1906, authorizes the President to singlehandedly designate any Federal public lands as national monuments. Its creation was motivated by the looting of Indian artifacts and archaeological sites dating back to the late 1800s.

While focusing on fixing a real issue of its day, the law was carefully crafted to protect private citizens from government overreach. The Antiquities Act designations should be done under, and I quote directly from the legislation, "the smallest area compatible with the proper care and management of the objects to be protected." Clearly, it was meant to be limited in scope.

Just like everything else, this administration and previous Democrat administrations make it impossible for us to have nice things. Think about this. In the 8 years that Joe Biden was Vice President under the Obama administration, the Antiquities Act was weaponized for 550 million acres of land. That is roughly a quarter of the land by acreage in the United States. That is a problem that goes beyond the scope and intent of this act.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I claim time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, this amendment would prohibit the President of the United States from designating national monuments under the Antiquities Act of 1906. The Antiquities Act provides the President with the authority to designate national monuments in order to protect objects of historic or scientific interest. Both Republican and Democratic Presidents have used this authority to increase protection of special Federal lands.

This amendment inappropriately restricts the President's ability to declare national monuments in specific parts of the country. It goes against 100 years of American tradition to protect the Nation's cultural and natural resources.

The Antiquities Act represents an important achievement in the progress of conservation and preservation efforts in the United States, and Congress should not stand in the way of these achievements.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I agree with my colleague on one point, that it has been used, it has been overused, and it has been abused.

This is intended to protect historic sites that are being looted and being damaged by whatever force is in play. To control, to take from States and private citizens 550 million acres of land over an 8-year period is not the intent of this act. It is clear that it no longer serves its purpose and, quite frankly, if the President or Vice President identifies an antiquity or area of land that needs protection, they can come to Congress. If it is worthy of Congress' designation, we can work with the administration, Republican or Democrat.

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

□ 2150

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I continue to oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I ask for adoption of this amendment. We are at a point in history that if any further monument needs designation, it should come before Congress and have congressional approval.

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 117 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 117 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency for the U.S. Global Change Research Program (USGCRP).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, my amendment prohibits funds to be used by the Environmental Protection Agency for the U.S. Global Change Research Program, or the USGCRP.

This program coordinates with 13 different Federal departments and agencies. Its focus as it relates to areas within EPA's jurisdiction is to conduct research on climate change.

I think it is fair to say that the climate is changing, and we have a role to play in it. However, there is a degree of climate alarmism in this country that has compelled smooth-talking bureaucrats and their grant-seeking associates in the private sector to grovel for more and more funding.

At its core, climate alarmism is immoral. It is impacting industry and business because people of power are telling Americans every day that they are going to die unless they adopt these policies, and I object.

I think more and more Americans are fed up with the subsidizing of this agenda, of this alarmism. At a time of inflation and at a time when the economy is struggling, it is time to stop.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, this amendment seeks to prohibit funding for the EPA's Global Change Research Program, which will result in more resilient communities, mitigate the impacts of climate change, and protect our world for future generations.

The gentleman who proposed this amendment said that there is too much research on climate change and that climate change alarmism, as he called it, is immoral.

In my perspective, not being alarmed by the possibility of climate change is actually immoral. Our responsibility is to care for and protect future generations, to care for and protect the planet.

He said that the impact is too great on businesses and is creating problems for businesses. I say if we don't deal with climate change, we are impacting all of our businesses that have to deal with things in my State like sea level rise, adverse weather impacts, flooding, drought, all the things that are impacting our farmers, natural resource-based businesses, and communities.

It is our responsibility to do something about this. To say it is just alarmist or that somehow we shouldn't talk about it, research it, or do something about it is putting our heads in the sand and not taking responsibility for what we need to do.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, I think part of the problem in this country is that we tend to hold ourselves or the left tends to hold us to a standard that is really unattainable. Meanwhile, our partners, like China, are left to abuse the environment. They are the worst polluters in the world or one of the worst polluters in the world, and they are held to a different standard. This puts a burden on our industry.

It is climate alarmism, and this administration's agenda no longer allows us to be energy independent. We are now dependent on our enemies for precious metals and for gas and oil. We should be an energy-independent nation.

When we look at the crisis in this country with inflation and economy, the fact that the American Dream of homeownership is slipping away, it gets back to this alarmism. The fact that we are undermining our oil and gas industry with ESG, this alarmism has made us no longer energy independent.

If we are going to get out of this mess we are in with these deficits, we have to grow our way out of it. When you look at inflation, when you look at commodities, when you look at the price of oil and gas, we have to move away from this alarmism and get back to the facts.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, there is a lot of alarmism going on because we are facing a significant climate crisis. We just had the hottest summer on record. We are having some of the most challenging weather, whether it is a hurricane or a drought or flooding, impacting all of us in all of our districts.

We are facing this and trying to end our dependence on foreign sources of energy by making sure that we have renewable energy in this country, by investing in American businesses, not Chinese owned, not other foreign countries, but making sure as we did through the IRA that we are investing in American manufacturing and American energy solutions.

Most of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle oppose this. They continue to oppose the solutions that we

have to implement to make sure that we are energy independent and that we can deal with climate change. This is one more example of that.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, we may have had a hot summer, but I just went trick-or-treating with my kids and the low that evening was 29 degrees, so temperatures change. Temperatures have been changing for the millennia.

That being said, it is this alarmism, this agenda, that stands in the way of our energy independence.

If we were truly worried about the environment, if we truly wanted to be energy independent, we would have modular nuclear reactors being built all over this country. That is the future of electricity. That is the future of the environment. That is the future of us being energy independent. Meanwhile, this agenda blocks such types of projects.

It is time we admit the truth that they are making us more dependent on our enemies. This amendment is a good amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 118 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 118 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce any COVID-19 mask mandates.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chair, my amendment prohibits the funds appropriated by this act from being used to enforce any COVID-19 mask mandates. I was fortunate enough to introduce this amendment during the Energy-Water appropriations, and I am happy to do so again here.

Policy involving mandatory mask implementation is not about safety nor about science. It is about control. Let's be clear: Mask mandates are about control.

Tom Jefferson, a leading epidemiologist who coauthored what The New York Times Opinion section called "the most rigorous and comprehensive analysis of scientific studies conducted on the efficacy of masks for reducing the spread of respiratory illnesses, in-

cluding COVID-19," found that there was no evidence that masks made any difference.

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

□ 2200

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, this amendment would prohibit any funds to enforce any COVID-19 mask mandates. This amendment is one of the more controversial poison pill policy riders that sadly shows extremist Republicans are not interested in bills that can gain bipartisan support and become law.

Preventing disease reduces healthcare costs, such as hospitalization and pharmaceuticals, and benefits employers by resulting in less employee absenteeism. Facial masks are an essential personal protective measure to fight the COVID-19 virus.

We also know that some people infected with the virus that causes COVID-19 can suffer from the long-term effects from their infection, meaning they can experience health problems that can last for years. Why would we politicize something that would help our fellow Americans stay healthy?

From January 3, 2020, to September 27, 2023, there were 1,127,152 deaths from COVID-19 in the United States reported to the World Health Organization, some of whom the people in this room knew and loved.

I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this harmful amendment.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I go back to the study, and it found that wearing a mask in public places makes little to no difference in the number of infections.

For the folks on the other side who privately believe that masks work, it should be noted that mask mandates include any type of mask, even just your thin paper mask, but the study looked at N95 masks, the gold standard of masks. You know what they found? It didn't make any difference.

Even if you pair mask mandates with other preventative measures, such as washing hands and social distancing, it found that none of it made a difference.

Going on, Dr. Jefferson goes on to say that policymakers who imposed mask mandates on Americans were convinced by nonrandomized studies and flawed observations.

On the other hand, Dr. Jefferson and his colleagues analyzed 18 randomized control trials before reaching their conclusion. They looked at science, not fear. They looked at science to seek a better outcome, not seek control.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I don't know that we have time to debate all

the science tonight, but a study that says that mask using has no impact, I wouldn't want to go into a surgery ward and find out that the surgeon who was about to perform my operation wasn't wearing a mask.

To say that hand washing doesn't matter, I have never seen a physician who doesn't go into the emergency room or a surgical room without washing their hands.

Social distancing, this is starting to sound a little bit like crack science to me, not anything very serious, something that you might see on the internet or social media, so I question my colleague's science in this regard.

I also just say I oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, to be clear, it was The New York Times. The study was examined or authored with coauthors but, in particular, Dr. Jefferson, and it looked at 18 different studies that used proper scientific controls. By the way, if you are going to cite the WHO, you are losing credibility with me.

Mr. Chairman, we have a choice between truth and science or fiction.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part A of House report 118-261, on which further proceedings were postponed in the following order:

Amendment No. 85 by Mr. CRANE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 86 by Mr. CRANE of Arizona.

Amendment No. 89 by Mr. FULCHER of Idaho.

Amendment No. 91 by Mr. GOSAR of Arizona.

Amendment No. 94 by Ms. GREENE of Georgia.

Amendment No. 101 by Mr. MCCORMICK of Georgia.

Amendment No. 102 by Mr. MCCORMICK of Georgia.

Amendment No. 103 by Mrs. MILLER of Illinois.

Amendment No. 107 by Mr. NEHLS of Texas.

Amendment No. 110 by Mr. NORMAN of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 112 by Mr. NORMAN of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 113 by Mr. NORMAN of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 115 by Mr. NORMAN of South Carolina.

Amendment No. 116 by Mr. OGLES of Tennessee.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 85 OFFERED BY MR. CRANE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on amendment No. 85, printed in part A of House Report 118–261 offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CRANE), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 161, noes 251, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 579]

AYES—161

Aderholt	Gaetz	Miller-Meeks
Alford	Gallagher	Mills
Allen	Garcia, Mike	Moolenaar
Amodei	Good (VA)	Mooney
Armstrong	Gooden (TX)	Moore (AL)
Arrington	Gosar	Moran
Babin	Graves (LA)	Murphy
Balderson	Graves (MO)	Nehls
Banks	Green (TN)	Norman
Bean (FL)	Greene (GA)	Ogles
Bentz	Grothman	Owens
Bergman	Guest	Palmer
Biggs	Guthrie	Perry
Billirakis	Hageman	Pfuger
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Posey
Boebert	Harshbarger	Reschenthaler
Bost	Hern	Rodgers (WA)
Brecheen	Higgins (LA)	Rose
Buchanan	Hill	Rosendale
Burchett	Houchin	Rouzer
Burgess	Hudson	Roy
Burlison	Huizenga	Rutherford
Cammack	Hunt	Santos
Carey	Issa	Scalise
Carl	Jackson (TX)	Schweikert
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Self
Carter (TX)	Johnson (SD)	Smith (MO)
Cline	Jordan	Smith (NE)
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Clyde	Kelly (MS)	Smucker
Collins	Kustoff	Spartz
Comer	LaHood	Stauber
Crane	LaMalfa	Stefanik
Crawford	Lamborn	Steil
Crenshaw	Langworthy	Steube
Davidson	Latta	Strong
De La Cruz	LaTurner	Tenney
DesJarlais	Lee (FL)	Tiffany
Donalds	Letlow	Timmons
Duarte	Loudermilk	Van Drew
Duncan	Luetkemeyer	Van Orden
Emmer	Luna	Wagner
Estes	Luttrell	Walberg
Ezell	Malliotakis	Waltz
Fallon	Mann	Weber (TX)
Feenstra	Massie	Webster (FL)
Ferguson	Mast	Westerman
Finstad	McCauley	Williams (NY)
Fischbach	McClain	Williams (TX)
Fitzgerald	McClintock	Wilson (SC)
Fox	McHenry	Wittman
Franklin, Scott	Miller (IL)	Yakym
Fry	Miller (OH)	
Fulcher	Miller (WV)	

NOES—251

Adams	Buck	Cherfilus-
Aguilar	Bucshon	McCormick
Allred	Budzinski	Chu
Auchincloss	Bush	Ciscomani
Bacon	Calvert	Clark (MA)
Baird	Caraveo	Clarke (NY)
Balint	Carbajal	Cleaver
Barragán	Cárdenas	Clyburn
Beatty	Carson	Cohen
Bera	Carter (LA)	Cole
Beyer	Cartwright	Correa
Bice	Casara	Costa
Bishop (GA)	Case	Courtney
Blunt Rochester	Craig	Crow
Bonamici	Casten	Crockett
Bowman	Castor (FL)	Crow
Boyle (PA)	Castro (TX)	Cuellar
Brown	Chavez-DeRemer	Curtis

D'Esposito	Khanna	Porter
Davids (KS)	Kiggans (VA)	Pressley
Davis (IL)	Kildee	Quigley
Davis (NC)	Kiley	Ramirez
Dean (PA)	Kilmer	Raskin
DeGette	Kim (CA)	Rogers (AL)
DeLauro	Kim (NJ)	Rogers (KY)
DelBene	Krishnamoorthi	Ross
Deluzio	Kuster	Ruiz
DeSaulnier	LaLota	Ruppersberger
Diaz-Balart	Larsen (WA)	Ryan
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Salazar
Doggett	Lawler	Salinas
Dunn (FL)	Lee (CA)	Sánchez
Edwards	Lee (NV)	Sarbanes
Ellzey	Lee (PA)	Schakowsky
Escobar	Leger Fernandez	Schiff
Eshoo	Levin	Schneider
Espallat	Lieu	Scholten
Evans	Lofgren	Schrier
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Scott (VA)
Fleischmann	Lynch	Scott, Austin
Fletcher	Mace	Scott, David
Flood	Magaziner	Sherman
Foster	Manning	Sherrill
Foushee	Matsui	Simpson
Frankel, Lois	McBath	Slotkin
Frost	McClellan	Smith (WA)
Gallego	McCollum	Sorensen
Garamendi	McGarvey	Soto
Garcia (IL)	McGovern	Spanberger
Garcia (TX)	Meeks	Stansbury
Garcia, Robert	Menendez	Stanton
Gimenez	Meng	Steel
Golden (ME)	Mfume	Stevens
Goldman (NY)	Molinaro	Strickland
Gomez	Moore (UT)	Swalwell
Gonzales, Tony	Moore (WI)	Sykes
Gonzalez,	Morelle	Takano
Vicente	Moskowitz	Thanedar
González-Colón	Moulton	Thompson (CA)
Gottheimer	Moylan	Thompson (MS)
Green, Al (TX)	Mryan	Thompson (PA)
Grijalva	Mullin	Titus
Harder (CA)	Nadler	Tlaib
Hayes	Neal	Tokuda
Higgins (NY)	Neguse	Tonko
Himes	Nickel	Torres (CA)
Hinson	Norcross	Torres (NY)
Horsford	Norton	Trahan
Houlihan	Nunn (IA)	Trone
Hoyle (OR)	Obermole	Turner
Huffman	Ocasio-Cortez	Underwood
Ivey	Omar	Valadao
Jackson (IL)	Pallone	Vargas
Jackson (NC)	Panetta	Vasquez
Jacobs	Pappas	Veasey
James	Pascarell	Velazquez
Jayapal	Payne	Wasserman
Jeffries	Pelosi	Schultz
Johnson (GA)	Peltola	Waters
Kamlager-Dove	Pence	Watson Coleman
Kaptur	Perez	Wild
Kean (NJ)	Peters	Williams (GA)
Keating	Pettersen	Wilson (FL)
Kelly (IL)	Pingree	Womack
Kelly (PA)	Pocan	Zinke

NOT VOTING—26

Barr	Joyce (OH)	Plaskett
Blumenauer	Landsman	Radewagen
Brownley	Lesko	Sablan
Connolly	McCarthy	Scanlon
Garbarino	McCormick	Sessions
Granger	Meuser	Sewell
Griffith	Napolitano	Van Dwyne
Hoyer	Newhouse	Wexton
Jackson Lee	Phillips	

□ 2229

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Mrs. STEEL changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. BARR. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 579.

Stated against:

Ms. BROWNLEY. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 579.

AMENDMENT NO. 86 OFFERED BY MR. CRANE

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. STEUBE). The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 86, printed in part A of House Report 118–261 offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. CRANE), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 219, not voting 28, as follows:

[Roll No. 580]

AYES—191

Aderholt	Fry	Miller-Meeks
Alford	Fulcher	Mills
Allen	Gaetz	Molinaro
Amodei	Gallagher	Moolenaar
Armstrong	Garcia, Mike	Moore (AL)
Arrington	Gimenez	Moore (UT)
Babin	Gonzales, Tony	Moran
Baird	González-Colón	Moylan
Balderson	Good (VA)	Murphy
Banks	Gooden (TX)	Nehls
Barr	Gosar	Norman
Bean (FL)	Graves (LA)	Nunn (IA)
Bentz	Graves (MO)	Obermole
Bergman	Green (TN)	Ogles
Bice	Greene (GA)	Griffith
Biggs	Guest	Grothman
Billirakis	Guthrie	Palmer
Bishop (NC)	Hageman	Peltola
Boebert	Harris	Pence
Bost	Harshbarger	Perry
Brecheen	Hern	Pfuger
Buchanan	Higgins (LA)	Posey
Buck	Hinson	Reschenthaler
Bucshon	Houchin	Rodgers (WA)
Burchett	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Huizenga	Rogers (KY)
Burlison	Hunt	Rose
Cammack	Johnson (OH)	Rosendale
Carey	Johnson (SD)	Roy
Carl	Joyce (PA)	Salazar
Carter (GA)	Kean (NJ)	Santos
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
Ciscomani	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert
Cline	Kiggans (VA)	Scott, Austin
Cloud	Kustoff	Self
Clyde	LaHood	Smith (MO)
Collins	LaLota	Smith (NE)
Comer	LaMalfa	Smucker
Crane	Lamborn	Stauber
Crawford	Langworthy	Steel
Crenshaw	Latta	Stefanik
Curtis	LaTurner	Steil
D'Esposito	Lawler	Steube
Davidson	Lee (FL)	Strong
De La Cruz	Letlow	Tenney
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
Donalds	Lucas	Tiffany
Duarte	Luetkemeyer	Timmons
Duncan	Luna	Turner
Dunn (FL)	Luttrell	Van Drew
Edwards	Malliotakis	Van Dwyne
Ellzey	Mann	Wagner
Emmer	Massie	Walberg
Estes	Mast	Waltz
Ezell	McCauley	Weber (TX)
Fallon	McClain	Webster (FL)
Feenstra	McClintock	Westerman
Ferguson	McCormick	Williams (NY)
Finstad	McHenry	Williams (TX)
Fischbach	Miller (IL)	Wilson (SC)
Fitzgerald	Miller (OH)	Wittman
Flood	Miller (WV)	Yakym
Fox		Zinke
Franklin, Scott		

NOES—219

Adams	Garcia, Robert	Norcross
Aguilar	Golden (ME)	Norton
Allred	Goldman (NY)	Ocasio-Cortez
Auchincloss	Gomez	Omar
Bacon	Gonzalez,	Pallone
Balint	Vicente	Panetta
Barragán	Gottheimer	Pappas
Beatty	Granger	Payne
Bera	Green, Al (TX)	Pelosi
Beyer	Grijalva	Perez
Bishop (GA)	Harder (CA)	Peters
Blunt Rochester	Hayes	Pettersen
Bonamici	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Bowman	Hill	Pocan
Boyle (PA)	Himes	Porter
Brown	Horsford	Pressley
Brownley	Houlihan	Quigley
Budzinski	Hoyer	Ramirez
Bush	Hoyle (OR)	Raskin
Calvert	Huffman	Ross
Caraveo	Issa	Ruiz
Carbajal	Ivey	Ruppersberger
Cárdenas	Jackson (IL)	Rutherford
Carson	Jackson (NC)	Ryan
Carter (LA)	Jacobs	Salinas
Cartwright	James	Sánchez
Casar	Jayapal	Sarbanes
Case	Jeffries	Schakowsky
Casten	Johnson (GA)	Schiff
Castor (FL)	Kamlager-Dove	Schneider
Castro (TX)	Kaptur	Scholten
Chavez-DeRemer	Keating	Schrier
Cherfilus-	Kelly (IL)	Scott (VA)
McCormick	Khanna	Scott, David
Chu	Kildee	Sherman
Clark (MA)	Kiley	Sherrill
Clarke (NY)	Kilmer	Simpson
Cleaver	Kim (CA)	Slotkin
Clyburn	Kim (NJ)	Smith (NJ)
Cohen	Krishnamoorthi	Smith (WA)
Cole	Kuster	Sorensen
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Soto
Costa	Larson (CT)	Spanberger
Courtney	Lee (CA)	Stansbury
Craig	Lee (NV)	Stanton
Crockett	Lee (PA)	Stevens
Crow	Leger Fernandez	Strickland
Cuellar	Levin	Swalwell
Davids (KS)	Lieu	Sykes
Davis (IL)	Lofgren	Takano
Davis (NC)	Lynch	Thanedar
Dean (PA)	Mace	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	Magaziner	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	Manning	Titus
DelBene	Matsui	Tlaib
Deluzio	McBath	Tokuda
DeSaulnier	McClellan	Tonko
Dingell	McCollum	Torres (CA)
Doggett	McGarvey	Trahan
Escobar	McGovern	Trone
Eshoo	Meeks	Underwood
Españat	Menendez	Valadao
Evans	Meng	Van Orden
Fitzpatrick	Mfume	Vargas
Fleischmann	Moore (WI)	Vasquez
Fletcher	Morelle	Veasey
Foster	Moskowitz	Velázquez
Foushee	Moulton	Wasserman
Frankel, Lois	Mrvan	Schultz
Frost	Mullin	Watson Coleman
Gallo	Nadler	Wild
Garamendi	Neal	Williams (GA)
Garcia (IL)	Neguse	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (TX)	Nickel	Womack

NOT VOTING—28

Blumenauer	McCarthy	Scanlon
Connolly	Meuser	Sessions
Diaz-Balart	Napolitano	Sewell
Garbarino	Newhouse	Spartz
Jackson (TX)	Pascarell	Torres (NY)
Jackson Lee	Phillips	Waters
Jordan	Plaskett	Wenstrup
Joyce (OH)	Radewagen	Wexton
Landsman	Rouzer	
Lesko	Sablan	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2232

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 89 OFFERED BY MR. FULCHER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 89, printed in part A of House Report 118–261 offered by the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 212, noes 202, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 581]

AYES—212

Aderholt	Foxx	McClintock
Alford	Franklin, Scott	McCormick
Allen	Fry	McHenry
Amodei	Fulcher	Miller (IL)
Armstrong	Gaetz	Miller (OH)
Arrington	Gallagher	Miller (WV)
Babin	Garcia, Mike	Miller-Meeks
Bacon	Jimenez	Mills
Baird	Golden (ME)	Molinaro
Balderson	Gonzales, Tony	Moolenaar
Banks	González-Colón	Mooney
Barr	Good (VA)	Moore (AL)
Bean (FL)	Gooden (TX)	Moore (UT)
Bentz	Gosar	Moran
Bergman	Graves (LA)	Moylan
Bice	Graves (MO)	Murphy
Biggs	Green (TN)	Nehls
Bilirakis	Greene (GA)	Norman
Bishop (NC)	Griffith	Nunn (IA)
Boebert	Grothman	Overholte
Brecheen	Guest	Ogles
Buchanan	Guthrie	Owens
Buck	Hageman	Palmer
Bucshon	Harris	Pence
Burchett	Harshbarger	Perez
Burgess	Hern	Perry
Burlison	Higgins (LA)	Pfluger
Calvert	Hill	Posey
Cammack	Hinson	Reschenthaler
Carey	Houchin	Rodgers (WA)
Carl	Hudson	Rogers (AL)
Carter (GA)	Huizenga	Rogers (KY)
Carter (TX)	Hunt	Rose
Ciscomani	Issa	Rosendale
Cline	Jackson (TX)	Rouzer
Cloud	James	Roy
Clyde	Johnson (OH)	Rutherford
Cole	Johnson (SD)	Salazar
Collins	Jordan	Santos
Comer	Joyce (PA)	Scalise
Crane	Kean (NJ)	Schweikert
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Scott, Austin
Crenshaw	Kelly (VA)	Self
Cuellar	Kiggans (VA)	Simpson
Curtis	Kiley	Smith (MO)
D'Esposito	Kim (CA)	Smith (NE)
Davidson	Kustoff	Smith (NJ)
De La Cruz	LaHood	Smucker
DesJarlais	LaLota	Spartz
Diaz-Balart	LaMalfa	Staubert
Donalds	Lamborn	Steel
Duarte	Langworthy	Stefanik
Duncan	Latta	Steil
Dunn (FL)	LaTurner	Steube
Edwards	Lawler	Strong
Ellzey	Lee (FL)	Tenney
Emmer	Letlow	Thompson (PA)
Estes	Loudermilk	Tiffany
Ezell	Lucas	Timmons
Fallon	Luetkemeyer	Turner
Feenstra	Luna	Valadao
Ferguson	Luttrell	Van Drew
Finstad	Malliotakis	Van Dwyne
Fischbach	Mann	Van Orden
Fitzgerald	Massie	Wagner
Fleischmann	Mast	Walberg
Flood	McClain	Waltz

Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman

Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOES—202

Adams	Gomez	Omar
Aguilar	Gonzalez,	Pallone
Allred	Vicente	Panetta
Auchincloss	Gottheimer	Pappas
Balint	Green, Al (TX)	Pascarell
Barragán	Grijalva	Payne
Beatty	Harder (CA)	Pelosi
Bera	Hayes	Peltola
Beyer	Higgins (NY)	Peters
Blunt Rochester	Himes	Pettersen
Bonamici	Horsford	Pingree
Bowman	Houlihan	Pocan
Boyle (PA)	Hoyer	Porter
Brown	Hoyle (OR)	Pressley
Brownley	Huffman	Quigley
Budzinski	Ivey	Ramirez
Bush	Jackson (IL)	Raskin
Caraveo	Jackson (NC)	Ross
Carbajal	Jacobs	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Jayapal	Ruppersberger
Carson	Jeffries	Salinas
Carter (LA)	Johnson (GA)	Sánchez
Cartwright	Kamlager-Dove	Sarbanes
Casar	Kaptur	Schakowsky
Case	Keating	Schiff
Casten	Kelly (IL)	Schneider
Castor (FL)	Khanna	Scholten
Castro (TX)	Kildee	Schrier
Cherfilus-	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
McCormick	Kim (NJ)	Scott, David
Chu	Krishnamoorthi	Sherman
Clark (MA)	Kuster	Sherrill
Clarke (NY)	Larsen (WA)	Slotkin
Cleaver	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Clyburn	Lee (CA)	Sorensen
Cohen	Lee (NV)	Soto
Correa	Lee (PA)	Spanberger
Costa	Leger Fernandez	Stansbury
Courtney	Levin	Stanton
Craig	Lieu	Stevens
Crockett	Lofgren	Strickland
Crow	Lynch	Swalwell
Davids (KS)	Mace	Sykes
Davis (IL)	Magaziner	Takano
Davis (NC)	Manning	Thanedar
Dean (PA)	Matsui	Thompson (CA)
DeGette	McBath	Thompson (MS)
DeLauro	McCaul	Titus
DelBene	McClellan	Tlaib
Deluzio	McCollum	Tokuda
DeSaulnier	McGarvey	Tonko
Dingell	McGovern	Torres (CA)
Doggett	Meeks	Torres (NY)
Escobar	Menendez	Trahan
Eshoo	Meng	Trone
Españat	Mfume	Underwood
Evans	Moore (WI)	Vargas
Fitzpatrick	Morelle	Vasquez
Fleischmann	Moskowitz	Veasey
Fletcher	Moulton	Velázquez
Foster	Mrvan	Wasserman
Foushee	Mullin	Schultz
Frankel, Lois	Nadler	Waters
Frost	Neal	Watson Coleman
Gallo	Neguse	Wild
Garamendi	Nickel	Williams (GA)
Garcia (IL)	Norcross	Wilson (FL)
Garcia (TX)	Norton	
Goldman (NY)	Ocasio-Cortez	

NOT VOTING—24

Bishop (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Plaskett
Blumenauer	Landsman	Radewagen
Bost	Lesko	Ryan
Chavez-DeRemer	McCarthy	Sablan
Connolly	Meuser	Scanlon
Garbarino	Napolitano	Sessions
Granger	Newhouse	Sewell
Jackson Lee	Phillips	Wexton

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2235

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mrs. CHAVEZ-DEREMER. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “aye” on rollcall No. 581.

Stated against:

Mr. RYAN. Mr. Chair, had I been present, I would have voted “no” on rollcall No. 581.

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. GOSAR

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 91, printed in part A of House Report 118–261 offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 212, noes 206, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 582]

AYES—212

Aderholt	Estes	Langworthy
Alford	Ezell	Latta
Allen	Fallon	LaTurner
Amodei	Feenstra	Lawler
Armstrong	Ferguson	Lee (FL)
Arrington	Finstad	Letlow
Babin	Fischbach	Loudermilk
Bacon	Fitzgerald	Lucas
Baird	Flood	Luetkemeyer
Balderson	Foxx	Luna
Banks	Franklin, Scott	Luttrell
Barr	Fry	Malliotakis
Bean (FL)	Fulcher	Mann
Bentz	Gaetz	Massie
Bergman	Gallagher	Mast
Bice	Garcia, Mike	McCauley
Biggs	Gimenez	McClain
Bilirakis	Golden (ME)	McClintock
Bishop (NC)	Gonzales, Tony	McCormick
Boebert	Gonzalez-Colón	McHenry
Bost	Good (VA)	Miller (IL)
Brecheen	Gooden (TX)	Miller (OH)
Buchanan	Gosar	Miller (WV)
Buck	Granger	Miller-Meeks
Bucshon	Graves (LA)	Mills
Burchett	Graves (MO)	Molinaro
Burgess	Green (TN)	Moolenaar
Burlison	Greene (GA)	Mooney
Calvert	Griffith	Moore (AL)
Cammack	Grothman	Moore (UT)
Carey	Guest	Moran
Carl	Guthrie	Moylan
Carter (GA)	Hageman	Murphy
Carter (TX)	Harris	Nehls
Chavez-DeRemer	Harshbarger	Norman
Ciscomani	Hern	Nunn (IA)
Cline	Higgins (LA)	Oberholte
Cloud	Hill	Ogles
Clyde	Hinson	Owens
Cole	Houchin	Palmer
Collins	Huizenga	Pence
Comer	Hunt	Perez
Crane	Issa	Perry
Crawford	Jackson (TX)	Pfleger
Crenshaw	James	Posey
Cuellar	Johnson (OH)	Reschenthaler
Curtis	Johnson (SD)	Rodgers (WA)
D'Esposito	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Davidson	Joyce (PA)	Rogers (KY)
De La Cruz	Kelly (MS)	Rose
DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)	Rosendale
Diaz-Balart	Kiggans (VA)	Rouzer
Donalds	Kiley	Roy
Duarte	Kim (CA)	Rutherford
Duncan	Kustoff	Salazar
Dunn (FL)	LaHood	Santos
Edwards	LaLota	Scalise
Ellzey	LaMalfa	Schweikert
Emmer	Lamborn	Scott, Austin

Self
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smucker
Spartz
Stauber
Steel
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Strong

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DeBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Españillat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
García (TX)
García, Robert

Blumenauer
Connolly
Garbarino
Hudson
Jackson Lee
Joyce (OH)
Landsman

Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Dwyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz

NOES—206

Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Mace
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Norton
Ocasio-Cortez

NOT VOTING—20

Lesko
McCarthy
Meuser
Napolitano
Newhouse
Phillips
Plaskett

Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Peltola
Peters
Pettersen
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velazquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wild
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

□ 2239

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

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MS. GREENE OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 94, printed in part A of House Report 118–261 offered by the gentlewoman from Georgia (Ms. GREENE), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 227, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 583]

AYES—191

Aderholt	Franklin, Scott	McHenry
Alford	Fry	Meuser
Allen	Fulcher	Miller (IL)
Amodei	Gaetz	Miller (OH)
Armstrong	Gallagher	Miller (WV)
Arrington	Gimenez	Miller-Meeks
Babin	Gonzales, Tony	Mills
Baird	Gonzalez-Colón	Molinaro
Balderson	Good (VA)	Moolenaar
Banks	Gooden (TX)	Mooney
Barr	Gosar	Moore (AL)
Bean (FL)	Granger	Moran
Bentz	Graves (MO)	Moylan
Bergman	Green (TN)	Murphy
Bice	Greene (GA)	Nehls
Biggs	Griffith	Norman
Bilirakis	Grothman	Nunn (IA)
Bishop (NC)	Guest	Oberholte
Boebert	Guthrie	Ogles
Bost	Hageman	Palmer
Brecheen	Harris	Pence
Buchanan	Harshbarger	Perry
Buck	Hern	Posey
Bucshon	Higgins (LA)	Reschenthaler
Burchett	Hinson	Rodgers (WA)
Burgess	Houchin	Rogers (AL)
Burlison	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Calvert	Hunt	Rose
Cammack	Issa	Rosendale
Carey	Jackson (TX)	Rouzer
Carl	Johnson (OH)	Roy
Carter (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Rutherford
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Salazar
Chavez-DeRemer	Joyce (PA)	Santos
Ciscomani	Kelly (MS)	Scalise
Cline	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert
Cloud	Kiggans (VA)	Scott, Austin
Clyde	Kiley	Self
Cole	Kim (CA)	Simpson
Collins	Kustoff	Smith (MO)
Comer	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Crane	LaMalfa	Smucker
Crawford	Lamborn	Spartz
D'Esposito	Langworthy	Spartz
Davidson	Latta	Stauber
De La Cruz	LaTurner	Steel
DesJarlais	Lawler	Stefanik
Diaz-Balart	Lee (FL)	Steil
Donalds	Letlow	Steube
Duncan	Loudermilk	Strong
Dunn (FL)	Lucas	Tenney
Edwards	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
Ellzey	Luna	Tiffany
Emmer	Luttrell	Timmons
	Malliotakis	Turner
	Mann	Van Drew
	Massie	Van Dwyne
	Mast	Van Orden
	McCauley	Wagner
	McClain	Walberg
	McClintock	Waltz
	McCormick	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

Weber (TX) Williams (NY) Womack
Webster (FL) Williams (TX) Yakym
Wilson (SC) Zinke
Westerman Wittman

NOES—227

Adams Garcia (TX) Nickel
Aguilar Garcia, Mike Norcross
Allred Garcia, Robert Norton
Auchincloss Golden (ME) Ocasio-Cortez
Bacon Goldman (NY) Omar
Balint Gomez Owens
Barragán Gonzalez, Pallone
Beatty Vicente Panetta
Bera Gottheimer Pappas
Beyer Green, Al (TX) Pascarell
Bishop (GA) Grijalva Payne
Blunt Rochester Harder (CA) Pelosi
Bonamici Hayes Peltola
Bowman Higgins (NY) Perez
Boyle (PA) Hill Peters
Brown Himes Pettersen
Brownley Horsford Pingree
Budzinski Houlihan Pocan
Bush Hoyer Porter
Caraveo Hoyle (OR) Pressley
Carbajal Huffman Quigley
Cárdenas Huizenga Ramirez
Carson Ivey Raskin
Carter (LA) Jackson (IL) Ross
Cartwright Jackson (NC) Ruiz
Casar Jacobs Ruppersberger
Case James Ryan
Casten Jayapal Salinas
Castor (FL) Jeffries Sánchez
Castro (TX) Johnson (GA) Sarbanes
Chavez-DeRemer Kamlager-Dove Schakowsky
Cherfilus- Kaptur Schiff
McCormick Kean (NJ) Schneider
Chu Keating Scholten
Ciscomani Kelly (IL) Schrier
Clark (MA) Khanna Scott (VA)
Clarke (NY) Kildee Scott, David
Cleaver Kiley Sherman
Clyburn Kilmer Sherrill
Cohen Kim (CA) Slotkin
Correa Kim (NJ) Smith (NJ)
Costa Krishnamoorthi Smith (WA)
Courtney Kuster Sorensen
Craig LaLota Soto
Crenshaw Larsen (WA) Spanberger
Crockett Larson (CT) Stansbury
Crow Lee (CA) Stanton
Cuellar Lee (NV) Stevens
Curtis Lee (PA) Strickland
Davids (KS) Leger Fernandez Swallow
Davis (IL) Levin Sykes
Davis (NC) Lieu Takano
Dean (PA) Lofgren Thaneadar
DeGette Lynch Thompson (CA)
DeLauro Mace Thompson (MS)
DelBene Magaziner Titus
Deluzio Manning Tlaib
DeSaulnier Matsui Tokuda
Dingell McClellan Tonko
Doggett McClellan Torres (CA)
Duarte McCollum Torres (NY)
Ellzey McGarvey Trahan
Escobar McGovern Trone
Eshoo Meeks Underwood
Español Menendez Valadao
Evans Mfume Vargas
Feenstra Moore (UT) Vasquez
Fitzpatrick Moore (WI) Veasey
Fletcher Morelle Velázquez
Flood Moskowit Wasserman
Foster Moulton Schultz
Foushee Mrvan Waters
Frankel, Lois Mullin Watson Coleman
Frost Nadler Wild
Galleo Nadler Williams (GA)
Garamendi Neal Wilson (FL)
Garcia (IL) Neguse Zinke

NOT VOTING—20

Blumenauer Lesko Radewagen
Connolly McCarthy Sablan
Garbarino Napolitano Scanlon
Graves (LA) Newhouse Sessions
Jackson Lee Pfluger Sewell
Joyce (OH) Phillips Wexton
Landsman Plaskett

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2242

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MR.
McCORMICK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
business is the demand for a recorded
vote on amendment No. 101, printed in
part A of House Report 118-261 offered
by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr.
McCORMICK), on which further pro-
ceedings were postponed and on which
the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
vice, and there were—ayes 166, noes 251,
not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 584]

AYES—166

Aderholt Gaetz Miller-Meeks
Alford Gallagher Mills
Allen Garcia, Mike Molinaro
Amodei Good (VA) Moolenaar
Armstrong Gooden (TX) Mooney
Babin Gosar Moore (AL)
Balderson Graves (LA) Murphy
Banks Graves (MO) Nehls
Barr Green (TN) Norman
Bean (FL) Greene (GA) Ogles
Bentz Grothman Palmer
Bergman Guest Perry
Biggs Guthrie Posey
Bilirakis Hageman Reschenthaler
Bishop (NC) Harris Rodgers (WA)
Boebert Harshbarger Rose
Bost Hern Higgins (LA)
Breechen Buchanan Hill
Buchanan Burchett Rouzer
Burgess Hudson Roy
Burison Huizenga Rutherford
Cammack Hunt Santos
Carey Issa Scalise
Carl Jackson (TX) Schweikert
Carter (GA) Johnson (OH) Scott, Austin
Carter (TX) Johnson (SD) Self
Cline Jordan Smith (MO)
Cloud Joyce (PA) Smith (NE)
Clyde Kelly (MS) Smith (NJ)
Collins Kustoff Smucker
Comer LaHood Spartak
Crane LaLota Stauter
Crawford LaMalfa Stefanik
Crenshaw Lamborn Steil
D'Esposito Langworthy Steube
Davidson Latta Strong
De La Cruz Lee (FL) Tenney
DesJarlais Letlow Tiffany
Donalds Loudermilk Timmons
Duarte Luetkemeyer Van Drew
Duncan Luna Van Dwyne
Dunn (FL) Luttrell Van Orden
Emmer Estess Wagner
Estes Malliotakis Walberg
Ezell Mann Waltz
Fallon Massie Weber (TX)
Feenstra Mast Webster (FL)
Ferguson McCaul Wenstrup
Finstad McClain Westerman
Fischbach McClintock Williams (NY)
Fitzgerald McCormick Williams (TX)
Foxy Meuser Wilson (SC)
Franklin, Scott Miller (IL) Wittman
Fry Miller (OH) Yakym
Fulcher Miller (WV)

NOES—251

Adams Baird Beyer
Aguilar Balint Bice
Allred Barragán Bishop (GA)
Auchincloss Beatty Blunt Rochester
Bacon Bera Bonamici

Bowman Green, Al (TX) Pallone
Boyle (PA) Grijalva Panetta
Brown Harder (CA) Pappas
Brownley Hayes Pascarell
Buck Higgins (NY) Payne
Bucshon Himes Pelosi
Budzinski Hinson Peltola
Bush Horsford Pence
Calvert Houlihan Perez
Caraveo Hoyer Peters
Carbajal Hoyle (OR) Pettersen
Cárdenas Huffman Pingree
Carson Ivey Pocan
Carter (LA) Jackson (IL) Porter
Cartwright Jackson (NC) Pressley
Casar Jacobs Quigley
Case James Ramirez
Casten Jayapal Raskin
Castor (FL) Jeffries Rogers (AL)
Castro (TX) Johnson (GA) Rogers (KY)
Chavez-DeRemer Kamlager-Dove Ross
Cherfilus- Kaptur Ruiz
McCormick Kean (NJ) Ruppersberger
Chu Keating Ryan
Ciscomani Kelly (IL) Salazar
Clark (MA) Kelly (PA) Salinas
Clarke (NY) Khanna Sánchez
Cleaver Kiggins (VA) Sarbanes
Clyburn Kildee Schakowsky
Cohen Kiley Schiff
Cole Kilmer Schneider
Correa Kim (CA) Scholten
Costa Kim (NJ) Schrier
Courtney Krishnamoorthi Scott (VA)
Craig Kuster Scott, David
Crockett Larsen (WA) Sherman
Crow Larson (CT) Sherrill
Cuellar Lawler Simpson
Curtis Lee (CA) Slotkin
Davids (KS) Lee (NV) Smith (WA)
Davis (IL) Lee (PA) Sorensen
Davis (NC) Leger Fernandez Soto
Dean (PA) Levin Spanberger
DeGette Lieu Stansbury
DeLauro Lofgren Stanton
DelBene Lucas Steel
Deluzio Lynch Stevens
DeSaulnier Mace Strickland
Dingell Diaz-Balart Swallow
Doggett Dingell Manning Sykes
Duarte Doggett Matsui Takano
Ellzey Edwards McBath Thaneadar
Escobar Ellzey McClellan Thompson (CA)
Eshoo Eshoo McCollum Thompson (MS)
Español Español McGarvey Thompson (PA)
Evans Evans McGovern Titus
Evans Evans Meeks Tlaib
Feenstra Menendez Tokuda
Fitzpatrick Meng Tonko
Fletcher Mfume Torres (CA)
Flood Moore (UT) Torres (NY)
Foster Foster Moore (WI) Trahan
Foushee Foushee Morelle Trone
Frankel, Lois Moskowit Turner
Frost Moulton Underwood
Galleo Garamendi Moylan Valadao
Garamendi Garcia (IL) Mrvan Vargas
Garcia (IL) Garcia (TX) Mullin Vasquez
Garcia (TX) Garcia, Robert Nadler Veasey
Gimenez Gimenez Neal Velázquez
Golden (ME) Neguse Wasserman
Goldman (NY) Nickel Schultz
Gomez Norcross Waters
Gonzales, Tony Norton Watson Coleman
Gonzalez, Nunn (IA) Wild
Vicente Obernolte Williams (GA)
González-Colón Ocasio-Cortez Wilson (FL)
Gottheimer Omar Womack
Granger Owens Zinke

NOT VOTING—21

Arrington Landsman Plaskett
Blumenauer Lesko Radewagen
Connolly McCarthy Sablan
Garbarino McHenry Scanlon
Griffith Napolitano Sessions
Jackson Lee Newhouse Sewell
Joyce (OH) Phillips Wexton

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2245

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

□ 2250

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR.
MCCORMICK

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 102, printed in part A of House Report 118–261 offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. MCCORMICK), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 217, noes 202, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 585]

AYES—217

Aderholt	Fischbach	Luetkemeyer
Alford	Fitzgerald	Luna
Allen	Fleischmann	Luttrell
Amodei	Flood	Mace
Armstrong	Fox	Malliotakis
Arrington	Franklin, Scott	Mann
Babin	Fry	Massie
Bacon	Fulcher	Mast
Baird	Gaetz	McCaul
Balderson	Gallagher	McClain
Banks	Garcia, Mike	McClintock
Barr	Gimenez	McCormick
Bean (FL)	Golden (ME)	McHenry
Bentz	Gonzales, Tony	Meuser
Bergman	González-Colón	Miller (IL)
Bice	Good (VA)	Miller (OH)
Biggs	Gooden (TX)	Miller (WV)
Bilirakis	Gosar	Miller-Meeks
Bishop (NC)	Granger	Mills
Boebert	Graves (LA)	Molinaro
Bost	Graves (MO)	Moolenaar
Brecheen	Green (TN)	Mooney
Buchanan	Greene (GA)	Moore (AL)
Buck	Griffith	Moore (UT)
Bucshon	Grothman	Moran
Burchett	Guest	Moylan
Burgess	Guthrie	Murphy
Burlison	Hageman	Nehls
Calvert	Harris	Norman
Cammack	Harshbarger	Nunn (IA)
Carey	Hern	Oberholte
Carl	Higgins (LA)	Ogles
Carter (GA)	Hill	Owens
Carter (TX)	Hinson	Palmer
Chavez-DeRemer	Houchin	Peltola
Ciscomani	Hudson	Perez
Cline	Huizenga	Perry
Cloud	Hunt	Pfluger
Clyde	Issa	Posey
Cole	Jackson (TX)	Reschenthaler
Collins	James	Rodgers (WA)
Comer	Johnson (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Crane	Johnson (SD)	Rogers (KY)
Crawford	Jordan	Rose
Cuellar	Joyce (PA)	Rosendale
Curtis	Kean (NJ)	Rouzer
D'Esposito	Kelly (MS)	Roy
Davidson	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford
De La Cruz	Kiggans (VA)	Salazar
DesJarlais	Kiley	Santos
Diaz-Balart	Kim (CA)	Scalise
Donalds	Kustoff	Schweikert
Duarte	LaHood	Scott, Austin
Duncan	LaLota	Self
Dunn (FL)	LaMalfa	Simpson
Edwards	Lamborn	Smith (MO)
Ellzey	Langworthy	Smith (NE)
Emmer	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Estes	LaTurner	Smucker
Ezell	Lawler	Spartz
Fallon	Lee (FL)	Staubert
Feenstra	Letlow	Steel
Ferguson	Loudermilk	Stefanik
Finstad	Lucas	Steil

Steube
Strong
Tennet
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick

Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert

Blumenauer
Connolly
Crenshaw
Garbarino
Jackson Lee
Joyce (OH)
Landsman

Van Duyn
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman

NOES—202

Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
Larsen (WA)
Larsen (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mryan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Norton
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar

NOT VOTING—19

Lesko
McCarthy
Napolitano
Newhouse
Phillips
Plaskett
Radewagen

Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Pence
Peters
Petterson
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Swalwell
Sykes
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
De La Cruz
DesJarlais
Donalds
Duarte
Duncan
Ellzey
Emmer
Estes
Ezell
Fallon
Feenstra
Ferguson
Finstad
Fischbach
Fitzgerald
Foxy

Sablan
Scanlon
Sessions
Sewell
Wexton

AMENDMENT NO. 103 OFFERED BY MRS. MILLER
OF ILLINOIS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 103, printed in part A of House Report 118–261 offered by the gentlewoman from Illinois (Mrs. MILLER), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 151, noes 263, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 586]

AYES—151

Aderholt	Franklin, Scott	Miller-Meeks
Alford	Fry	Mills
Allen	Fulcher	Molinaro
Amodei	Gaetz	Moolenaar
Armstrong	Gallagher	Mooney
Babin	Gosar	Moore (AL)
Balderson	Graves (LA)	Murphy
Banks	Graves (MO)	Nehls
Barr	Green (TN)	Norman
Bean (FL)	Greene (GA)	Ogles
Bentz	Grothman	Palmer
Bergman	Guest	Perry
Biggs	Guthrie	Pfluger
Bilirakis	Hageman	Posey
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Reschenthaler
Boebert	Harshbarger	Rodgers (WA)
Bost	Hern	Rose
Brecheen	Higgins (LA)	Rosendale
Buchanan	Hill	Rouzer
Burchett	Houchin	Roy
Burgess	Huizenga	Rutherford
Burlison	Hunt	Santos
Cammack	Issa	Scalise
Carey	Jackson (TX)	Schweikert
Carl	Johnson (OH)	Self
Carter (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Smith (MO)
Cline	Jordan	Smith (NE)
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Smucker
Clyde	Kelly (MS)	Spartz
Collins	Kustoff	Staubert
Comer	LaHood	Stefanik
Crane	LaMalfa	Steil
Crawford	Lamborn	Steube
Crenshaw	Langworthy	Strong
Davidson	Latta	Tennet
De La Cruz	Loudermilk	Thompson (PA)
DesJarlais	Luetkemeyer	Tiffany
Donalds	Luna	Timmons
Duarte	Luttrell	Van Drew
Duncan	Malliotakis	Van Duyn
Ellzey	Mann	Wagner
Emmer	Massie	Waltz
Estes	Mast	Weber (TX)
Ezell	McCaul	Wenstrup
Fallon	McClain	Westerman
Feenstra	McClintock	Williams (TX)
Ferguson	McCormick	Wilson (SC)
Finstad	McHenry	Wittman
Fischbach	Miller (IL)	Yakym
Fitzgerald	Miller (OH)	
Foxy	Miller (WV)	

NOES—263

Adams	Bishop (GA)	Carbajal
Aguilar	Blunt Rochester	Cárdenas
Allred	Bonamici	Carson
Arrington	Bowman	Carter (LA)
Auchincloss	Boyle (PA)	Carter (TX)
Bacon	Brown	Cartwright
Baird	Brownley	Casar
Balint	Buck	Case
Barragán	Bucshon	Casten
Beatty	Budzinski	Castor (FL)
Bera	Bush	Castro (TX)
Beyer	Calvert	Chavez-DeRemer
Bice	Caraveo	

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

□ 2248

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

Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Ciscomani
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Cole
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Curtis
D'Esposito
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Dunn (FL)
Edwards
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Mike
Garcia, Robert
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez,
Vicente
González-Colón
Gottheimer
Granger
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Hudson
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)

NOT VOTING—24

Blumenauer
Connolly
Garbarino
Good (VA)
Gooden (TX)
Griffith
Jackson Lee
Joyce (OH)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2251

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 107 OFFERED BY MR. NEHLS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 107, printed in part A of House Report 118-261 offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. NEHLS), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 196, noes 222, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 587]

AYES—196

Aderholt
Alford
Allen
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bean (FL)
Bentz
Bergman
Bice
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Boebert
Bost
Brecheen
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Burchett
Hinson
Houchin
Hudson
Huizenga
Hunt
Issa
Jackson (TX)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (PA)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kim (CA)
Kustoff
LaLota
LaMalfa
LaMort
Lamborn
Latta
LaTurner
Lee (FL)
Letlow
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Luna
Luttrell
Malliotakis
Mann
Massie
Mast
McCaull
McClain
McClintock
McCormick
Meuser
Miller (IL)
Miller (OH)
Miller (WV)
Miller-Meeks
Mills

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Auchincloss
Baird
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chavez-DeRemer
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Ciscomani
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espallat
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Fletcher
Flood
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert
Gimenez
Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzales, Tony
Gonzalez,
Vicente
González-Colón
Gottheimer
Granger
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hinson
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Hudson
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)

NOES—222

Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
González-Colón
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jacobs
James
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Kean (NJ)
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kiggans (VA)
Kildee
Kiley
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster
LaHood
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawler
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lucas
Lynch
Mace
Magaziner
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Molinaro
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross

NOT VOTING—20

Blumenauer
Connolly
Garbarino
Jackson Lee
Joyce (OH)
Landsman
Langworthy

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2254

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

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded

vote on amendment No. 110, printed in part A of House Report 118–261 offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 207, noes 213, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 588]

AYES—207

Aderholt	Fry	Miller (OH)
Alford	Fulcher	Miller (WV)
Allen	Gaetz	Miller-Meeks
Amodei	Gallagher	Mills
Armstrong	Garcia, Mike	Molinaro
Arrington	Jimenez	Moolenaar
Babin	Gonzales, Tony	Mooney
Bacon	Good (VA)	Moore (AL)
Baird	Gooden (TX)	Moore (UT)
Balderson	Gosar	Moran
Banks	Granger	Moylan
Barr	Graves (LA)	Murphy
Bean (FL)	Graves (MO)	Nehls
Bentz	Green (TN)	Norman
Bergman	Greene (GA)	Nunn (IA)
Bice	Griffith	Overholte
Biggs	Grothman	Ogles
Bilirakis	Guest	Owens
Bishop (NC)	Guthrie	Palmer
Boebert	Hageman	Pence
Bost	Harris	Perry
Brecheen	Harshbarger	Pfuger
Buchanan	Hern	Posey
Buck	Higgins (LA)	Reschenthaler
Bucshon	Hill	Rodgers (WA)
Burchett	Hinson	Rogers (KY)
Burgess	Houchin	Rose
Burlison	Hudson	Rosendale
Calvert	Huizenga	Rouzer
Cammack	Hunt	Roy
Carey	Issa	Rutherford
Carl	Jackson (TX)	Santos
Carter (GA)	James	Scalise
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Schweikert
Ciscomani	Johnson (SD)	Self
Cline	Jordan	Simpson
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Smith (MO)
Clyde	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NE)
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Collins	Kiggans (VA)	Smucker
Comer	Kiley	Spartz
Crane	Kim (CA)	Staubert
Crawford	Kustoff	Steel
Crenshaw	LaHood	Stefanik
Curtis	LaLota	Steil
D'Esposito	Lamborn	Steube
Davidson	Langworthy	Strong
De La Cruz	Latta	Tenney
DesJarlais	LaTurner	Thompson (PA)
Diaz-Balart	Lawler	Tiffany
Donalds	Lee (FL)	Timmons
Duarte	Letlow	Valadao
Duncan	Loudermilk	Van Drew
Dunn (FL)	Lucas	Van Dwyne
Edwards	Luetkemeyer	Van Orden
Ellzey	Luna	Wagner
Emmer	Luttrell	Walberg
Estes	Mace	Waltz
Ezell	Malliotakis	Weber (TX)
Fallon	Mann	Webster (FL)
Feenstra	Massie	Wenstrup
Ferguson	Mast	Westerman
Finstad	McCaul	Williams (NY)
Fischbach	McClain	Williams (TX)
Fitzgerald	McClintock	Wilson (SC)
Fleischmann	McCormick	Wittman
Flood	McHenry	Womack
Foxx	Meuser	Yakym
Franklin, Scott	Miller (IL)	Zinke

NOES—213

Adams	Goldman (NY)	Pallone
Aguilar	Gomez	Panetta
Allred	Gonzalez,	Pappas
Auchincloss	Vicente	Pascrell
Balint	González-Colón	Payne
Barragán	Gottheimer	Pelosi
Beatty	Green, Al (TX)	Peltola
Bera	Grijalva	Perez
Beyer	Harder (CA)	Peters
Bishop (GA)	Hayes	Pettersen
Blunt Rochester	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Bonamici	Himes	Pocan
Bowman	Horsford	Porter
Boyle (PA)	Houlihan	Pressley
Brown	Hoyer	Quigley
Brownley	Hoyle (OR)	Ramirez
Budzinski	Huffman	Raskin
Bush	Ivey	Rogers (AL)
Caraveo	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Carbajal	Jackson (NC)	Ruiz
Cárdenas	Jacobs	Ruppersberger
Carson	Jayapal	Ryan
Carter (LA)	Jeffries	Salazar
Cartwright	Johnson (GA)	Salinas
Casas	Kamlager-Dove	Sánchez
Case	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Casten	Kean (NJ)	Schakowsky
Castor (FL)	Keating	Schiff
Castro (TX)	Kelly (IL)	Schneider
Chavez-DeRemer	Khanna	Scholten
Cheerflus-	Kildee	Schrier
McCormick	Kilmer	Scott (VA)
Chu	Kim (NJ)	Scott, Austin
Clark (MA)	Krishnamoorthi	Scott, David
Clarke (NY)	Kuster	Sherman
Cleaver	LaMalfa	Sherrill
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Slotkin
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Smith (WA)
Correa	Lee (CA)	Sorensen
Costa	Lee (NV)	Soto
Courtney	Lee (PA)	Spanberger
Craig	Leger Fernandez	Stansbury
Crockett	Levin	Stanton
Crow	Lieu	Stevens
Cuellar	Lofgren	Strickland
Davids (KS)	Lynch	Swalwell
Davis (IL)	Magaziner	Sykes
Davis (NC)	Manning	Takano
Dean (PA)	Matsui	Thanedar
DeGette	McBath	Thompson (CA)
DeLauro	McClellan	Thompson (MS)
DeBene	McCollum	Titus
Deluzio	McGarvey	Tlaib
DeSaulnier	McGovern	Tokuda
Dingell	Meeks	Tonko
Doggett	Menendez	Torres (CA)
Escobar	Meng	Torres (NY)
Eshoo	Mfume	Trahan
Españat	Moore (WI)	Trone
Evans	Morale	Turner
Fitzpatrick	Moskowitz	Underwood
Fletcher	Moulton	Vargas
Foster	Mrvan	Vasquez
Foushee	Mullin	Veasey
Frankel, Lois	Nadler	Velazquez
Frost	Neal	Wasserman
Gallego	Neguse	Schultz
Garamendi	Nickel	Waters
Garcia (IL)	Norcross	Watson Coleman
Garcia (TX)	Norton	Wild
Garcia, Robert	Ocasio-Cortez	Williams (GA)
Golden (ME)	Omar	Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—18

Blumenauer	Lesko	Radewagen
Connolly	McCarthy	Sablan
Garbarino	Napolitano	Scanlon
Jackson Lee	Newhouse	Sessions
Joyce (OH)	Phillips	Sewell
Landsman	Plaskett	Wexton

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2258

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Chair, on rollcall No. 588, I mistakenly voted “no” when I intended to vote “aye.”

AMENDMENT NO. 112 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 112, printed in part A of House Report 118–261 offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 159, noes 259, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 589]

AYES—159

Aderholt	Fry	Miller (OH)
Alford	Fulcher	Miller (WV)
Allen	Gaetz	Miller-Meeks
Amodei	Gallagher	Mills
Armstrong	Good (VA)	Molinaro
Babin	Gooden (TX)	Moolenaar
Baird	Gosar	Mooney
Balderson	Graves (LA)	Moore (AL)
Banks	Graves (MO)	Murphy
Barr	Green (TN)	Nehls
Bean (FL)	Greene (GA)	Norman
Bentz	Grothman	Ogles
Bergman	Guest	Owens
Biggs	Guthrie	Palmer
Bilirakis	Hageman	Perry
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Pfuger
Boebert	Harshbarger	Posey
Bost	Hern	Reschenthaler
Brecheen	Higgins (LA)	Rodgers (WA)
Buchanan	Hill	Rose
Burchett	Houchin	Rosendale
Burgess	Hudson	Rouzer
Burlison	Huizenga	Roy
Cammack	Hunt	Rutherford
Carey	Jackson (TX)	Santos
Carl	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Carter (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Schweikert
Carter (TX)	Jordan	Self
Ciscomani	Joyce (PA)	Smith (MO)
Cline	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NE)
Cloud	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NJ)
Clyde	Kiggans (VA)	Smucker
Cole	Kiley	Staubert
Collins	Kim (CA)	Steil
Comer	Kustoff	Steube
Crane	LaHood	Strong
Crawford	LaMalfa	Tenney
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Thompson (PA)
Curtis	Langworthy	Tiffany
D'Esposito	Latta	Timmons
Davidson	LaTurner	Van Drew
De La Cruz	Lee (FL)	Van Dwyne
DesJarlais	Letlow	Van Orden
Diaz-Balart	Loudermilk	Wagner
Donalds	Luetkemeyer	Walberg
Duarte	Luna	Waltz
Duncan	Luttrell	Weber (TX)
Dunn (FL)	Malliotakis	Webster (FL)
Edwards	Mann	Wenstrup
Ellzey	Massie	Westerman
Emmer	Mast	Williams (NY)
Estes	McCaul	Williams (TX)
Ezell	McClain	Wilson (SC)
Fallon	McClintock	Wittman
Feenstra	McCormick	Womack
Ferguson	McHenry	Yakym
Finstad	Meuser	Zinke
Fischbach	Miller (IL)	
Fitzgerald		
Fleischmann		
Flood		
Foxx		
Franklin, Scott		

NOES—259

Adams	Bishop (GA)	Caraveo
Aguilar	Blunt Rochester	Carbajal
Allred	Bonamici	Cárdenas
Arrington	Bowman	Carson
Auchincloss	Boyle (PA)	Carter (LA)
Bacon	Brown	Carter (TX)
Balint	Brownley	Cartwright
Barragán	Buck	Casas
Beatty	Bucshon	Case
Bera	Budzinski	Casten
Beyer	Bush	Castor (FL)
Bice	Calvert	Castro (TX)

Chavez-DeRemer Jackson (IL)
 Cherfilus- Jackson (NC)
 McCormick Jacobs
 Chu James
 Ciscomani Jayapal
 Clark (MA) Jeffries
 Clarke (NY) Johnson (GA)
 Cleaver Kamlager-Dove
 Clyburn Kaptur
 Cohen Kean (NJ)
 Cole Keating
 Correa Kelly (IL)
 Costa Kelly (PA)
 Courtney Khanna
 Craig Kiggans (VA)
 Crockett Kildee
 Crow Kiley
 Cuellar Kilmer
 Curtis Kim (CA)
 Davids (KS) Kim (NJ)
 Davis (IL) Krishnamoorthi
 Davis (NC) Kuster
 Dean (PA) LaLota
 DeGette Larsen (WA)
 DeLauro Larson (CT)
 DelBene Lawler
 Deluzio Lee (CA)
 DeSaulnier Lee (NV)
 Diaz-Balart Lee (PA)
 Dingell Leger Fernandez
 Doggett Levin
 Dunn (FL) Lieu
 Edwards Lofgren
 Ellzey Lucas
 Escobar Lynch
 Eshoo Mace
 Espaillat Magaziner
 Evans Manning
 Fitzpatrick Matsui
 Fleischmann McBath
 Fletcher McCaul
 Flood McClellan
 Foster McCollum
 Foushee McGarvey
 Frankel, Lois McGovern
 Frost Meeks
 Gallego Menendez
 Garamendi Meng
 Garcia (IL) Mfume
 Garcia (TX) Moore (UT)
 Garcia, Mike Moore (WI)
 Garcia, Robert Moran
 Gimenez Morelle
 Golden (ME) Moskowitz
 Goldman (NY) Moulton
 Gomez Moylan
 Gonzales, Tony Mrvan
 Gonzalez, Mullin
 Vicente Nadler
 González-Colón Neal
 Gottheimer Neguse
 Granger Nickel
 Green, Al (TX) Norcross
 Grijalva Norton
 Harder (CA) Nunn (IA)
 Hayes Obernolte
 Higgins (NY) Ocasio-Cortez
 Himes Omar
 Hinson Pallone
 Horsford Panetta
 Houlahan Pappas
 Hoyer Pascrell
 Hoyle (OR) Payne
 Huffman Pelosi
 Issa Peltola
 Ivey Pence

NOT VOTING—20

Blumenauer Lesko
 Connolly McCarthy
 Garbarino Napolitano
 Griffith Newhouse
 Jackson Lee Phillips
 Joyce (OH) Plaskett
 Landsman Radewagen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2301

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 113 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded

vote on amendment No. 113, printed in
 part A of House Report 118-261 offered
 by the gentleman from South Carolina
 (Mr. NORMAN), on which further pro-
 ceedings were postponed and on which
 the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-
 vice, and there were—ayes 150, noes 265,
 not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 590]

AYES—150

Aderholt Fry
 Alford Fulcher
 Allen Gaetz
 Amodei Gallagher
 Armstrong Good (VA)
 Babin Gooden (TX)
 Balderson Graves (MO)
 Banks Green (TN)
 Barr Greene (GA)
 Bean (FL) Guest
 Bentz Guthrie
 Bergman Hageman
 Biggs Harris
 Bilirakis Harshbarger
 Bishop (NC) Hern
 Boebert Higgins (LA)
 Bost Hill
 Brecheen Houchin
 Buchanan Huizenga
 Burchett Hunt
 Burlison Issa
 Cammack Jackson (TX)
 Carey Johnson (SD)
 Carl Jordan
 Carter (GA) Joyce (PA)
 Cline Kelly (MS)
 Cloud Kustoff
 Clyde LaHood
 Collins LaMalfa
 Comer Lamborn
 Crane Langworthy
 Crawford Latta
 Crenshaw LaTurner
 D'Esposito Lee (FL)
 Davidson Letlow
 De La Cruz Loudermilk
 DesJarlais Luetkemeyer
 Donalds Luna
 Duarte Luttrell
 Duncan Malliotakis
 Emmer Mann
 Estes Massie
 Ezell Mast
 Fallon McClain
 Feenstra McClintock
 Finstad McCormick
 Fischbach McHenry
 Fitzgerald Meuser
 Foxx Miller (IL)
 Franklin, Scott Miller (OH)

NOES—265

Adams Brownley
 Aguilar Buck
 Allred Bucshon
 Arrington Budzinski
 Auchincloss Burgess
 Bacon Bush
 Baird Calvert
 Balint Caraveo
 Barragán Carbajal
 Beatty Cardenas
 Bera Carson
 Beyer Carter (LA)
 Bice Carter (TX)
 Bishop (GA) Cartwright
 Blunt Rochester Casar
 Bonamici Case
 Bowman Casten
 Boyle (PA) Castor (FL)
 Brown Castro (TX)

Davids (KS) Kelly (IL)
 Davis (IL) Kelly (PA)
 Davis (NC) Khanna
 Dean (PA) Kiggans (VA)
 DeGette Kildee
 DeLauro Kiley
 DelBene Kilmer
 Deluzio Kim (CA)
 DeSaulnier Kim (NJ)
 Diaz-Balart Krishnamoorthi
 Dingell Kuster
 Doggett LaLota
 Dunn (FL) Larsen (WA)
 Edwards Larson (CT)
 Ellzey Lawler
 Escobar Lee (CA)
 Eshoo Lee (NV)
 Espaillat Lee (PA)
 Evans Leger Fernandez
 Ferguson Levin
 Fitzpatrick Lieu
 Fleischmann Lofgren
 Fletcher Lucas
 Flood Lynch
 Foster Mace
 Foushee Magaziner
 Frankel, Lois Manning
 Frost Matsui
 Gallego McBath
 Garamendi McCaul
 Garcia (IL) McClellan
 Garcia (TX) McCollum
 Garcia, Mike McGarvey
 Garcia, Robert McGovern
 Gimenez Meeks
 Golden (ME) Menendez
 Goldman (NY) Meng
 Gomez Mfume
 Gonzales, Tony Molinaro
 Gonzalez, Moore (UT)
 Vicente Moore (WI)
 González-Colón Moran
 Gottheimer Morelle
 Granger Moskowitz
 Graves (LA) Moulton
 Green, Al (TX) Moylan
 Grijalva Mrvan
 Harder (CA) Mullin
 Hayes Nadler
 Higgins (NY) Neal
 Himes Neguse
 Hinson Nickel
 Horsford Norcross
 Houlahan Norton
 Hoyer Nunn (IA)
 Hoyle (OR) Obernolte
 Hudson Ocasio-Cortez
 Huffman Omar
 Ivey Pallone
 Jackson (IL) Panetta
 Jackson (NC) Pappas
 Jacobs Pascrell
 James Payne
 Jayapal Pelosi
 Jeffries Peltola
 Johnson (GA) Pence
 Johnson (OH) Perez
 Kamlager-Dove Peters
 Kaptur Pettersen
 Kean (NJ) Pingree
 Keating Pocan

NOT VOTING—23

Blumenauer Landsman
 Connolly Lesko
 Garbarino McCarthy
 Gosar Napolitano
 Griffith Newhouse
 Grothman Phillips
 Jackson Lee Plaskett
 Joyce (OH) Radewagen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2304

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced
 as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 115 OFFERED BY MR. NORMAN

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished
 business is the demand for a recorded
 vote on amendment No. 115, printed in
 part A of House Report 118-261 offered
 by the gentleman from South Carolina

(Mr. NORMAN), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 263, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 591]

AYES—156

Alford	Gaetz	Mills
Allen	Gallagher	Molinaro
Amodei	Good (VA)	Moolenaar
Armstrong	Gooden (TX)	Mooney
Babin	Gosar	Moore (AL)
Balderson	Graves (MO)	Murphy
Banks	Green (TN)	Nehls
Barr	Greene (GA)	Norman
Bean (FL)	Grothman	Ogles
Bentz	Guest	Owens
Bergman	Guthrie	Palmer
Biggs	Hageman	Perry
Bilirakis	Harris	Pfuger
Bishop (NC)	Harshbarger	Posey
Boebert	Hern	Reschenthaler
Bost	Higgins (LA)	Rodgers (WA)
Brecheen	Hill	Rose
Buchanan	Houchin	Rosendale
Burchett	Huizenga	Rouzer
Burlison	Hunt	Roy
Cammack	Issa	Rutherford
Carey	Jackson (TX)	Santos
Carl	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Carter (GA)	Johnson (SD)	Schweikert
Cline	Jordan	Self
Cloud	Joyce (PA)	Smith (MO)
Clyde	Kelly (MS)	Smith (NE)
Collins	Kustoff	Smucker
Comer	LaHood	Spartz
Crane	LaLota	Staubert
Crawford	Lamborn	Stefanik
Crenshaw	Langworthy	Steil
D'Esposito	Latta	Steube
Davidson	LaTurner	Strong
De La Cruz	Lee (FL)	Tenney
DesJarlais	Letlow	Tiffany
Donalds	Loudermilk	Timmons
Duarte	Luetkemeyer	Van Drew
Duncan	Luna	Van Dwyne
Emmer	Luttrell	Van Orden
Estes	Malliotakis	Wagner
Ezell	Mann	Walberg
Fallon	Massie	Waltz
Feenstra	Mast	Weber (TX)
Ferguson	McClain	Webster (FL)
Finstad	McClintock	Wenstrup
Fischbach	McCormick	Westerman
Fitzgerald	McHenry	Williams (NY)
Foxx	Miller (IL)	Williams (TX)
Franklin, Scott	Miller (OH)	Wilson (SC)
Fry	Miller (WV)	Wittman
Fulcher	Miller-Meeks	Yakym

NOES—263

Adams	Buck	Chu
Aderholt	Bucshon	Ciscomani
Aguilar	Budzinski	Clark (MA)
Allred	Burgess	Clarke (NY)
Arrington	Bush	Cleaver
Auchincloss	Calvert	Clyburn
Bacon	Caraveo	Cohen
Baird	Carbajal	Cole
Balint	Cárdenas	Correa
Barragán	Carson	Costa
Beatty	Carter (LA)	Courtney
Bera	Carter (TX)	Craig
Beyer	Cartwright	Crockett
Bice	Casara	Crow
Bishop (GA)	Case	Cuellar
Blunt Rochester	Casten	Curtis
Bonamici	Castor (FL)	Davids (KS)
Bowman	Castro (TX)	Davis (IL)
Boyle (PA)	Chavez-DeRemer	Davis (NC)
Brown	Cherfilus-	Dean (PA)
Brownley	McCormick	DeGette

DeLauro	Kildee	Pressley
DelBene	Kiley	Quigley
Deluzio	Kilmer	Ramirez
DeSaulnier	Kim (CA)	Raskin
Diaz-Balart	Kim (NJ)	Rogers (AL)
Dingell	Krishnamoorthi	Rogers (KY)
Doggett	Kuster	Ross
Dunn (FL)	LaMalfa	Ruiz
Edwards	Larsen (WA)	Ruppersberger
Elizy	Larson (CT)	Ryan
Escobar	Lawler	Salazar
Eshoo	Lee (CA)	Salinas
Españolat	Lee (NV)	Sánchez
Evans	Lee (PA)	Sarbanes
Fitzpatrick	Leger Fernandez	Schakowsky
Fleischmann	Levin	Schiff
Fletcher	Lieu	Schneider
Flood	Lofgren	Scholten
Foster	Lucas	Schrier
Foushee	Lynch	Scott (VA)
Frankel, Lois	Mace	Scott, Austin
Frost	Magaziner	Scott, David
Gallego	Manning	Sherman
Garamendi	Matsui	Sherrill
García (IL)	McBath	Simpson
García (TX)	McCaul	Slotkin
García, Mike	McClellan	Smith (NJ)
García, Robert	McCollum	Smith (WA)
Gimenez	McGarvey	Sorensen
Golden (ME)	McGovern	Soto
Goldman (NY)	Meeks	Spanberger
Gomez	Menendez	Stansbury
Gonzales, Tony	Meng	Stanton
Gonzalez,	Meuser	Steel
Vicente	Mfume	Stevens
González-Colón	Moore (UT)	Strickland
Gottheimer	Moore (WI)	Swalwell
Granger	Moran	Sykes
Graves (LA)	Morale	Takano
Green, Al (TX)	Moskowitz	Thanedar
Grijalva	Moulton	Thompson (CA)
Harder (CA)	Moylan	Thompson (MS)
Hayes	Mrvan	Thompson (PA)
Higgins (NY)	Mullin	Titus
Himes	Nadler	Tlaib
Hinson	Neal	Tokuda
Horsford	Neguse	Tonko
Houlahan	Nickel	Torres (CA)
Hoyer	Norcross	Torres (NY)
Hoyle (OR)	Norton	Trahan
Hudson	Nunn (IA)	Trone
Huffman	Obermole	Turner
Ivey	Ocasio-Cortez	Underwood
Jackson (IL)	Omar	Valadao
Jackson (NC)	Pallone	Vargas
Jacobs	Panetta	Vasquez
James	Pappas	Veasey
Jayapal	Pascarell	Velazquez
Jeffries	Payne	Wasserman
Johnson (GA)	Pelosi	Schultz
Kamlager-Dove	Peltola	Waters
Kaptur	Pence	Watson Coleman
Kean (NJ)	Perez	Wild
Keating	Peters	Williams (GA)
Kelly (IL)	Pettersen	Wilson (FL)
Kelly (PA)	Pingree	Womack
Khanna	Pocan	Zinke
Kiggans (VA)	Porter	

NOT VOTING—19

Blumenauer	Lesko	Sablan
Connolly	McCarthy	Scanlon
Garbarino	Napolitano	Sessions
Griffith	Newhouse	Sewell
Jackson Lee	Phillips	Wexton
Joyce (OH)	Plaskett	
Landsman	Radewagen	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2307

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

AMENDMENT NO. 116 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on amendment No. 116, printed in part A of House Report 118-261 offered by the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES), on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the ayes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 175, noes 244, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 592]

AYES—175

Aderholt	Gimenez	Mills
Alford	Gonzales, Tony	Moolenaar
Allen	Good (VA)	Mooney
Amodei	Gooden (TX)	Moore (AL)
Armstrong	Gosar	Moore (UT)
Arrington	Granger	Moran
Babin	Graves (LA)	Murphy
Baird	Graves (MO)	Nehls
Balderson	Green (TN)	Norman
Banks	Greene (GA)	Nunn (IA)
Bean (FL)	Griffith	Ogles
Bentz	Grothman	Owens
Bergman	Guest	Palmer
Biggs	Guthrie	Perry
Bilirakis	Hageman	Pfuger
Bishop (NC)	Harris	Posey
Boebert	Harshbarger	Reschenthaler
Bost	Hern	Rodgers (WA)
Brecheen	Higgins (LA)	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Hinson	Rogers (KY)
Burchett	Houchin	Rose
Burgess	Hudson	Rosendale
Burlison	Huizenga	Rouzer
Cammack	Hunt	Roy
Carey	Issa	Rutherford
Carl	Jackson (TX)	Santos
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Scalise
Cline	Johnson (SD)	Schweikert
Cloud	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Clyde	Joyce (PA)	Self
Collins	Kelly (MS)	Smith (MO)
Comer	Kelly (PA)	Smith (NE)
Crane	Kustoff	Smith (NJ)
Crawford	LaHood	Smucker
Crenshaw	LaMalfa	Spartz
Curtis	Lamborn	Staubert
Davidson	Langworthy	Steel
De La Cruz	Latta	Stefanik
DesJarlais	LaTurner	Steil
Donalds	Lee (FL)	Steube
Duarte	Letlow	Strong
Duncan	Loudermilk	Tenney
Dunn (FL)	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
Elizy	Luna	Tiffany
Emmer	Luttrell	Timmons
Estes	Malliotakis	Turner
Ezell	Mann	Van Drew
Feenstra	Massie	Van Dwyne
Ferguson	Mast	Walberg
Finstad	McCaul	Waltz
Fischbach	McClain	Weber (TX)
Fitzgerald	McClintock	Wenstrup
Flood	McCormick	Westerman
Foxx	McHenry	Williams (TX)
Franklin, Scott	Meuser	Wittman
Fry	Miller (IL)	Yakym
Fulcher	Miller (OH)	
Gaetz	Miller (WV)	
Gallagher	Miller-Meeks	

NOES—244

Adams	Brownley	Chavez-DeRemer
Aguilar	Bucshon	Cherfilus-
Allred	Budzinski	McCormick
Auchincloss	Bush	Chu
Bacon	Calvert	Ciscomani
Balint	Caraveo	Clark (MA)
Barr	Carbajal	Clarke (NY)
Barragán	Cárdenas	Cleaver
Beatty	Carson	Clyburn
Bera	Carter (GA)	Cohen
Beyer	Carter (LA)	Cole
Bice	Carter (TX)	Correa
Bishop (GA)	Cartwright	Costa
Blunt Rochester	Casara	Courtney
Bonamici	Case	Craig
Bowman	Casten	Crockett
Boyle (PA)	Castor (FL)	Crow
Brown	Castro (TX)	Cuellar

D'Esposito	Kildee	Quigley
Davids (KS)	Kiley	Ramirez
Davis (IL)	Kilmer	Raskin
Davis (NC)	Kim (CA)	Ross
Dean (PA)	Kim (NJ)	Ruiz
DeGette	Krishnamoorthi	Ruppersberger
DeLauro	Kuster	Ryan
DeBene	LaLota	Salazar
Deluzio	Larsen (WA)	Salinas
DeSaulnier	Larson (CT)	Sánchez
Diaz-Balart	Lawler	Sarbanes
Dingell	Lee (CA)	Schakowsky
Doggett	Lee (NV)	Schiff
Edwards	Lee (PA)	Schneider
Escobar	Leger Fernandez	Scholten
Eshoo	Levin	Schrier
Espallat	Lieu	Scott (VA)
Evans	Lofgren	Scott, David
Fitzpatrick	Lucas	Sherman
Fleischmann	Lynch	Sherrill
Fletcher	Mace	Simpson
Foster	Magaziner	Slotkin
Foushee	Manning	Smith (WA)
Frankel, Lois	Matsui	Sorensen
Frost	McBath	Soto
Gallego	McClellan	Spanberger
Garamendi	McCollum	Stansbury
Garcia (IL)	McGarvey	Stanton
Garcia (TX)	McGovern	Stevens
Garcia, Mike	Meeks	Strickland
Garcia, Robert	Menendez	Swalwell
Golden (ME)	Meng	Sykes
Goldman (NY)	Mfume	Takano
Gomez	Molinaro	Thanedar
Gonzalez,	Moore (WI)	Thompson (CA)
Vicente	Morelle	Thompson (MS)
González-Colón	Moskowitz	Titus
Gottheimer	Moulton	Tlaib
Green, Al (TX)	Moylan	Tokuda
Grijalva	Mrvan	Tonko
Harder (CA)	Mullin	Torres (CA)
Hayes	Nadler	Torres (NY)
Higgins (NY)	Neal	Trahan
Hill	Neguse	Trone
Himes	Nickel	Underwood
Horsford	Norcross	Valadao
Houlahan	Norton	Van Orden
Hoyer	Obernolte	Vargas
Hoyle (OR)	Ocasio-Cortez	Vasquez
Huffman	Omar	Veasey
Ivey	Pallone	Velázquez
Jackson (IL)	Panetta	Wagner
Jackson (NC)	Pappas	Wasserman
Jacobs	Pascrell	Schultz
James	Payne	Waters
Jayapal	Pelosi	Watson Coleman
Jeffries	Peltola	Webster (FL)
Johnson (GA)	Pence	Wild
Kamlager-Dove	Perez	Williams (GA)
Kaptur	Peters	Williams (NY)
Kean (NJ)	Pettersen	Wilson (FL)
Keating	Pingree	Womack
Kelly (IL)	Pocan	Zinke
Khanna	Porter	
Kiggans (VA)	Pressley	

NOT VOTING—19

Blumenauer	Lesko	Sablan
Connolly	McCarthy	Scanlon
Fallon	Napolitano	Sessions
Garbarino	Newhouse	Sewell
Jackson Lee	Phillips	Wexton
Joyce (OH)	Plaskett	
Landsman	Radewagen	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2311

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 119 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 119 printed in part A of House Report 118–261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used for the Environmental Financial Advisory Board of the Environmental Protection Agency.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, the Environmental Financial Advisory Board, or the EFAB, was chartered under the 1972 Federal Advisory Committee Act. The EFAB boasts of making recommendations that would supposedly lower the cost of environmental protection.

Unfortunately, they are entirely beholden to the left's climate alarmism agenda. In a November 2022 meeting, the EFAB spent taxpayer resources gloating about the establishment of the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund created from the so-called Inflation Reduction Act of 2022, a bill whose subsidies will cost the American taxpayers \$1.2 trillion.

□ 2320

This de facto slush fund provides \$27 billion to the EPA through September 2024. If the argument here is that we need the EFAB to expedite the rate at which the Biden administration can give out green subsidies to his donor base, I submit to my colleagues that perhaps the EFAB has outgrown its usefulness.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MORAN). The gentlewoman from Maine is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE. The Environmental Financial Advisory Board supports the EPA's mission to lower the cost of and increase investment in environmental and public health protection.

Just to be clear about its role, here are some of the activities the board pursues: ways to lower the cost of environmental protection; remove financial and programmatic barriers that raise costs; increase public and private contributions in environmental facilities and services; and build State and local financial ability to meet environmental laws.

This mission is critical if we want to ensure that the investments we need to protect our country from climate change are sound and achievable.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, let's take a look at the eligible recipients of this \$27 billion boondoggle: State-sponsored green banks; nonprofit or quasi-government green banks—so much for the free market, Mr. Chairman—and nonprofit energy conservation funds and nonprofit social funds, just to name a few. In other words, slush funds, Mr. Chairman.

If you look at the EFAB's charter, you will find that they provide recommendations on ways the EPA can implement funding from the infrastructure law and the Inflation Reduction Act to support environmental justice and to tackle the climate crisis, which is beyond their original intent.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption at a time of inflation, at a time when we are growing energy dependent on our enemies. It is time that we cull back this alarmism. It is time that we cull back these slush funds. It is time that we do the right thing and cut the budget. Cut this nonsense.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 120 OFFERED BY MR. OGLES

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 120 printed in part A of House Report 118–261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end, before the short title, insert the following:

MINERAL LEASING ACT MODERNIZATION

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce section 50262 of Public Law 117–169 (commonly known as the “Inflation Reduction Act”).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. OGLES) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, at a time of, again, increased dependency on our enemies, my amendment addresses the royalty rates that were imposed by the Biden administration through the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022. We can see today that it did nothing to reduce inflation, taking away from many Americans their dream of owning a home.

In order to pay for what ended up being approximately \$1.2 trillion in green subsidies, the Biden administration chose to raise the royalty rate of onshore oil and gas leases from 12.5 percent to 16.6 percent through the Inflation Reduction Act of 2022.

Democrats also voted in unison to quintuple the minimum bid amount from \$2 per acre to \$10 per acre. They voted to increase the rental rate by a factor of 9, from \$1.50 to \$15 per acre.

At the time of the bill's passage, estimates indicated the bill would impose a \$6.5 billion hike on oil and gas development.

Here is what I find to be one of the most remarkable things about the so-called Inflation Reduction Act of 2022: Nowhere in that bill did Democrats identify any government program worth cutting. Not one.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, it is hard for me to actually understand my colleague's argument here. He opposes modernizing the Mineral Leasing Act, basically raising lease fees at a time when he is complaining about the deficit, meaning the revenue could be very helpful.

The way I read this, we are just catering to oil and gas interests, enabling them to continue to operate at rates that don't benefit the American people.

I have no idea how this works well for us. Why would my colleague think that at a time when he is also looking for more ways to balance our budget?

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I will point out that a \$6.5 billion hike on oil and gas development isn't going to decrease inflation. It increases underlying costs.

When you look at commodities across sectors, everything has gone up—food, oil, et cetera—because of things like this. Instead of saving the American people money, this administration chose to surrender our energy independence.

Again, I go back to the underlying cost of everything. Everything in this room, everything in your kitchen, is dependent on oil, gas, diesel. Everything in this country moves by that mechanism, so this so-called business-friendly idea has done nothing more than cripple our oil and gas industry. It is contributing to inflation. The fact that it is called the Inflation Reduction Act is offensive because it did nothing.

They should admit their mistake and try to fix it. Instead, they go on increasing costs to an industry that is the backbone of our country. Again, for minerals, we are currently dependent on enemies. Oil and gas, we are dependent on enemies.

Mr. Chairman, right now, oil prices are trading around \$90 a barrel. If the Hamas-instigated war against Israel continues or escalates, the American people will endure the consequences of once again depending on OPEC for our energy needs. Some estimates say that oil could go up to \$150.

Again, at a time of great inflation, we have to be taking steps to roll back costs on our infrastructure, on oil and gas exploration.

I always make the comment in my townhalls that if you find oil and gas in my yard, drill, baby, drill, because we need it. We need it for our infrastructure. We need it for our independence. We need it for national security.

It is about time we acknowledge the fact the Inflation Reduction Act in 2022 was a scam that screwed America.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I couldn't possibly call the Inflation Reduction Act a scam that has ruined anything in America. I have to say it is one of the best things we have ever done. It is the first time we have made a significant investment in renewable energy and in defeating climate change.

I am sorry that my colleague doesn't see it in the same way. I am sorry that my colleague thinks that the only way we can end our dependence on foreign oil is to drill in his front yard. I wish him luck on that. I hope that he does discover oil in his front yard. That could be an amazing day in his life.

The fact is that we need to invest in renewable energy. We need to invest in American manufacturing.

The very idea that this incredibly wealthy industry, the oil and gas industry, shouldn't pay reasonable rates when it is extracting resources from the land that belongs to all Americans, that somehow that should be a free kind of giveaway to them, is that what the free market is? America giving away its resources to highly profitable companies is not the way I see the free market. I see the free market as paying a fair price.

For this administration to modernize this act to make sure that gas and oil interests are paying a fair price when they do drill on American public land seems only reasonable to me. It seems like a better way to take care of American taxpayers.

While the gentleman might say that doesn't amount to much money, I have been listening to bill after bill tonight where people say this person's salary here will make a difference on the deficit, that \$15,000 cuts to the Secretary of the Interior would make a difference on the deficit.

I have been hearing all night long—in fact, all day and all night long, as I recall—that every penny counts. That these pennies don't count because we should be giving a break to the oil and gas industry goes far beyond my understanding of how business should work and how our job protecting American resources should work.

Once again, this is a terrible amendment, one in a string of terrible amendments, and I oppose it.

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

Mr. OGLES. Mr. Chairman, I thank my colleague for wishing that I find oil in my yard. I hope I do, but that being said, I joke.

Mr. Chairman, let me just say that this is a step in the right direction to have a more responsible energy policy. It is lowering the cost on the producers as they explore and continue to explore for our energy independence.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. 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 Tennessee will be postponed.

□ 2330

AMENDMENT NO. 121 OFFERED BY MR. OWENS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 121 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end, before the short title, insert the following:

DOMESTIC MINING

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce any recommendation of the Interagency Working Group on Mining Regulations, Laws, and Permitting of the Department of the Interior contained in the report titled "Recommendations to Improve Mining on Public Lands" (published September 12, 2023).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Utah (Mr. OWENS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Utah.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment No. 121 that prevents any funds in today's bill from being used to implement recommendations made by the Biden administration's Interagency Working Group on Mining.

This last September, the Working Group released a 168-page report containing 65 different recommendations. There are a few recommendations in this report that were helpful but, unfortunately, the vast majority further undermine, rather than facilitate, our industry and congressional efforts to secure our own domestic mineral supply.

The Biden administration knows and acknowledges that a strong U.S. mining supply chain is critical. They are aware that demand for minerals is skyrocketing, doubling over the last 5 years and will continue to grow. They know that we are dangerously dependent on overseas suppliers, in particular adversaries like China, Russia, and other unstable countries, for minerals that are essential to our economic competitiveness and national security.

Examples of this can be seen in countries like Peru and Chile, which combined produce about 40 percent of the world's supply of copper. Peru has gone through seven Presidents in the last few years. In Chile, the government is

now making plans to nationalize the country's lithium supply. Despite acknowledging this as a national security issue, the Biden administration continues to attack our American suppliers with layer, upon layer, upon layer of burdensome, duplicative, and unworkable regulations.

The Biden administration needs to do more than just talk about a strong, stable American economy. They need to act by fostering a strong domestic minerals supply. Unfortunately, they continue to do the opposite by proposing inconsistent, uncoordinated, and insufficient policies that slow our progress to independence through self-imposed barriers.

The recommendations in this report embolden our adversaries and are not beneficial to America. Countries like Australia, Canada, and even the European Union have committed to increase domestic production. All of them have developed long-term strategies to be the global suppliers of choice for minerals. Under this administration, the United States has yet to put together a long-term strategy. Other countries will be competing for the same global mineral supply, at the same time, putting stress on America's ability to source additional volumes outside of our country.

My State of Utah produces large amounts of copper, gold, magnesium, and silver. We are the global leader in beryllium, which is used for aerospace and national security applications. We need to allow these producers to thrive and to do what they do best. It is well known that the United States has a higher standard than any other country when it comes to quality, safety, cleanliness of process and product. We have an opportunity to emerge as a world leader in the mineral mining space. This administration needs to stop standing in our way.

Many of these dangerous report recommendations would only reinforce China as the permanent leader in minerals. This is not good for our country, our economy, our jobs, our industry, and, most importantly, for our national security. We should not, therefore, use Federal funds to administer or enforce these recommendations. Hopefully, the administration will go back to the drawing board and, with an America First mindset, create a durable and sustainable strategy that would actually help our domestic mineral supply chain and the American worker, not the Communist Chinese Government. The risk is far too great when we are already decades behind.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, we oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Chair, I think the question is why is it so difficult for us

to understand that independence is the American way. Independence is what we have always sought. It is allowing the middle class to grow because it is powered by a strong business segment. It appears that at every turn that is possible. The Biden administration—and this is a good example of that—finds a way to put more regulations to stifle that ingenuity, that innovation, and our opportunity to become independent.

We have to make sure that we are, in particular with rare-earth minerals, leading the charge and not falling behind and taking advantage of the remarkable wealth we have in this country.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 122 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 122 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out the powers granted under section 3063 of title 18, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chair, the Environmental Protection Agency, the EPA, spends as much as \$50 million a year to employ nearly 200 armed agents at an average cost of \$216,000 per year, per agent. The American people would likely be disturbed to hear that.

According to the nonprofit Open the Books, the EPA has spent millions of dollars over the years on antitank ammunition, amphibious assault craft, night vision equipment, unmanned aircraft, and other military equipment. It is difficult for me to imagine that the EPA has a legitimate use for antitank ammunition. To me, that sounds like we are arming a SEAL team. The difference is a SEAL team can explain why they need these things; the EPA cannot.

These agents have been involved in raids in Alaska, Idaho, Wyoming, Montana, Massachusetts, North Carolina, and in my own State of Alabama. In Alaska, EPA agents wearing flak jackets and carrying long guns showed up to review paperwork at a family-owned mining operation.

In my home State of Alabama, armed EPA agents took over two waste treat-

ment facilities in Dothan, Alabama. These agents were posted at each entrance to the plant and recorded identification information on all of those going in and going out.

The EPA is just one of more than 70 Federal agencies that employ armed personnel, many of which most Americans would never associate with law enforcement.

I think we need to take a step back and reevaluate whether arming the bureaucracy is the best way to ensure that our laws are enforced. Federal agencies should be able to demonstrate their need for armed personnel and, absent such a demonstration, should rely on and partner with local, State, or Federal law enforcement when there is a need for armed protection.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS).

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, the EPA does not need armed agents loaded with attitude rolling up on American citizens trying to mind their own business. This is happening. It is stunning but it is happening. You have armed EPA agents rolling up on our farmers with no warrant. You have two agents emerge from an unmarked car to check the fuel in the saddlebag tanks of diesel trucks with their little strips and proceed to issue \$10,000 fines.

Can you imagine, Mr. Chair, your city's code enforcement being pushed by armed agents with attitudes? This is happening in our EPA. It is happening in other alphabet agencies. It is wrong, and we are going to put a stop to it one way or another.

I support my friend's amendment, and I urge all colleagues to step up and push back against the weaponization of our Federal Government against the American people.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to this amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I strongly oppose this amendment that would cripple the EPA's ability to exercise its criminal enforcement function by preventing the EPA criminal enforcement from being able to issue warrants, make arrests, or carry firearms.

I am truly befuddled by this attack on law enforcement. The majority's disdain for the EPA has been evident throughout the debate of this bill, but this amendment is beyond the pale.

I cannot understand how anyone would think it is a good idea to give a pass to criminals who deliberately break the law.

The EPA's criminal enforcement function is a vital part of our efforts to help protect the environment and safeguard the public health, but it is important to recognize that it is only one part of these efforts.

□ 2340

The fact is that EPA's compliance and enforcement process is a multistep process that uses criminal law enforcement only as a last resort. EPA initially provides compliance assistance

to help the regulated community understand and comply with regulations. EPA compliance monitoring subsequently assesses compliance through inspections and other activities.

Enforcement actions are initiated only when the regulated community does not comply or when cleanup is required. Criminal actions are usually reserved for the most serious violations, those that are willful or knowingly committed.

The mere threat of criminal action can and does help ensure compliance. If this irresponsible amendment passes and we remove the threat of criminal action, we will inevitably see a decline in willful compliance of our environmental laws. That would be bad news for all of us, as the quality of our air, water, and public health will inevitably suffer.

As to the issue of EPA personnel carrying firearms, I would point out that more than 70 Federal agencies employ law enforcement officers who are authorized to carry firearms and make arrests in the United States, including the Bureau of Engraving and Printing, the Food and Drug Administration, and the Tennessee Valley Authority. The EPA is hardly unique in this regard.

Make no mistake, this amendment is clearly anti-law enforcement. It cripples the ability of the EPA to ensure enforcement of our environmental laws and will inevitably lead to even more harm to the public health.

Let's ensure that the EPA can continue to enforce our Nation's environmental standards.

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I am stunned to hear the response to this coming from the side that supports defunding the police. What we want to do is have proper law enforcement enforcing our laws and not weaponizing the entire Federal bureaucracy against the citizens of the United States.

I can't imagine why the EPA would need anti-tank ammunition to enforce the laws of the EPA. We have seen what this leads to in multiple examples, which I will not go into at this point. The critics' claims, though, that my amendment would put EPA personnel at risk of harm, that would be wrong.

My amendment does not prohibit the EPA from using funds to provide security for its personnel or property. It does not prohibit training of EPA security or law enforcement personnel, either.

My amendment would prohibit funding for the EPA's armed and militarized agents who have a history of intimidating Americans by conducting aggressive raids and begin to address the troubling trend of militarization of our Federal agencies.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support 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 Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 123 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 123 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, this amendment prohibits the EPA from using funds for actions pursuant to section 115 of the Clean Air Act.

Section 115 of the Clean Air Act allows the EPA to mandate State emissions levels to whatever level the agency deems appropriate if they find the following: U.S. emissions endanger a foreign nation, and the endangered nation has a reciprocal agreement to prevent or control these emissions in their own nation.

That sounds complicated and screwed up because it is.

Our EPA deciding what we do in our States based on their agreement with some other nation about what is happening in their nation shouldn't have an impact on our States.

This is a backdoor provision that allows the EPA to vastly expand its regulatory authority and encroach on the rights of the States to regulate their own energy sectors based on the actions of a foreign nation and a determination of the executive branch solely without any input from this branch.

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

A similar amendment has passed the House during previous Interior-Environment appropriations packages. I know because I offered it. I am hoping that my colleagues will do the same on this one and take back our Article I authority and support this amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chairman, I rise to oppose this amendment.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, section 115 of the Clean Air Act is essential. It en-

ables the United States to work with other nations to address transboundary air pollution.

As we have seen recently while Canada was experiencing historic wildfires, pollution knows no boundaries and can travel anywhere, whether by air or water.

We cannot address these environmental issues on our own, and we must work with other nations. Prohibiting the EPA from implementing section 115 of the Clean Air Act is shortsighted, and I oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, this goes exactly to the Paris climate accord. When section 115 was written, along with the rest of the Clean Air Act, that Paris climate accord did not exist. It is not a treaty. We haven't signed it, yet we are bound to it as long as the executive branch wants to use it and a foreign government says that our government is polluting their country.

It is absolutely absurd. It was never envisioned by the EPA. I think that they had good intentions, and I agreed with those good intentions at the time, but since the Paris climate accord has been agreed to by this administration, this is a dangerous precedent to set. It is dangerous to allow it to be there.

Again, as I said, this has passed in previous appropriations debates—this very amendment—and I encourage Members to vote in favor of it again to make sure that we are controlling our country, that States can control themselves, and that we don't rely on foreign governments to control our country.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 124 OFFERED BY MR. POSEY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 124 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

At the end of the bill (before the short title) insert the following:

SEC. _____. The amount otherwise made available by this Act for "Environmental Protection Agency-Environmental Programs and Management" for the Office of Air and Radiation is hereby reduced by 50 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chair, my amendment would reduce the EPA environmental programs and management account for the Office of Air and Radiation by 50 percent.

This office has destroyed an entire industry already and is currently working hard to bankrupt a family-owned business in my district. The EPA's OAR used the regulatory process to destroy the glider truck industry in favor of a Chinese-owned trucking industry. Many of these glider trucks are operated by small mom-and-pop businesses.

Now, the same EPA is targeting a family-owned business in my district that supplies the only domestically manufactured outboard motors preferred by the U.S. Navy SEALs and other Special Operations Forces, including those of our allies.

They are putting their Green New Deal agenda ahead of our national security and the safety of our men and women on the front lines protecting our freedom.

□ 2350

My amendment reduces the number of unelected, unaccountable, and unrecalable bureaucrats from vetoing the U.S. Navy SEAL military equipment they direly need, and I ask my colleagues to support me in joining this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE).

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. POSEY) which would reduce funding for the Office of Air and Radiation under the EPA by 50 percent.

The EPA's Office of Air and Radiation is one of the most radical, out-of-touch, and burdensome regulatory authorities in the Federal Government that most Americans have never heard of. They are essentially charged with carrying out the Biden administration and progressive Democrats' job and economy killing Green New Deal agenda.

The unelected bureaucrats at the Office of Air and Radiation have repeatedly targeted small business industries—people's livelihoods and the way of life for thousands of Americans—with little or no regard.

It is time the American people's Representatives in this body, the U.S. House, say enough is enough and remove the EPA's boot from the neck of the American people.

Mr. Chair, there is no better way to start than supporting Mr. POSEY's amendment, and I urge my colleagues to join me in doing so.

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

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

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, on top of the cuts already included in the base bill, this would nearly eliminate the office. This means that we will no longer have anyone in the government to run programs that prevent air pollution, ensure high-quality indoor and outdoor air, monitor and reduce pollution from

vehicles and engines, prevent acid rain, protect the public against radiation, and monitor and address stratospheric ozone depletion.

These draconian and shortsighted cuts put all Americans at risk.

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

Mr. POSEY. Mr. Chairman, we are talking about a rogue agency here that is not only failing to do the job that they are supposed to do, but they are out harming people.

They are harming the heroes who are on the front lines that direly need their supplies while they fiddle or faddle in the back room, whatever they do, and deny those supplies, while they themselves are gorging upon \$10 million in combat materials and weapons.

I asked the administrator about this in a meeting a couple weeks ago. I said, Tell me why the EPA needs the \$10 million in combat-grade arms.

He said, Well, I didn't know we got it.

He said, I will get back to you. I will explain it to you.

I am still waiting to hear the answer.

There needs to be some accountability for agencies that are going off the track, and I think this is really a good start.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 125 OFFERED BY MR. ROSE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 125 printed in part A of House Report 118-261.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. _____. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, apply, enforce, or carry out any plastic straw prohibitions.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 838, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. ROSE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 4821, the Department of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act.

In June, the Biden administration's Department of the Interior led by Secretary Deb Haaland issued an order to phase out the use of single use plastics, including plastic straws, by 2032.

My amendment is straightforward. My amendment will prevent the Department of the Interior from banning the sale of plastic straws on public lands and national parks.

According to a study published in the journal Food Additives and Contami-

nants, paper straws may not be more eco-friendly than plastic straws. The majority of the paper straws in this study included perfluoroalkyl substances and polyfluoroalkyl substances, or PFAS, which are often referred to as forever chemicals.

According to a recent article in USA Today, scientists in Belgium tested 39 brands of straws made of paper, bamboo, plastic, and stainless steel found in shops, supermarkets, and restaurants across the country.

The article continued that: "These 'eco-friendly' plant-based straws are not necessarily a more sustainable alternative to plastic straws, said the study's conclusion, because they can be considered as an additional source of PFAS exposure in humans and the environment."

Mr. Chairman, we have to ask: Why is the Department of the Interior rushing to ban plastic straws in national parks when it is far from clear whether or not there is any environmental benefit to switching to paper straws?

Additionally, paper straws are absolutely despised by many Americans because they start to become soggy almost immediately when you put them into a drink. I think probably, Mr. Chairman, most Americans have experienced exactly that.

So, Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the text of this USA Today article titled "Not so eco-friendly? Paper straws contain more 'forever chemicals' than plastic, study says."

[From USA Today, Aug. 28, 2023]

NOT SO ECO-FRIENDLY? PAPER STRAWS CONTAIN MORE 'FOREVER CHEMICALS' THAN PLASTIC, STUDY SAYS

(By Mary Walrath-Holdridge)

Not a fan of those paper straws that have replaced disposable plastic ones in the name of being eco-friendly? As it turns out, some of those efforts to save the environment may have been in vain.

A new study, published Thursday in the journal Food Additives and Contaminants, found evidence of "forever chemical" PFAS (per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances) in the majority of both paper and bamboo straws tested.

Scientists in Belgium tested 39 brands of straws made of paper, bamboo, plastic and stainless steel found in shops, supermarkets and restaurants across the country.

Of the straws tested, almost all contained some concentration of PFAS, which are often used during manufacturing to make products water resistant. Out of the total 39 tested, the chemicals were detected in 27, none of which were stainless steel.

Paper straws, on the other hand, were the most likely to contain PFAS, with 18 out of 20, or 90%, of paper brands testing positive. They were also found in four out of five bamboo straws, three out of four plastic straws and two out of five glass straws.

NOT SO ECO-FRIENDLY?

Eighteen different PFAS were detected in total, though overall in low concentrations. The chemical most commonly found, however, was perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) which was banned globally in 2020.

"These 'eco-friendly' plant-based straws are not necessarily a more sustainable alternative to plastic straws," said the study's conclusion, "because they can be considered

as an additional source of PFAS exposure in humans and the environment (e.g. after degradation in landfills or through incomplete incineration)."

The study also discovered PFAS that are known to be highly water soluble, meaning they have the potential to bleed from the straw into a drink, but did not investigate this component further.

The researchers proposed that, while manufacturers could intentionally be coating their plant-based straws in chemicals to make them water-repellent, the presence of PFAS could also be attributed to contaminated soil or an unintended consequence of material recycling. The authors suggested further analysis and studies be conducted to determine the primary source of contamination in the straws and how the chemicals may impact drinks and people consuming them.

This Belgian study comes on the heels of a 2021 U.S. study, which found the presence of 21 PFAS in paper and other plant-based straws versus no measurable amounts in plastic ones.

While PFAS were present in most straws tested, the low concentration, paired with the limited extent to which people use straws, means they don't pose an immediate risk to humans.

Small amounts of PFAS are not harmful in and of themselves, but rather their ability to build up over time, including in the human body, is what poses the most risk. Even with these findings, plant-based straws are still better for the environment than straight-up plastics.

As stainless-steel straws are reusable long-term and all tested PFAS-free, the study authors suggest the use of these straws for both environmental and health-related reasons.

WHAT ARE PFAS?

PFAS stands for "per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances," and refers to a collection of long-lasting chemicals that take a very long time to slowly break down in the environment.

According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), PFAS are widely used and persist for long periods of time in the environment, meaning they are found in the blood of people and animals around the world, as well as air, water, soil and in low levels in foods, packaging and household products.

WHAT HEALTH RISKS ARE ASSOCIATED WITH PFAS?

While scientists are still working to determine the extent to which PFAS impact us, animals and our environment, they are already associated with a list of health concerns.

According to the EPA, PFAS have been linked to:

Reproductive effects such as decreased fertility or increased high blood pressure in pregnant women.

Developmental effects or delays in children, including low birth weight, accelerated puberty, bone variations, or behavioral changes.

Increased risk of some cancers, including prostate, kidney, and testicular cancers. Reduced ability of the body's immune system to fight infections, including reduced vaccine response.

Interference with the body's natural hormones.

Increased cholesterol levels and/or risk of obesity.

WHERE ARE PFAS USUALLY FOUND?

According to the U.S. Food and Drug Administration (FDA), PFAS can be found in hundreds of products we use daily. In some

cases, they are approved for use in limited amounts by the FDA, such as in food packaging.

They are commonly found in:

Stain- and water-resistant fabrics and carpeting.

Cleaning products.

Paints.

Fire-fighting foams.

Cookware.

Food packaging

Food processing equipment.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chairman, the American people do not want their government dictating what type of straws they can drink from.

A "yes" vote on my amendment is a resounding repudiation of the nanny state that the Biden administration is currently building via edicts from unelected bureaucrats.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Chair, honestly, I don't even know where to start. I am pretty sure it is about midnight, and this is the United States Congress. We are dealing with enormous challenges in the world. We currently have a war going on in Ukraine with Russia, in Israel with the Hamas, and we are trying to face a climate change and so many serious issues, and we are here debating a plastic straw, whether or not plastic straws should be used, whether or not they are the best alternative.

I understand it is complicated, what is the best kind of straw to use, a reusable straw, a paper straw, or a plastic straw, and there are issues related to this. Nonetheless, this is because of a mandate to reduce the amount of single-use plastic.

I don't know about you, Mr. Chair, but I have an ocean border that is longer than any other ocean border in the United States, and one of the big challenges that we are dealing with right now is an excess amount of plastic in the ocean. We have no good recycling in this country. We have excess amounts of plastics in our landfill, and we have toxics that we are dealing with every day. So reducing our amount of single-use plastic is important.

Whether or not it is our job in Congress to decide what kind of straw should be used or exactly how these bans should be implemented, I just don't think it is something that we should be doing at midnight when we have a lot of big problems to deal with.

I am just disappointed to see this amendment, to see that my colleague doesn't want to address the big challenges that we have with single-use plastic, and the difficult issues that have to be dealt with.

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

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chair, I have no further speakers, and I am prepared to close.

Mr. Chair, it is time to get the government out of our drinks. I understand the concern that my colleague expresses, Mr. Chair, but I would say that the best way to avoid the need for congressional intervention would be for the administration to not be chasing its tail trying to force American consumers to make choices that are absolutely not clear in terms of the environmental impact that they would have.

The plastic straw ban being implemented by the Department of the Interior is fundamentally and fatally flawed. Numerous scientific studies have cast serious doubts as to whether or not paper straws are more environmentally friendly than plastic straws.

Mr. Chair, just listen to these headlines regarding paper straws.

□ 0000

From the National Post, "It turns out all those paper straws are bad for the environment too."

From U.S. News & World Report, "'Eco-Friendly' Paper Straws Contain Harmful PFAS Chemicals."

Finally, from KSL News, "Paper straws are no better than plastic, research says."

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD these several articles.

[From nationalpost.com, Aug. 29, 2023]

IT TURNS OUT ALL THOSE PAPER STRAWS ARE BAD FOR THE ENVIRONMENT

(By Tristin Hopper)

Canada has legislated the mandatory adoption of paper straws just in time for new evidence to emerge that the new straws may be just as unsustainable as their plastic predecessors.

A new study published in the journal Food Additives and Contaminants examined more than 20 different brands of plant-based straws and found high levels of toxic chemicals in almost all of them.

"These 'eco-friendly' plant-based straws are not necessarily a more sustainable alternative to plastic straws," concluded a research team based at Belgium's University of Antwerp.

Straws examined by the researchers were largely found to be laden with per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS), commonly known as "forever chemicals."

This not only means that the straws likely aren't biodegradable, but that they are vectors for chemicals considered hazardous to human and environmental health.

The report noted that even in situations where a plant-based straw doesn't become litter, it will most likely end up in a landfill where it will spend the rest of its lifecycle "releasing PFAS further into the environment."

"Straws made from plant-based materials . . . are often advertised as being more sustainable and eco-friendly than those made from plastic. However, the presence of PFAS in these straws means that's not necessarily true," environmental scientist Thimo Groffen said in a press statement.

Canada is in the midst of an all-out drive to prohibit the distribution of single-use plastics, with plastic straws being one of the most visible targets of the ban.

In December 2022, Environment Canada made it illegal to manufacture or import plastic straws, cutlery and checkout bags, among others. At the end of this year, the sale of those products will also become prohibited. The transition is not free; even according to the most optimistic estimates of

the Government of Canada, the average Canadian can expect to pay \$50 apiece in the higher costs of plastic alternatives.

The University of Antwerp team performed chemical analysis on 39 different types of straws sourced from Belgium supermarkets and fast food outlets: 20 paper, five glass, five bamboo, five stainless steel, and four plastic.

Only the stainless-steel straws were found to be completely PFAS-free. The steel straws were also the only type that could realistically be recycled. Researchers were surprised to discover that even glass straws contained measurable amounts of forever chemicals.

As to why these chemicals were so widespread in alternative straws, one reason is that they were added to make the products water-repellent. The Belgian study also noted that it might be partially unintended; with so many paper straws made from recycled materials, manufacturers might be unwittingly using raw ingredients that were previously infused with PFAS.

Although Canada's straw ban has often pitched as a means to protect ocean health, the vast majority of plastic in the world's oceans comes from a handful of countries (largely in South Asia) that dump their waste directly onto beaches or into rivers.

In Canada, by contrast, the vast majority of single-use plastics are captured by existing waste-management systems. A 2019 report commissioned by Environment Canada determined that of the 3,268 kilotonnes of plastic waste Canada generated in 2016, 3,239 kilotonnes were "collected."

Ottawa has also done little to no research on the environmental impacts or the potential unintended consequences of finding alternatives to single-use plastics. A Government of Canada report on alternatives to plastic straws and checkout bags simply advises retailers to find products that won't be "problematic."

That same report touts how Starbucks replaced plastic straws in 2019 with specialized "strawless" lids, but fails to note that the new lids actually contain more plastic than the prior cup/straw combo.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Aug. 25, 2023]

'ECO-FRIENDLY' PAPER STRAWS CONTAIN HARMFUL PFAS CHEMICALS

(By Cara Murez)

"Straws made from plant-based materials, such as paper and bamboo, are often advertised as being more sustainable and eco-friendly than those made from plastic," said researcher Thimo Groffen, an environmental scientist at the University of Antwerp in Belgium. "However, the presence of PFAS in these straws means that's not necessarily true."

For this study, published Aug. 24 in the journal *Food Additives and Contaminants*, Groffen and colleagues tested 39 straw brands in a variety of materials for poly- and perfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS).

Straws were paper, bamboo, glass, stainless steel and plastic. Each straw went through two rounds of testing for PFAS.

PFAS were found in 69 percent of the straws. Testing detected 18 different PFAS.

These chemicals were found in 90 percent of paper straws; about 80 percent of bamboo straws; 75 percent of plastic straws, and 40 percent of glass straw brands.

PFAS were not detected in any of the five types of steel straws tested.

The most commonly found PFAS was perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA), which has been banned worldwide since 2020.

Testing also detected trifluoroacetic acid (TFA) and trifluoromethanesulfonic acid (TFMS). These "ultra-short-chain" PFAS are highly water soluble and so might leach

out of straws into drinks, according to the study.

These all may pose limited risk to human health because people tend to use straws only occasionally and chemical concentrations were low, researchers said. But the chemicals can build up in the body for years.

"Small amounts of PFAS, while not harmful in themselves, can add to the chemical load already present in the body," Groffen said in a journal news release.

It's not known if the straws contained the PFAS to waterproof them or because of contamination from soil used to grow materials or water used in manufacturing.

PFAS are used in many everyday products, including nonstick pans and outdoor clothing. They make these items resistant to water, heat and stains, but break down very slowly over time and can persist in the environment for thousands of years.

They're associated with health problems, such as lower response to vaccines, lower birth weight, thyroid disease, increased cholesterol levels, liver damage, kidney cancer and testicular cancer.

A recent U.S. study found PFAS in plant-based drinking straws as well. While some countries have banned single-use plastic products, plant-based alternatives have become popular.

Researchers said the prevalence of PFAS in the straws suggests they were added as a waterproof coating.

"The presence of PFAS in paper and bamboo straws shows they are not necessarily biodegradable," Groffen said. "We did not detect any PFAS in stainless steel straws, so I would advise consumers to use this type of straw—or just avoid using straws at all."

[From KLS.com, Sept. 3, 2023]

PAPER STRAWS ARE NO BETTER THAN PLASTIC, RESEARCH SAYS

(By Mariah Maynes)

Plastic straws have long been vilified for their negative impact on the environment. In efforts to be more environmentally friendly, many businesses and consumers have adopted paper straws as an alternative.

Despite well-meaning attempts to cause less harm to the environment by using paper instead of plastic, researchers found that paper straws are just as bad.

Christian Britschgi, a reporter for Reason Magazine, said Belgian researchers conducted a study to examine 39 straw brands. The straws were made with different materials like paper, plastic, metal, and bamboo.

The researchers measured the presence of polyfluoroalkyl substances. The chemicals are common in consumer products and industrial processes.

The chemicals are often called "forever chemicals" because they do not break down in the environment, according to the CDC. The lack of regular decomposition means these paper straws can move through soil and water, contaminating food and drinking water. Bioaccumulation can cause health problems in animals.

Research has found that these forever chemicals are hazardous to the environment and to human health. Research has found that exposure to certain levels of polyfluoroalkyl substances can result in adverse health risks, the EPA said. Some examples are decreased fertility, increased risk of developing some cancers and reduced immunity, among other conditions. Research into adverse health effects related to these forever chemicals exposure is ongoing.

Human consumption of products derived from animals that were exposed to bioaccumulation, breathing contaminated air or drinking contaminated water, or certain occupations such as chemical manufacturing, are all examples of exposure to polyfluoroalkyl substances.

PAPER VS. PLASTIC STRAWS

Researchers found that the paper straws all contained polyfluoroalkyl substances. The paper straws contained higher concentrations of forever chemicals than their counterparts constructed with other materials.

Plastic straws also contain these forever chemicals, but in lower concentrations. About 70 percent of the plastic straws examined by the researchers contained the chemicals.

The only type of straw that did not contain polyfluoroalkyl substances was the steel option, researchers found. Steel straws are a reusable option.

Britschgi said the emissions and pollution produced from making straws should be taken into account when determining how environmentally friendly they are.

Mr. ROSE. Mr. Chair, my amendment will stop the nonsense that the Biden administration is trying to force upon the American people through the Department of the Interior by prohibiting any funds from being used to implement, administer, apply, enforce, or carry out any plastic straw prohibitions.

Mr. Chair, in closing, I urge Members to vote "yes" on my amendment and the underlying bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. SIMPSON. 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. ROSE) having assumed the chair, Mr. MORAN, 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. 4821) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2024, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), the House adjourned until today, Friday, November 3, 2023, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-2261. A letter from the Comptroller, Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter reporting violations of the Antideficiency Act, contained in Navy case number N21-01, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; Public Law 97-258, Sept. 13, 1982; (96 Stat. 927); to the Committee on Appropriations.

EC-2262. A letter from the Secretary of Defense and Secretary of Energy, Department of Defense and Department of Energy, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2022 Report on the