



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 2017

No. 144

## House of Representatives

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

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
September 7, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable JOE BARTON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,  
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

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

### HONORING ED GILROY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX) for 5 minutes.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and say farewell to a member of the House Committee on Education and the Workforce staff who has dedicated more than 20 years of public service to the people's House.

Ed Gilroy began his congressional career on the staff of former Congressman Rod Chandler of Washington, but most of us know him for his nearly 16

years of service as the committee's Director of Workforce Policy.

Ed led our efforts to expand access to affordable healthcare for small-business employees, provide moms and dads more flexibility in the workplace, and protect the rights of workers and employers. When we think about the passage of the bipartisan Pension Protection Act in 2006 and the Multiemployer Pension Reform Act of 2014, we have to think of Ed.

Ed Gilroy has been a trusted adviser, dedicated public servant, distinguished colleague, and an invaluable member of our committee family. We are deeply grateful for his many years of service to the American people and the U.S. House of Representatives, and we wish him all the best in the years ahead.

### 25TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE FIRST CHARTER SCHOOL

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago, something monumental occurred for students and families who were seeking a new way to pursue a high-quality education. Twenty-five years ago, our Nation's first charter school, the City Academy, opened its doors in St. Paul, Minnesota. City Academy began a new era for school choice and provided families with an alternative option to the traditional public school system. Today, over 3 million students are enrolled in charter schools, and more than 6,800 have opened in over 40 States.

Charter schools are not only growing as an option for students, but these schools are also getting results. Innovative charter schools are providing thousands of students and families with the hope and opportunity that they can receive a high-quality education and gain the skills they need to succeed for the future.

I congratulate City Academy for being a true pioneer in school choice 25 years ago and support the expansion of school choice for American students and families.

### HONORING ALEXANDER FURNITURE ACADEMY

Mr. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the efforts of the CVCC Alexander Furniture Academy, located in Taylorsville, North Carolina. This fantastic facility hosts a program where students are taught the basic skill levels required to gain employment as a sewing operator or upholstery craftsman within the furniture trade.

Under the leadership of Center Director Eunice Mays and thanks to the generous scholarships awarded by many groups like Craftmaster Incorporated, AHFA, and others, nearly 50 students have graduated, and almost all are now employed.

I wholeheartedly commend Eunice and the Alexander Furniture Academy as well as all of its sponsors for putting together a program that doesn't just teach valuable skills to would-be job seekers, but a program that literally helps individuals build the skills they need to succeed from the bottom up.

In the last 6 months, students have crafted 90 sofas and chairs and 20 loveseats which have been sold. The profits from the students' creations are invested in scholarships and help to keep the academy open.

I commend the Catawba Valley Community College Alexander Furniture Academy teachers, staff, and students on this terrific program.

### FUNDING FOR THE FAA

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

Ms. BASS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my dissatisfaction at the majority's failure to allow consideration of amendments I proposed to the appropriations bill that include funding for the FAA. The Rules Committee did not forward those items so my colleagues could consider and vote on them.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H7091

My amendments represent beginning steps toward addressing what has become an intolerable level of noise from planes in my district. The amendments will not see debate in this body, however, despite the fact that noise affects the health, well-being, and economic livelihood of people in every part of the country, whether they are Republicans or Democrats.

When Congress directed the FAA to update how we control our airways, we were promised that, by reworking the Nation's airspace and using satellite technology instead of radars, our Nation's flight system would become not only more efficient, but cleaner and quieter.

Next Generation systems were supposed to allow virtually automated air traffic control, eliminate circling overhead waiting for a landing slot, and facilitate smooth gliding flight descents without noisy engine power. Plus, planes would be able to stay higher longer, and FAA's published flight procedures would specify minimum altitudes over heavily populated areas, meant to ensure that effects on the ground were minimized.

That is not what we got. Eight of the country's busiest and most complex metropolitan areas, called metroplexes, have seen NextGen implementation so far. Phoenix, North Carolina, and Washington, D.C., are just a few of the metroplex victims who have decided to take legal action against the FAA. The D.C. Circuit Court recently ruled in the Phoenix case, noting that the FAA had not paid enough attention to the effects of its actions.

In every case, noise that used to be spread out across a wide area became concentrated over narrowed corridors, visiting misery on those living below. The best analogy I can offer is this: Imagine that all of the traffic using a 6-lane highway was narrowed to a single lane. The concentration of that much traffic would surely cause considerable problems.

Well, that is exactly what has happened in the southern California metroplex implementation. Areas that used to see planes flying overhead every 15 or 20 minutes now feel bombarded by flights as close together as every 3 minutes or less.

As you can imagine, sometimes those planes and narrowed highways might get too close together. Air traffic controllers have to keep minimum separation for the safety of all involved. But in order to adhere to that narrowed lane, controllers tell the pilots to deviate from the flight path by going downward. Sometimes they fly at half, or less, of what the minimum altitude is supposed to be. So planes that are supposed to fly at 6,000 feet may fly as low as 3,000 feet at a frequency of every 3 to 5 minutes. I hope that you can appreciate that that noise is intolerable.

Film production of all types, whether TV commercials, movies, or videos, is an economic driver in my district. The neighborhoods of the 37th Congress-

sional District have been used to represent cities and towns across the continent.

Though you might not know it, I am sure you have seen both Culver City and the historic West Adams district, built over 100 years ago, in some of your favorite TV shows and movies. Unfortunately, the movie studios of Culver City and the homes of West Adams are directly under the new, narrowed flight path. Studios are complaining about having to move production from their back lots because of the noise.

I have elderly constituents who have lived in their neighborhoods for decades and who rely on income from location filming to help them remain in their homes. Film scouts have told them that the frequent loud plane traffic makes it impossible to film there anymore.

At this point, countless American and European health studies have demonstrated the harms that come from exposure to noise—and at much lower levels than that experienced by people on the ground. The arbitrary and outdated 65 decibel day/night level that the FAA uses to determine acceptable levels of exposure is calculated at an average of sound over a 24-hour period.

Parents with young children have told me that their kids' sleep patterns have been disrupted by unrelenting noise, enough to alter their academic performance.

A health clinic serving the affected areas has begun to investigate whether a spike in reported health problems, including poor control of chronic conditions like hypertension, can be related to the constant exposure to excessive noise.

The European Union standard for noise exposure at night is half of the U.S. level and is still cause for health concerns there.

In the absence of consideration of my amendments, I invite my colleagues to join me and nearly 40 other colleagues in the House Quiet Skies Caucus, which is working to make progress on this important issue.

My constituents and I know many of my colleagues' constituents are suffering under the burden of excessive airplane noise as a result of the implementation of the FAA's Next Generation project. We cannot and must not sacrifice the health of those on the ground in the name of airline efficiency.

#### CALLING ON THE SENATE TO MAKE CTE A PRIORITY THIS FALL

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, during the August in-district work period, I had the privilege of visiting CPI in Pleasant Gap, Pennsylvania. CPI is the Central Pennsylvania Institute of Science and Technology.

I was proud that my colleague, Congressman RAJA KRISHNAMOORTHY of Illinois, was able to join me in Pennsylvania's Fifth District at CPI on the first day of school.

CPI was founded in 1969 to meet the career and technical education needs of high school students in Centre County. By combining academies with technical training and industry-recognized certifications, CPI is uniquely poised to prepare students for rapid employment and long-term career success. CPI offers more than 18 secondary programs, over 60 in-house adult and continuing education programs, and more than 350 online courses.

In addition to exceptional classroom and hands-on instruction from a highly qualified, experienced faculty, CPI offers certification in a wide range of disciplines, a notable advantage to CPI graduates and their employers.

Congressman KRISHNAMOORTHY and I were at CPI to talk about our bill, the Strengthening Career and Technical Education for the 21st Century Act. This House unanimously approved the bill in June, and I call on the United States Senate to make it a priority for this fall.

Mr. Speaker, our bill is the first major overhaul to the Carl D. Perkins Career and Technical Education Act in more than 10 years. The bipartisan legislation strengthens and improves career and technical education and gives Americans the skills they need to compete for in-demand jobs.

This can be witnessed firsthand at CPI. This November, CPI will launch a new 2-year degree program: Natural Gas Compression—CAT/Ariel Emphasis Associate of Specialized Technology. The program is in partnership with the Cleveland Brothers, a Pennsylvania-based Caterpillar dealer, and Ariel Corporation, the world's leading manufacturer of natural gas compressors. CPI is currently accepting students for a November 28, 2017, start date. It is only one of two programs of its kind nationwide.

Ariel Corporation compressors and CAT engines are located in oil and gas fields throughout the world. Graduates of CPI's natural gas compressor degree program will have an opportunity to work locally, nationally, and globally. Cleveland Brothers, Ariel, and gas industry partners will be interviewing the NGC students after the first term. If pre-hired by the program's industry partners, students will receive company-sponsored tuition reimbursement.

Mr. Speaker, this is exactly the type of career and technical education investments we should be making and encouraging. By educating Americans in high-demand fields, they can climb rungs on the ladder of opportunity and obtain family-sustaining jobs.

I will continue to advocate for these important reforms that will benefit Americans from all walks of life. I urge the Senate to take up our bill without delay. It is important to close the skills gap and give every American a chance at having a fulfilling career.

□ 1015

Now, I want to thank my colleague, Congressman KRISHNAMOORTHY, for traveling to Pennsylvania to see this program in action. I want to thank the staff of CPI for not only hosting us on the first day of school, but for working to educate students in their chosen fields.

Mr. Speaker, I urge the Senate to act on this bipartisan bill without delay because it is critically important to closing the skills gap in this country, and above all else, it is a win for the American worker and American families. Let's help all Americans learn to earn.

#### HONORING ARMY SPECIALIST MATTHEW TURCOTTE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, on August 23, Army Specialist Matthew Turcotte was killed during a live ammunition exercise at Fort Carson in Colorado.

Specialist Turcotte was a lifelong resident of North Smithfield, Rhode Island. He joined the Army 2 years ago and was assigned to the 4th Infantry Division.

He died a hero, having earned numerous medals for his service to our Nation, including the Army Achievement Medal and the Global War on Terrorism Service Medal. Last Saturday, hundreds gathered in Providence to give Specialist Turcotte a hero's farewell at his funeral mass.

All of us know, who serve in this Chamber, that our country owes an enormous debt of gratitude to all who have served, and especially to those who have made the ultimate sacrifice on the altar of freedom.

My thoughts and prayers are with Specialist Turcotte's family today, especially his wife, Megan, and his parents, Raymond and Liza.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S DECISION TO TERMINATE  
THE DEFERRED ACTION FOR CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS PROGRAM

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I also want to spend a moment to speak about President Trump's decision to terminate the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. It is one of the cruelest in Presidential actions in recent memory. This was a shameful moment for our country. America has always stood as a beacon of freedom and opportunity, but not right now.

The DACA program has allowed nearly 800,000 DREAMers to work, study, and serve their communities and Nation. That includes nearly 1,300 DREAMers in my home State of Rhode Island.

The DREAMers are workers and taxpayers. They pay \$3 billion in taxes each year, including \$2.6 million in my home State. They contribute \$2 billion each year to Social Security and another \$470 million to Medicare.

They didn't choose to come here. They were brought here by their parents as very young children. They love this country. They share our values. They are contributing to their communities every single day.

They are young men and women like Lesdin Salazar, a 22-year-old Rhode Islander who came here from Guatemala with her parents when she was 7 years old. Lesdin was a high school junior when President Obama signed an executive order to establish DACA. She was later accepted to Rhode Island College, where she is paying out of pocket today to pursue a degree in teaching. Lesdin also works at Calcutt Middle School in Central Falls, Rhode Island, where she helps kids who need behavioral and emotional support, but she will have to give up this dream unless Congress acts.

The same is true of Ana Abigail Molina, a 27-year-old Rhode Islander who came to the United States when she was just 6 years old. Today Ana works at Thundermist Health Center and has dreams of going back to school to become a surgical technologist. And like so many DREAMers, Ana doesn't really remember much of the country where she was born. She considers herself an American.

Javier Juarez also considers himself an American, a young man who just graduated from Rhode Island College and is planning to attend graduate school on an academic scholarship at Brown University starting this fall. His dream is to one day attend Harvard Law School.

Javier has been living in Rhode Island for 18 years. Before DACA, he couldn't drive, get a good job, or go to college, but now he is the first member of his family to graduate from a 4-year university. He, too, will have to give up his American Dream unless Congress acts.

And finally, Maribel Rivera Sosa, who came to Rhode Island from Mexico at the age of 9. When she graduated high school 5 years ago, Maribel didn't think she would be able to attend college, but just days later, when President Obama established DACA, Maribel's opportunities became limitless. She was able to attend the Community College of Rhode Island while working three separate jobs. After earning an associate's degree, Maribel enrolled at Johnson & Wales University, and her dream is to earn a master's degree in health administration.

Who among us thinks that someone who works three jobs shouldn't be able to follow their dreams?

This is just cruel. President Trump is ripping apart hundreds of thousands of families and injecting chaos and uncertainty into the lives of members of our community who know no other home than America. If Congress doesn't replace DACA with the Dream Act, it will result in \$460 billion in lost economic activity over the next decade, including \$61 million in Rhode Island.

Republicans in Congress need to bring the Dream Act to the floor right

now. We need a permanent solution, and I am proud to be a cosponsor of the bipartisan Dream Act. We need to bring that bill to the floor. Every Republican who disagrees with President Trump's actions needs to tell Speaker RYAN to bring the Dream Act to the floor.

This Congress must act in a manner worthy of a country that has inspired these young DREAMers and pass the Dream Act without delay.

#### AFGHANISTAN: EMPIRE STOPPER

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

Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, on September 4, 4 days ago, The New York Times International Edition carried a story, entitled, "The Empire Stopper," which said foreign powers have tried to control Afghanistan since the 19th century. The story had a very interesting first paragraph: "When the American author James A. Michener went to Afghanistan to research his work of historical fiction 'Caravans,' it was 1955 and there were barely any roads in the country. Yet there were already Americans and Russians there jockeying for influence."

Continuing the Times' quote:

"Later, the book's Afghan protagonist would tell an American diplomat that one day both America and Russia would invade Afghanistan and that both would come to regret it."

Michener wrote that 62 years ago. Since then, Afghanistan has been described many times as the "Graveyard of Empires."

This 17-year war in Afghanistan has always been more about money than anything else, and it should have been ended long ago. Many people wonder why we keep sending so many soldiers and military contractors to Iraq and Afghanistan. Well, it has always been about money, increased appropriations for the Defense Department, and huge profits for the contractors who hire retired admirals and generals.

There have been so many examples of waste, fraud, and abuse in these Middle East wars that it is sickening. One recent example was reported this way by Newsweek:

"U.S.-based security firm Sallyport Global has been accused by two former internal investigators of smuggling alcohol, stealing, keeping two different account ledgers, and even human trafficking of prostitutes while executing an almost \$700 million contract to protect Balad Air Base in Iraq. The Associated Press reported Wednesday."

Military bases should be protected by military personnel, not highly paid contractors, but most Members of Congress are afraid to criticize anything the Defense Department does for fear of someone saying they are not "supporting the troops."

We now have over 11,000 troops in Afghanistan and probably that many or more contractors in addition to no telling how many Federal civilian employees. Then we are also paying more than

330,000 Afghan military and police personnel.

The international community is now providing 60 percent of the Afghan GDP, and almost all of these so-called peacekeeping—really, U.N. wars—the U.S. taxpayers are paying over 90 percent of the cost.

When the so-called coalition bombs go astray killing civilians and women and children, they are really seen by the locals as being U.S. bombs, creating even more hatred and resentment for our country.

We have now had almost 2,500 young American soldiers killed in Afghanistan and 20,000 wounded, many maimed for life. We have spent \$1 trillion directly on this war and even more indirectly.

Mr. Speaker, the American people don't want forever, permanent wars. This Afghanistan folly has lasted four times longer than World War II. We should have come home a long time ago.

#### PERSONAL STORIES OF DREAMERS IN PORTLAND

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

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I was standing next to JOHN LEWIS as we joined our Democratic colleagues from the House and the Senate who delivered a spirited message of resolve to fight Donald Trump's cruelty towards almost 800,000 young Americans and, of course, several million other members of their families, their friends, their employers, who all had their lives turned upside down by Trump's senseless, unnecessary decision.

Strange for somebody who professes to love the DREAMers, Trump is caught in his own trap. He clearly didn't know what he was doing, trying to figure out ways to pass responsibility for his decision on to others. But, of course, that is sort of what we have come to expect from someone who appears to care only for himself. He was afraid, even, to deliver the message himself. Typical of Donald Trump, he outsourced the decision to Jeff Sessions, who Trump spent most of the summer demeaning.

Now, I think there is a simple solution: take it back. Donald Trump is famous for mulligans on the golf course, do-overs. If he didn't like the shot, he would just do it again. Well, let's declare a DACA mulligan. Take it back. Yes, it might look foolish, but that really hasn't stopped him before.

In the meantime, the outrage builds: the community of faith, the business community, people across the country who are understanding the lunacy of this decision, its unfairness. But the most telling and powerful points are from the young DREAMers themselves.

My colleagues have delivered this message from people whom they have

heard from in their districts. I have countless ones that have been shared with us.

Jamie, a 31-year-old father of two, a DACA recipient, was 12 when his family fled to the United States to escape poverty and corruption. For 9 years, he has dedicated his life to helping young people cope with these challenges. He is working with young people impacted by the issue, concerned about their mental health and their well-being.

Eddie arrived from Mexico as a 1-year-old baby. He really didn't understand the impact of being undocumented until he applied for college and was not eligible for Federal assistance, but eventually he attended and graduated from Portland State University; and he has become the first undocumented student admitted to Oregon Health & Science University School of Dentistry. Scheduled to graduate next year, he wants to be able to serve the community that raised him.

Karla, arrived as a 4-year-old, is currently a student, but whose concern is the message that is being sent to others whom she works with. DACA recipients are not all young professionals or valedictorians. Some work in fast-food restaurants and are struggling to get through community college.

She makes the point that some may call her a DREAMer, but she felt that the real DREAMers were her parents, who had the dream for her. They fought to come to this country to raise her and give her the opportunity to work, attend school, and live without fear of deportation.

These are compelling stories, Mr. Speaker, but the one that stands out in my mind most clearly was one of my first meetings after the election. I was meeting with a number of the young DREAMers, listening to their concerns, their apprehensions. The conversation stopped with one young man who just said, "What country should I go to?" He had choices to go to Canada or Europe. He was an accomplished student, ambitious.

"What country should I go to?" I must admit, at the time, I counseled him to not give up on the United States too quickly. I wonder what he thinks today.

#### HONORING CLIFF GLOVER

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in honor of one of the Third District's most upstanding citizens, Mr. Cliff Glover.

Mr. Glover passed away last month at the age of 104, but not before touching countless lives in our community. His community service began at a young age in the Boy Scouts, an organization that he would work with for the rest of his life, earning the rank of Life Scout and the Silver Antelope Award for his service to the organization.

Mr. Glover also served his Nation in the Civil Engineer Corps of the U.S. Naval Reserve during World War II, working on the U.S. Naval Air Station in Jacksonville, Florida, now known as Cape Canaveral.

□ 1030

In the private sector, Mr. Cliff successfully led the Batson-Cook Construction Company as it built many important buildings and developments throughout the southeast.

I consider myself blessed to have known Mr. Glover personally, and his commitment to serving others helped inspire my own public service.

I want to challenge all of my colleagues, friends, and neighbors to carry on his legacy of serving others.

#### A 21ST CENTURY AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL SYSTEM

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. Well, Mr. Speaker, I was just reading a message from Citizens for On Time Flights.

Now, I fly a lot and I would love to be on time more. They are talking about our aviation system here. Air traffic control is a World War II relic and saying that if we only would give it over to the private sector, i.e., the airlines, it would work better.

Well, let's see, a couple of things wrong with that statement. Number one, the greatest problem with air delays is weather. Now, actually, we are dealing with that technologically through a new system called Datacom, where, at our 55 busiest airports, the pilots and the air traffic controllers now can communicate by text and they don't have to repeat over and over on the radio the messages; many fewer misunderstandings, easier to reroute. This has been implemented by the FAA.

What is the number two cause?

Oh, it is airline operations and scheduling—the airlines themselves. They are the second greatest cause of delays, they, in themselves.

So it turns out that Citizens for On Time Flights is actually funded by a group of airlines.

Now, what is the bottom line here? Do we have a World War II relic, as Gary Cohn has said after he read some of this and heard this propaganda?

No, actually. We have the most advanced system in the world. We could fly planes today closer together using GPS technology called ADS-B and not use the older radar system, except—the system is up and running, except the airlines won't pay to put the equipment in their planes. They say it is too expensive.

So they are complaining about the FAA and saying they could do a better job, they could do it more efficiently, they could fly planes closer together, but they won't invest in the equipment.

Now, it is very expensive. For instance, American Airlines would have to spend 40 percent of last year's baggage fees to equip every one of their planes so they could use this modern system—40 percent of their baggage fees. Wow, what a hit they would take for that.

Now, what is the bottom line here?

The bottom line is we fund the current system—the largest, most complex, most advanced in the world—with a tax on the tickets. It is a progressive tax; the more you pay for your ticket, the more you pay for air traffic control, 7½ percent tax.

For years the airlines have said to me: That's our money.

I said: What do you mean it's your money? I pay the tax when I buy a ticket.

They said: No. That's our money. We should have it.

In fact, a few years ago, when the FAA bill expired for 2 weeks because of a chairman named John Mica, every airline in America, except for one—when the 7½ percent tax went away for 2 weeks, every airline in America, except Alaska Airlines, raised their ticket prices 7½ percent.

So what is the bottom line of this bill?

This bill—going to be pushed by the Republicans over here—would repeal the 7½ percent tax. That would be a \$10 billion windfall for the aviation industry.

And then what? How are we going to pay for it?

Well, the private corporation will decide. Congress will have nothing to say about how it is paid for, and it is going to be paid for with a head tax. So you get on the plane; they will say: Oh, it's 50 bucks to sit in that seat, to use the public airspace of the United States of America.

That's how the corporation is going to pay for it, with a head tax.

So we go from a progressive tax to a regressive tax. If you buy a \$50 ticket, you are going to pay 50 bucks to sit in the seat. So it is now \$100. Today you would have paid \$3.75.

So that is the real bottom line here. It is not about efficiency. It is not bringing the system up to date.

Now, they have done a great job with this propaganda, and the chairman of the committee has done a great job. They talk about those paper strips. They use paper strips in the traffic control towers.

Well, yeah, we do. It works real well. We replaced them in the en route centers, but we haven't replaced them yet in the towers. It is infallible. It has worked forever. It is efficient. But we are going to go to electronic flight strips, and we are going to do it in a way that actually is going to improve the efficiency of the system and dispatch planes better.

Now, they say: Well, Canada has electronic flight strips.

Yeah, they did it for billing purposes because they charge per flight. They

don't, and are not going to, have the new system we are going to have, which is going to sort out all the planes by their future routes, everything as they depart from the airport, and it is going to be way more efficient.

So, actually, the FAA is doing an excellent job. And 7 to 10 years ago I never would have said that. But they have got it straightened out over the last 7 years. Randy Babbitt and Mr. Huerta have got it straightened out. It is working today.

There is a GAO report, which I am releasing today, which the Republicans tried to repress, which says, in fact, the system is on time, on budget, and, in fact, privatization will delay the modernization of the system.

So the House is going to push and the Republicans are going to push for a bill that actually is going to set us back instead of moving us forward into the 21st century air traffic control system.

#### HOUSTON STRONG

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks ago, a monster Category 4 hurricane named Harvey hit my home. It hit us very hard. And 2 days after the first blow, it hit us once again. It reversed course and hit us twice in the span of 2 days.

It took out our schools, our shops, our homes, our pets, and the lives of over 50 Texans. But there is one thing that Harvey can never take from us, and that is, we are "Houston Strong."

Houston Strong is the Smith family. Annie was going into labor as her apartment was being swallowed up by floodwaters. She and her husband, Greg, were doctors. They prepared to have a home delivery of their first child. Their phone calls for help were unanswered.

Annie called her church and, within an hour, a rescue truck drove up. That is her right there, being assisted on the rescue truck an hour after she made that call. Twelve hours later, their family grew by one. Their daughter, Adrielle, was born. The Smith family is Houston Strong.

Houston Strong is Buster Stoker and the Cajun Navy. Buster and his buddies from Louisiana brought 14 boats to rescue others in our disaster. Buster said: "There were a lot of submerged cars and street signs underneath us." It reminded Buster of cypress knees in the marshes at home. Buster rescued over 100 people, seven by seven. Buster and the Cajun Navy are Houston Strong.

Houston Strong are our first responders, our police officers, firemen, EMS drivers, our military, the entire Texas National Guard. And first responders include normal, everyday Texans like this man carrying a mother and her baby out of harm's way. Texans are Houston Strong.

Two days ago, I took a helicopter tour of the damage with Leader

MCCARTHY. The crew on our Coast Guard helicopters rescued 2,000 people in harm's way. And I am sure this scene was played out over and over inside those helicopters—a neighbor, glad to be alive, her hand resting on a rescuer's shoulder. Our first responders are Houston Strong.

Houston Strong is the thousands of volunteers who have been in shelters and churches and schools all throughout southeast Texas. I went to this high school, Cinco Ranch, in the Katy Independent School District. This was up and running within 24 hours of getting the go order. They had food, water, toiletries, clothes, and a smile.

I saw on those people who lost everything smile after smile after smile because of volunteers at shelters like Cinco Ranch High School. Shelters in Cinco Ranch are Houston Strong.

I have saved the best for last. This young boy's name is J.W. Claburn, IV. He lives in my district, Richmond, Texas. This young boy's photo is exactly what I have been trying to convey these last 5 minutes.

In closing, I will say that we—America is strong, Texas is strong, and Houston is stronger because of Hurricane Harvey.

#### CONDEMNING PRESIDENT TRUMP'S DECISION TO END DACA

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

Ms. KELLY of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to condemn in the strongest possible terms the President's decision to end the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program, also known as DACA.

This issue should be very simple. These are children who were brought here by their parents, through no fault of their own. They grew up with our kids, attended the same schools, played on the same playgrounds, and learned to drive in our neighborhoods. These kids are Americans in their hearts and in their minds, just not on paper, yet.

Beyond that, my faith, my conscience, my understanding of basic economics prevents me from supporting this cruel and inhumane decision by President Trump.

If we are to love our neighbors as ourselves, we must remember that we, too, were once strangers in a strange land. Many of us have our own immigrant stories, stories of how we became Americans.

My family's story begins like many of yours. My great-grandfather, Metro, was born in Austria in 1881, and my great-grandmother, Margaret Skruttt, was born in Ukraine in 1882. They got married and knew that they could find a better life in America; so, in 1906, they took a chance and came to America, arriving on November 1, 1906.

They settled in Northumberland County, Pennsylvania, because other Ukrainians already lived there. They joined the community, worked hard,

went to church, raised a family of Americans, including my grandmother, Anna Guryesh.

My great-grandparents' story is the story of America. It is the story of immigration and immigrant families dreaming of a better life and making America great.

It is the same story repeated 24 years later when Mary Anne McLeod boarded the Transylvania in Glasgow on May 2, 1930. Nine days later, she arrived in New York with \$50 in her pocket. Eighty-six years later, her son was elected President of the United States of America.

At the age of seven, a young woman left Cuba, fleeing communism. In 1989, she became the first Latina elected to Congress, and it is a privilege to serve with her.

Melania Knavs was born in Slovenia. She first became a permanent resident, and then a citizen of the United States. This young lady, born in southeastern Slovenia, now lives in northwest D.C. as the First Lady of the United States of America.

Daniel, one of my constituents who I helped with his DACA status: He works hard, pays his taxes, loves this country, his country, as much as any other American.

So many great Americans are Americans by choice, not by birth. This has made America the greatest, strongest, wealthiest country in the world. We can attract the best, the brightest, the most driven and the most talented.

People like Dr. Elizabeth Stern was born in Kansas, but, in 1915, became an American. She drove forward our ability to detect and treat cancer.

□ 1045

Author Ayn Rand, a favorite of the Speaker, was born in 1905 in Russia, and came to the United States in 1926.

Actress Natalie Portman, born in 1981 in Jerusalem, came to the U.S. as a toddler.

Alonso Guillen was born in Mexico but died last week as an American hero working to save lives during Hurricane Harvey.

At the last Olympics, Americans born in places like Australia, Kenya, and Poland brought home nine medals, including two gold for the United States.

Their stories are all the same. They came to America seeking a better life and a better future. They contributed to our society and our culture. They made America great.

Margaret and Metro's story is America's story. America's story is Mary Anne's story and Daniel's story. This is the story of us, the story of America. It is a story that no President's pen can erase. America's story is Melania's, Ayn's, and the story of Albert. We are America, and we are here to stay. No matter where you were born, we are America, and we are here to stay. No matter what language you speak to your mom in, we are America, and we are here to stay. We are America, and

we are here to stay because America's story is our story.

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

#### HEROIN AND OPIOID USERS NEED "A WAY OUT" OF ADDICTION

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

Mr. HULTGREN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today full of sorrow and hope for those caught in the cycle of addiction to heroin and opioids.

This destructive plague is taking aim at Americans across the country— young and old, rich and poor, rural and urban.

Nowhere is this more true than in the Chicagoland area, a hub for drug trafficking spreading across northern Illinois, the Midwest, and the United States.

The collar counties of Chicago have felt it strongly. This year, in Will County alone, there have been 61 accidental overdose cases and 44 deaths from heroin and fentanyl overdoses. This is an extremely discouraging pace, surpassing previous years.

The numbers are similar across the seven counties that I represent in the 14th Congressional District. Stories have been long untold, and it continues to gain national attention. It still haunts our communities today.

I got involved in this issue more than 3 years ago when I met Ken Chiakas, who lost his 17-year-old daughter Stephanie to a heroin overdose. Together, we launched our community action plan on heroin, an analysis of our community leadership forum on the problem, an audit of existing and proposed community partnerships, and the next steps for our communities, our State, and our county.

In the years following this initiative, I have hosted meetings with law enforcement officers, treatment center workers, advocates for patients and lost loved ones, State and local government officials, emergency room physicians, pharmacists, and drug manufacturers.

Last month, my staff and I traveled throughout McHenry and Lake Counties to hear from local officials firsthand who are experiencing this plague every single day.

Law enforcement first responders are on the front lines fighting drug traffickers and dealers. They are also saving lives by reviving abusers in the midst of an overdose through the use of naloxone. It is now common practice in these police and sheriff's departments to have naloxone ready to be deployed in the hands of capable and trained officers. Many lives have now been spared through its use.

But even these encouraging numbers do not tell the whole story. Countless others live and struggle to fight heroin and opioid abuse every day in search of

treatment and battling towards recovery. They know what it is like to face an overwhelming force controlling their lives. It affects their relationships, it affects their outlook on life, it affects their ability to obtain and keep quality jobs.

Local officials expressed great concern at the loss of workforce, and the many months and years of career advancement and experience those caught in addiction have lost. Businesses are concerned by their search for qualified workers that doesn't yield enough or any applicants. Families are concerned that, without adequate outpatient treatment, their loved ones are far more likely to relapse, compounding these workforce and community problems.

That is why, among other programs, Lake County law enforcement has worked hard to implement the "A Way Out" program. Police officers and sheriffs' deputies come into regular contact with those caught in heroin and opioid abuse, sometimes seeing the same offenders in police stations and prisons several times a month.

Many of these men and women want to be free but don't know how, and a police officer is the last person they think to ask for help. A Way Out empowers police officers and opioid users to work together to end the destructive cycle of abuse, dependency, arrest, and relapse.

The program is simple. Those who seriously want help can ask for it from a police officer or at a police station and can receive help without fear of arrest or inability to pay for treatment. Officers who see the destruction of opioids every day want to help.

All that is required is for the person seeking treatment to choose the path of recovery. Individual motivation is essential to success. As of last summer, 15 people at 8 different police departments have taken advantage of this initiative.

Similarly, DuPage County launched Project Connect, a prearrest program through which individuals who have been administered Narcan are immediately offered treatment options and a case manager to see these men and women through to recovery.

I am so encouraged by and proud of the success stories I hear throughout the 14th Congressional District every day. Hope is near when those in recovery see a vision of what their life can be like after dependency—a life filled with healthy relationships, challenging and meaningful work, and a clear sense of individual purpose.

We must do all we can to offer this hope to those still suffering from heroin and opioid addiction. Connecting affected individuals with the people and organizations best equipped to help them is paramount to overcoming this devastating epidemic.

It remains my goal to make northern Illinois the hub of the best minds and the best practices in heroin and opioid abuse prevention, treatment, and recovery. I look forward to sharing these



best practices and recommendations across other congressional districts and the communities that we are here to serve, and ultimately to see lives saved.

#### KEEP THE DOOR OPEN FOR DREAMERS

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

Mr. KENNEDY. Mr. Speaker, we all suffer when this country breaks its promises. But for our children, that cost compounds. They pay the interest on our inaction and inadequacy. They pick up the pieces of the precious things that we broke, the sacred resources we took for granted, the battles that we were too afraid to fight.

Time and again, by choice and by chance, they have not disappointed. Their broad shoulders carry twice as much twice as far. Their spines prove twice as sturdy as the adults meant to protect them.

American history is littered with the names of young men and women, and even boys and girls, forced to be heroes before their time: the patriots of D-day, memorialized in a statue called the Spirit of Youth in Normandy; 14-year-old Emmett Till, lynched by a lie; Addie Mae Collins, Cynthia Wesley, Carole Robertson, all 14, and Carol Denise McNair, 11, four choir girls lost at the 16th Street Baptist Church bombing in Alabama.

The Children's Crusade. Little boys and girls, kids, who dared defy Bull Connor's firehoses and attack dogs to be arrested and rearrested again and again as a Nation recoiled in horror.

Nine African-American high school students from Little Rock marched into an all-White high school to prove that separate is not equal.

Four college students from Kent State who gave their lives to a war-weary nation's plea for peace.

Thirteen-year-old Ryan White from Indiana who showed our Nation that an HIV diagnosis does not claim your dignity.

The record number of men and women under the age of 21 who showed up at military recruiting stations in 2001, signing up to serve a nation reeling from terror on its soil.

Nineteen-year-old Zach Walls who told us that love is love as he bravely defended his two moms before the Iowa State Legislature.

Seventeen-year-old Lila Perry from Missouri who withstood the sting of stigma by being true to herself and her gender identity.

Thirty-one-year-old Alonso Guillen, a Texan who traveled 120 miles from safety into the heart of Hurricane Harvey's fury on a volunteer rescue mission, who gave his life so that others, strangers, might survive. His courage and sacrifice exemplify the best traits of our Nation. They place him squarely on the long list of young American heroes

who have carried us toward a more perfect union.

But this week, President Trump slammed the door on 800,000 people like Alonso. DREAMers. Children raised in our neighborhoods, who run on our playgrounds, who pitch in our Little Leagues, who proudly march in 4th of July parades, who make lemonade stands, build snowmen, go to prom, and get summer jobs, who hit the books, who earn a living, who raise families of their own, who serve in our military, who give to this country just as much, just as faithfully as you or I.

Now, our President told them that they are not wanted, that he would rather see them in handcuffs, their families ripped apart, their futures in limbo, sent to be strangers in a strange land.

Mr. Speaker, sometimes this body has to make hard choices. Sometimes our solutions are complex. This is not one of those times. This one is easy. Our work comes down to a very simple question: What are we willing to ask our children to bear?

We have the power in this body to say: Not this, not again, that we will not ask the youngest among us to force our country's conscience to awake because of the burden that we, the adults in the room, place on their shoulders. We can do better. We can be braver. We can change the course of that history. We will not stand here and leave it for future generations to wonder why we allowed such harm to pass.

#### KEEPING GUAM SAFE

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

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I introduced a resolution with 21 of our colleagues from both sides of the aisle condemning the threats North Korea made against Guam last month—you can imagine the fear that we had during this period—but also reaffirming the United States' absolute and unshakeable commitment to Guam's security, as well as that of the Pacific States, the territories, and our Asia-Pacific allies.

Mr. Speaker, this threat against Guam and, indeed, our entire Nation, was inexcusable, and it demands firm condemnation from this House of Representatives.

My resolution sends a clear message that North Korea's continued willful disregard for U.N. resolutions, international agreements, sanctions, and arms controls in pursuit of its illicit nuclear weapons program will not go unanswered by our government.

I remain fully confident in the defensive capabilities on Guam and in our region, but it is vital that we do all that we can to prevent a military conflict with North Korea and ensure that its regime does not continue down this path of reckless and destabilizing nuclear militarization.

I want to thank my colleagues who have cosponsored this resolution with

me, and I hope that the House leadership will quickly bring it to the floor for consideration, and I urge all the Members to support it.

CALLING FOR THE HOUSE TO TAKE UP THE DREAM ACT

Ms. BORDALLO. On a separate topic, Mr. Speaker, I also want to echo my Democratic colleagues in calling for the House to quickly take up a permanent legislation solution such as the Dream Act, H.R. 3440, and lift the veil of anxiety that has been placed on nearly 800,000 DREAMers who live in and contribute to our community.

□ 1100

I know one of those DREAMers on Guam. Her name is Christine. She is a registered nurse on our island and works every day to save lives in our community. And it is easy, Mr. Speaker, to hear the number 800,000 and forget that these DREAMers are real people.

They are individual children or young adults who study in our schools. They work. They pay taxes. So can you imagine how disruptive this must be in their homes? They are our neighbors, our coworkers, our children's classmates and friends.

They are first responders, servicemembers, reservists, National Guardsmen, active military who serve on the front lines in our military. They are nurses, and doctors, businessowners, and entrepreneurs, and all DREAMers contribute to the fabric of our great country of America.

So I hope that we will give these DREAMers the security of knowing that they will not be deported from the country that they love and have called home for most of their lives. They are Americans in all but paper, and we should treat them with the same compassion and love that they have for our great country.

#### CONGRATULATIONS TO COACH ROBERT HUGHES

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

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to see something very special back in December of 1995 in Texas high school sports history.

Now, before you think this is a story of "Friday Night Lights," it is not. This happened on the hardwood court of the Wilkerson Greines Activity Center in southeast Fort Worth. Four coaching legends on the court, all with 1,000 wins each: Morgan Wooten of DeMatha Catholic High School; Ralph Tasker, Hobbs High in New Mexico; Bill Kruger of Clear Lake High School just outside of Houston; and Coach Robert Hughes, Sr., of Dunbar High School located in Stop Six, Texas. They squared off in an extraordinary basketball game.

I would be remiss if I didn't mention that of these four coaching legends, Coach Hughes has the most wins with over 1,300 victories.

Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, Friday September 8, will mark another special moment in basketball history for Coach Hughes as he is inducted into the Basketball Hall of Fame in Springfield, Massachusetts.

Growing up in Fort Worth and having lived part of my childhood in Stop Six, I knew of Coach Hughes at a very young age. He was a legend before he retired. He is and was a master basketball strategist, coach, mentor to the boys he coached and the most prominent ambassador for high school sports in the State of Texas.

When you would go to a Dunbar basketball game and watch Coach Hughes work his craft, you ended up watching Coach Hughes as much as you watched the action on the floor. I saw this as a player that not only played against Coach Hughes, but also as a spectator and a fan for many, many years.

Hughes and his longtime trusted assistant, Leonadas Rambo, fielded some great teams to rack up over 1,300 victories. These wins were racked up at Dunbar High School and I.M. Terrell High School, which was shut down after desegregation.

Coach Hughes would pace the floor while his teams ran up and down the court at a swift pace. He usually gave them lots of latitude when they made mistakes that he felt could have been avoided by using better judgment. It didn't matter if you were the star point guard or the sixth man, he would stand up from the bench—and Coach Hughes always had his jacket unbuttoned—and with a look of disapproval on his face that was unmistakable, he would look down the bench—and I am going to say he would look down the bench with his signature look of tough love—and you knew that you were being pulled out of the game. There wasn't anything that your mom or dad could do for you.

That was the type of coach that Coach Hughes was. Coach Hughes earned the dedication of his players because of the excellence that he expected each and every day.

I will never forget in one Whataburger Basketball Tournament in Fort Worth when Dunbar was playing Oak Hill Academy from Mouth of Wilson, Virginia. Oak Hill had at least five or six guys that were all over 6 foot 8, three of whom went on to major Division I careers at the University of Virginia and Kansas.

Everybody at the gym that night, because Coach Hughes didn't have anybody over 6 foot 5, 6 foot 6, thought that Coach Hughes was outmatched. But with superior rebounding, patience, and good shot selection, Dunbar won the game. I was there, and I vividly remember the audience being shocked, but inspired, by the victory. But no one should have been surprised.

Once a reporter asked Coach Hughes who his favorite NBA player was, and it surprised everybody when he said Larry Bird was his favorite player. The reason why: he liked Larry's legendary rebounding, fundamentals, blocking

out, scoring, the type of things that may not have been fancy but led to victories.

But that is who Coach Hughes was. That was the kind of excellence Robert Hughes brought to coaching Fort Worth ISD and boys basketball in the State of Texas. And due to that fierce competitive streak in Coach Hughes' Dunbar teams, they always made the playoffs.

I will never forget one day Coach Hughes was quoted in the paper saying that the people who worked in the neighborhood, who worked at the various jobs around town, at General Motors, Miller Brewery, and Lockheed, they would always save up their vacation time so they can go to the quarterfinals and regional games in Midland, because everybody knew that Dunbar was at least going that far. And he could say that because it was true, and his teams could back it up.

I will never forget one year when Dunbar didn't make it that far and Coach Hughes shared his scouting report with another school. I believe it was Southwest High School. He shared his scouting report with the coach from Southwest of the team they were getting ready to take on in the playoffs because he felt that at least the other team in the Fort Worth Independent School District should have the chance to advance. That is the kind of class act he was on the court and he still is off the court today.

The men that he made, Mr. Speaker, his former players include current winning high school basketball coaches and one of the top all-time assist leaders in high school and college sports history, James Cash, an I.M. Terrell graduate who was the first Black player in the Southwest Conference who went on to become the chair of the Harvard MBA program.

In a State known for its Friday night lights, Mr. Speaker, there is not a single other person in high school sports who exemplifies this like Coach Hughes.

Mr. Speaker, I am humbled with the opportunity to recognize the next member of the Basketball Hall of Fame, Coach Robert Hughes. Congratulations, Coach Hughes.

Go Wildcats. Go I.M. Terrell.

#### REFORM CLOTURE RULE IN SENATE

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, 2 weeks after the 2016 election, I spoke on the House floor and warned that the greatest single obstacle to meeting the expectations of the American people was the cloture rule in the Senate. I said: "Voters elected Republican majorities in both Houses of Congress and they expect action. They'll get it from the President and from the House. But in order for the Senate to rise to this

occasion, it must reform its cloture rule."

Well, it didn't.

Now, cloture is the Senate motion to conclude debate, and it is based on a sound parliamentary principle that as long as a significant minority—currently, 40 Members of the Senate—want to continue to debate, that debate should continue. This principle assumes it is an actual debate between real people regarding the merits of the subject directly at hand, but that is not what cloture has become.

Today, any Senator can block virtually any bill simply by filing a protest, and until 60 of the 100 Senators agree to take up the bill, it cannot be heard. Thus, a motion designed to protect debate has now degenerated into a motion that very effectively prevents debate. It also hands practical control of the Senate to the Democratic minority, which can effectively veto any proposal by the majority, essentially reversing the result of the last election.

This is not some act of God or constitutional constraint that has been forced upon the Senate. No, this is a deliberate choice by Senate Republicans not to reform their cloture rule. It has rendered the Senate dysfunctional and, with it, the Congress.

Earlier this year, the Senate briefly recognized this and chose to reform cloture for Supreme Court nominations, but not for the legislation absolutely vital to the interests of our country.

The news yesterday that the President has now had to capitulate to Democratic demands on the debt limit should come as no surprise. By failing to reform cloture, Senate Republicans have effectively given CHUCK SCHUMER operational control of the Senate.

That is how we got wrapped around the axle on repealing and replacing ObamaCare. The House could have passed a comprehensive bill that completely and cleanly abolished ObamaCare and fully replaced it with all of the market and tax reforms that Republicans agreed with and campaigned on, popular reforms that put consumers back in charge of their healthcare decisions and placed those decisions within their financial reach.

Instead, the House leadership chose to attempt this through a budget process called reconciliation, a process completely unsuited for complex policy reform. They did so for one reason: to bypass the Senate cloture rule. By adhering to the very limited and restricted requirements of budget reconciliation, the House produced a mangled, tangled mess that fell well short of the reforms we had promised and, ultimately, failed to receive even a simple majority of the Senate.

Those who supported this process argued that a clean, complete, comprehensive bill would have been dead on arrival in the Senate for lack of Democratic votes for cloture. Well, I doubt that. Quite the contrary. Had the House done its job through regular



order rather than trying to cover for the Senate Republicans' bad choice, one of two things would have happened:

Senate Democrats would have been seen as the single obstacle to a popular, comprehensive reform while ObamaCare continued to implode and, quite possibly, eight of the most vulnerable Democrats would ultimately have crossed party lines and supported this rescue of our healthcare system; or, far more likely, Senate Republicans would have been forced to come to the same conclusion that they came to with respect to the Supreme Court nomination of Neil Gorsuch and reform this rule. Certainly, we couldn't have been any worse off than we are today.

I would ask that, henceforth, the House leadership stop covering for the Senate Republicans and move all of the legislation that we promised the American people to the Senate through regular order. It is time we left the management of the Senate to the Senate, stopped enabling their atrocious judgment on not reforming cloture, and made it very clear to the American public why the reforms they entrusted us to enact aren't being sent to the President.

Senator Dirksen once noted, when they feel the heat, they see the light. It is time the House and the American people adopted this maxim.

**HONORING FALLEN KISSIMMEE POLICE OFFICER MATTHEW BAXTER AND SERGEANT RICHARD "SAM" HOWARD**

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

Mr. SOTO. Mr. Speaker, it happened on a Friday night, August 18, that Sergeant Sam Howard and Police Officer Matthew Baxter responded to a report of three suspicious persons around Palmway Street and Cypress Street in Kissimmee. I remember hearing about it. It was unfortunate because a veteran, a marine who lived in our community, had a moment of post-traumatic stress disorder and ambushed these two Kissimmee police officers, killing one nearly instantly and the other only a little over a day later.

Officer Matthew Baxter was 27 years old. He grew up in Baltimore and moved to central Florida after high school. He had been with the department for only 3 years. He met his wife, Sadia, a detective of the Kissimmee Police Department, on the job. He left behind his wife and four young children, the youngest under a year old.

He was courageous and passionate in his devotion to public service, and he was known as a sharp dresser and as someone with overwhelming confidence.

Sergeant Richard "Sam" Howard was 36 years old, born and raised in Kissimmee. He served in the Army and fought in Iraq. He was a 10-year veteran of the department and a member of our SWAT team. He left his wife,

Billie Jo, and teenage daughter, Unique, behind.

My wife and I got to visit his wife's classroom and brought supplies to her students, knowing how difficult it was.

He was a family man, hardworking, very optimistic, and quite the fast talker, as we were reminded by everybody during his wake.

There are moments like these that test our will, our strength, our compassion. There are moments like these that test our community and even our faith. And more than we can ever imagine, there are moments like these that test the families of Sergeant Sam Howard and Officer Matthew Baxter.

We are here today and I am on the floor today to proclaim aloud what we already know in our hearts to be true. And make no mistake about it: these men were heroes, and we will never forget their sacrifices.

They are heroes because they got up every day and put on the Kissimmee Police uniform. They went out in our community every day to protect us. And, yes, they put themselves in harm's way every day to keep us safe.

These men are heroes because they were good family men. They were loving husbands, great fathers, and they were pillars of our community.

□ 1115

Yes, these men were heroes because when the moment came where they had to lay their lives on the line to protect our community, they did so without hesitation.

For those reasons, we will never forget Sergeant Sam Howard and Officer Matthew Baxter.

On August 21, 2017, an American flag was flown over our Capitol in honor of Sergeant Howard, and on that same day, an American flag was flown over our Capitol in honor of Officer Baxter.

These flags cannot take away the pain caused to their families. They cannot take away the pain caused to our community, to their fellow officers, and to the police department in general. But they were flown over our Nation's Capitol for a very good reason—to show that their lives matter, their sacrifices matter, and that their families matter.

For that, they remain in our hearts, they remain in our thoughts, and they will always be in our prayers.

God bless Sergeant Sam Howard, Officer Matthew Baxter, and their families.

God bless the city of Kissimmee, and God bless the United States of America.

**DEFERRED ACTION FOR CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS**

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

Mr. VARGAS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak about the recent decision made by the Trump administration to end the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, program.

By ending the DACA program, this administration leaves 800,000 people, mostly young adults and children, without any legal protections.

DACA gives these individuals, most of whom were brought to the United States as very young children, the opportunity to work hard, study hard, sustain their families, and contribute to their communities. DACA recipients are taxpayers, they are students, they are soldiers, and they are our neighbors.

I would like to mention one DACA recipient that I know. Her name is Jacqueline. Jacqueline was brought to the United States when she was 2 years old. She excelled in school and was an Advancement Via Individual Determination—or what we call AVID—student in high school. She did very well. She was a strong candidate for admission to many of our top universities.

When DACA was announced in 2012, it helped Jacqueline come out of the shadows and pursue her educational dreams. She did exactly that, and now she is a double major. She is doing very well. DACA gave Jacqueline and her family hope for a better future. It gave her a chance at the American Dream.

By ending DACA, this administration is taking away the hopes of 800,000 DREAMers like Jacqueline and threatening their deportation to countries that are very unfamiliar to them, places they may have never known—except, of course, when they were 2—and they have no family there.

I would like to thank the religious leaders who have come forward and have urged us to do the right thing and to pass a law to allow these kids and these young adults to stay here and to participate in our community as they have been doing.

I would like to read a letter now that was written by the religious leaders here in Washington to the President.

As leaders of the three Abrahamic faiths, we look to our sacred texts and traditions in seeking to follow the way of peace.

Our respective teachings are clear, and we speak with one voice when we say:

Supporting the dreams of young immigrants in the United States is consistent with the foundational values of our Nation and with the moral imperative of extending hospitality to the stranger, of caring for immigrants and children, and of loving our neighbors as ourselves.

Nearly 1 million young immigrants have benefited from the DACA program since its inception in 2012. Among that number, many of the program recipients are members of our respective faith communities as well as the communities we mentor in and around the Nation's Capital.

We have witnessed firsthand the relief and pride in our young people's faces as they finally came to feel validated and safe by participating in a program that made them feel more at home—in the only country that they have ever really considered their home.

But now anxiety and fear for their future has returned.

We note that DACA has widespread support across the country and among politicians who agree on little else, for good reason. DACA has dramatically improved the lives of these young people and the communities in which they live:

Ninety-five percent of the DACA participants are working or attend high school;

Sixty-eight percent of those working have seen their pay increase and, thus, are paying higher taxes;

Fifty percent now have driver's licenses, which makes the roads safer for everyone;

Fifty-four percent have purchased their first car; and

Twelve percent have purchased their first home.

Rescinding DACA would have a widespread, devastating impact not only on a generation of industrious young people, but also on their families, communities, and our society as a whole.

Thus, we add our voices to those urging you, Mr. President, to keep this policy in place until Congress puts in place a permanent solution.

It is our collective prayer that in the coming months congressional leaders work together to pass sensible and comprehensive immigration reform that our country so desperately needs, including making the DACA program permanent.

But until that time comes, the least that our country can do is to continue supporting our DREAMers. Keep DACA in place, Mr. President.

Faithfully,

The Right Reverend Mariann Edgar Budde, Bishop of the Episcopal Diocese of Washington;

Rabbi Bruce Lustig, Senior Rabbi of Washington Hebrew Congregation;

Imam Talib M. Shareef, The Nation's Mosque;

His Eminence Donald Cardinal Wuerl, Archbishop of Washington.

Mr. Speaker, we can do the right thing. We can pass comprehensive immigration reform, and we should. But at least we can pass DACA.

I know, Mr. Speaker, that there is goodwill on both sides. Let's come together over this and do the right thing as our community leaders and as our religious leaders are asking us.

#### DEFERRED ACTION FOR CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS

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

Mr. AGUILAR. Mr. Speaker, today is not a good day for our Nation. Today, 800,000 young people across this country are living in fear. They fear being ripped apart from the only home they have ever known. They fear being separated from their families, from their friends, and from the lives they have built here.

They fear deportation, Mr. Speaker, and they live with this fear because President Trump has decided that the Federal Government is going to break its promise and turn its back on DREAMers.

These are young men and women who did not break the law—they were brought to this country as children—who went to school here, who work here, and who pay taxes here.

The Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals, or DACA, program brought these young people out of the shadows and offered them some relief. It gave kids who grew up here and who truly believe that America is their home a

chance to lead normal lives and chase their dreams.

The fact of the matter is, though, Mr. Speaker, that DACA did not go quite far enough. DREAMers are American by every measure except for their paperwork, and it is time that we offer them a path to citizenship.

That is why I am here today to call upon my colleagues to bring the Dream Act back to the floor for a vote—no policy riders, no packages, just a straight up-or-down vote. Because if there are Members of this Chamber who still believe that DREAMers should remain in the shadows and that they should not have a chance to join our Nation as citizens, then they should stand up and be counted.

Many of my colleagues here come from all walks of life. They have charted their own path, however difficult it may be to join this House. DREAMers have earned that chance to carve their own path, too. They have earned the right to live without fear and in peace as Americans. Passing the Dream Act is the right thing to do, it is the moral thing to do, and, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, it is the American thing to do.

#### HURRICANE HARVEY

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

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, on August 26, Hurricane Harvey began a path of unprecedented destruction across southeast Texas. The historic levels of rainfall were so extraordinary that the National Weather Service had to add new colors to its map graphics just to record it.

As of August 30, it was estimated that 24.5 trillion gallons of water had been dumped over Texas and Louisiana. Harvey is now being called the most extreme rain event in United States history.

Year after year, the natural disasters that hit the United States are becoming more frequent and more severe. Democrats understand the root cause: climate change. It is long overdue for President Trump and the congressional Republicans to admit the truth.

Quickly following the tragic news that Harvey was on a path to cause catastrophic flooding in Texas, President Trump pledged to help pass the necessary financial aid to begin the long recovery. But, of course, the President and Members of Congress all knew we had better not deny or delay funding for this very devastating natural disaster.

The American people expected their government to quickly respond to Harvey. However, we must understand that there are other laws and policies that must be protected, laws that determine what the Congress can do and must do to assist our country with mitigation, preparedness, mapping, and affordable national flood insurance. The NFIP

must be dealt with and must be understood.

So Mr. Trump's previous record on the issue is appalling and is in direct contradiction to his latest pledge. Just days before Harvey made landfall, Trump repealed an Obama executive order that would have required the Federal Government to account for climate change so that infrastructure could be built to withstand catastrophic events. Trump also sent Congress a budget that cuts funding for programs that help us understand, prepare for, and recover from storms like Harvey.

His budget slashes operations and funding for the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's climate research, cuts \$62 million from the National Weather Service, eliminates the Regional Coastal Resilience grants, guts Coastal Zone Management grants, and cuts \$190 million from the National Flood Insurance Program's flood mapping program.

Trump's budget would also cut \$114 million from the Department of Agriculture's disaster assistance that would help farmers recover livestock, crops, and equipment that would be felt in Texas where many farms are currently under several feet of water.

His budget also completely eliminates HUD's Community Development Block Grant and HOME programs, vital grant programs that serve as one of the first available sources of funding to help communities recover even before disaster relief funding can be appropriated from Congress. What is more, Trump's budget would have cut \$876 million from the Federal Emergency Management Agency's Disaster Relief Fund, the very fund that he is now pledging billions of dollars of support for.

So we are pleased that he learned after the fact. All told, Trump would cut billions of dollars for disaster preparedness and disaster relief programs. Of course, he also appointed a known climate change denier to lead the Environmental Protection Agency. So I, for one, am not surprised that this is where his priorities lie.

The hypocrisy and shortsightedness do not end with Donald Trump. Let us remember that many House Republicans, including both Texas Senators, opposed disaster aid following Superstorm Sandy. Now that the shoe is on the other foot, they are asking for billions of dollars in taxpayer support for their constituents. Of course, we should pass a disaster aid package quickly and without hesitation because it is simply the right thing and the American people expect us to do it. But just as we are now witnessing the sudden change of heart for disaster relief in certain Members of Congress, I hope that we will see a similar change of heart in response to the push of certain Republicans to unwind the National Flood Insurance Program.

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

---

#### RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 29 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

---

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

---

#### PRAYER

Reverend Louis M. Murphy, Sr., Mount Zion Progressive Missionary Baptist Church, St. Petersburg, Florida, offered the following prayer:

Heavenly Father, creator of the heavens, the Earth, and of all mankind, thank You for the privilege to come before Your glorious throne, to first give praises to Your holy and righteous name, and to offer our petitions.

We stand on the floor of the House of Representatives today asking for Your divine guidance and wisdom for the men and women who have been elected and sworn to represent the interests of the people of these United States of America.

I pray that they would serve with humility, dignity, and honor, enacting laws that would be fair, just, and equitable.

You have blessed this Nation with great wealth and great resources. Thank You.

Help us to be mindful of the disenfranchised, despondent, dejected, and especially those who have been affected by Hurricane Harvey. We pray for Your protection for those in the path of Hurricane Irma.

Lord God, I humbly beseech You to hear my prayer. Enable this gathering to hear and believe in the power of prayer. In Your holy name, I pray.

Amen.

---

#### THE JOURNAL

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

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

---

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. WALBERG) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. WALBERG led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

---

#### WELCOMING REVEREND LOUIS M. MURPHY, SR.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. CRIST. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our guest chaplain, Reverend Louis M. Murphy, Sr., of my hometown of St. Petersburg, Florida.

Reverend Murphy truly embodies what it means to love your neighbor as yourself. In his 18 years as senior pastor at the Mt. Zion Progressive Missionary Baptist Church, he has been a dedicated disciple of Christ, giving his time, energy, and compassion to lifting up his congregation and the larger St. Petersburg community.

In addition to his duties as pastor of one of the largest churches in Pinellas County, Reverend Murphy has been a leader in economic revitalization efforts in south St. Petersburg, and in supporting job training and outreach programs for at-risk youth.

A native of Florida, truly a man of God, and a man of the people. I personally thank Reverend Murphy for coming to the people's House and providing such a moving, thoughtful invocation. God bless you.

---

#### COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZELDIN) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, September 7, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
*The Speaker, House of Representatives,*  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on September 7, 2017, at 9:27 a.m.:

That the Senate agreed to S. Con. Res. 23.  
That the Senate passed S. 652.  
That the Senate passed S. 849.  
That the Senate passed S. 920.  
That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 624.

That the Senate passed S. 1359.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

---

#### HONORING GREG BRUNT OF CATAWBA COUNTY

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in order to honor a Catawba County native.

Mr. Greg Brunt has won more than 100 medals in the Special Olympics and serves as an inspiration to the wider Catawba community and, in my opinion, the Nation.

Mr. Brunt's road cannot have been easy. He has overcome challenges that many Americans don't have to face. Instead of giving in, Mr. Brunt gives back. As a swimming instructor to younger students, Mr. Brunt teaches children the value of practice and perseverance.

Mr. Brunt has earned many Special Olympic medals, and has aspirations of being in the Catawba County Hall of Fame. Though I am not a voting member of the board, Mr. Brunt would have my vote.

Additionally, I was thrilled to learn that Mr. Brunt is a man of faith, who attends Corinth Reformed Church, and that his favorite song is "Amazing Grace."

When I think of the amazing accomplishments Mr. Brunt has achieved, I cannot help but think, how sweet the sound.

I wholeheartedly congratulate Mr. Brunt on all of his many wins, and wish him continued success.

---

#### WE MUST PASS THE DREAM ACT

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, America is founded on the promise that if you work hard and play by the rules, then we will have a place for you.

That is the American Dream. There is no reason it shouldn't extend to people who were brought here as young children and have been working since then to build a better life.

San Diego is home to 38,000 residents who could be eligible for DACA, the seventh most of any county in America.

DREAMers are our friends, our neighbors, and our coworkers, and our economy is more prosperous because of their contributions.

Like so many, I was saddened and angry at the decision by President Trump to end the DACA program. It was a cruel action, rooted in fear, that only makes us weaker.

Congress must act swiftly to correct this economic and moral catastrophe. We must pass the Dream Act to protect DREAMers, and give them and their employers the certainty that they deserve.

The time is right now for Congress to finally step up and do its job.

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

## RECOGNIZING LEACY BURKE

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

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, it is with sincere gratitude and appreciation that I have the opportunity to recognize Leacy Burke, former communications director for South Carolina's Second Congressional District. I will always appreciate Leacy for her years of service on behalf of the people of South Carolina.

A native of South Carolina, Leacy is an esteemed alumna of the University of South Carolina, where she graduated with both a bachelor of arts degree in political science and criminal justice, as well as a master's degree in mass communications, integrated communications. Beginning as a deputy press secretary for the office in 2015, it has been an honor to work with such a dedicated public servant making meaningful provisions for our office.

It is with mixed feelings, but great happiness, that our office bids Leacy farewell. She is now doing amazing work in her new role as communications director for Senator JIM INHOFE, Republican, of Oklahoma. I know her parents, Greg and Denise Burke, and family members join me in recognizing her achievements.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism. Our prayers are for all persons threatened by Hurricane Irma, from the Caribbean Islands to South Carolina.

---

LET US VOTE TO RESTORE OUR VALUES AND GIVE DREAMERS OPPORTUNITIES THEY DESERVE

(Ms. JUDY CHU of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, Ana was an intern in my office. She is also an undocumented immigrant. When DACA was announced, Ana was ecstatic. She told me that DACA meant she could qualify for financial aid or be an intern at the State Department. All she saw were opportunities to contribute to our country, and that is exactly what she has done.

Thanks to DACA, Ana earned her master's degree and got a job helping other immigrants to lay roots and contribute, like she did. She was able to get a driver's license to safely get to school and work. And today, she is attending law school.

Ana represents the promise that if you come here, work here, and contribute here, you will have a future here. But Donald Trump is breaking that promise by ending DACA.

And so it is up to us to fix it. The bipartisan Dream Act will protect these DREAMers who are American in every way but on paper.

Mr. Speaker, let us vote to restore our values and give these DREAMers the opportunities they deserve.

## CONGRATULATING INDIANA STATE SENATOR LUKE KENLEY

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

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Indiana's State Senator Luke Kenley on his retirement, and to thank him for the many years he dedicated to serving our fellow Hoosiers.

From balancing the budget to reforming State taxes, he has worked for 25 years to empower local communities and strengthen Indiana's economy. He led important efforts to enhance our schools, roads, businesses, local institutions, and more.

Senator Kenley's commitment to Hoosier common sense, and his tireless efforts to bring our State's economy into the 21st century, helped transform Indiana and improve Hoosiers' lives. I am grateful for Senator Kenley's leadership and his keen understanding of the Hoosier values that are so important to our way of life. I have no doubt his impact on our State will last far into the future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in wishing Indiana State Senator Luke Kenley the absolute best as he embarks on this next chapter in life.

---

DACA AND PROTECTING DREAMERS

(Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Speaker, when DACA was launched in 2012, it allowed nearly 800,000 young people to come out of the shadows and live without the constant fear of being deported. Some came here as infants in their parents' arms. Some know no other language but English, and they know no other country but America. And all of them simply seek a better future.

DACA helped breathe life into their American Dream. DREAMers are our neighbors, our friends, and our colleagues. They grew up here. They have done absolutely nothing wrong. They are in school, they are working, and they are contributing to the American economy.

And now, they must fear deportation once again. That is not the American Dream; that is not who we are.

I hope that all of my colleagues will take that to heart so that we can finally pass the Dream Act and keep these Americans out of the shadows, contributing to our economy, growing their lives, and helping live and be the American Dream.

---

RECOGNIZING PASTOR FRANK HAMPTON, JR.

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

Mr. WALBERG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Pastor Frank Hampton, Jr., as he celebrates 50 years of ministry at the Church of God in Jackson, Michigan.

Over the years, Pastor Hampton has been a steady example of what it means to be a father, a pastor, a mentor, and a community servant.

In addition to faithfully shepherding his congregation, Pastor Hampton has served as a volunteer chaplain for Allegiance Health, counseled disadvantaged youth, and helped build strong leaders in the community.

He has worked in conjunction with Jackson's judicial system, Jackson Public Schools, Jackson County Jail, and the Interfaith Shelter.

The longevity of his service to his congregation and to the community is a reflection of his mission to make a profound difference in the lives of everyone he meets.

Pastor Hampton is a remarkable man of integrity, perseverance, and servant leadership. His 50 years of ministry have set the standard for our community. I congratulate him on his milestone and pray for God's many blessings in the years ahead.

---

LET'S FIX DACA

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

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, President Trump shielded Sheriff Joe Arpaio from a prison sentence for criminal contempt, despite Sheriff Arpaio's record of illegal racial profiling and abuse directed at immigrant communities.

The President's latest salvo in his war on immigrants is his tragic decision to end the DACA program, which has given nearly 800,000 innocent DREAMers, who want to be Americans, the opportunity to work and attend school.

In my native State of Virginia, we have more than 12,000 DREAMers, who contribute more than \$711 million to our GDP every year—that is contribute.

These young, hardworking DREAMers, who see themselves as Americans, as do I, are contributing to our communities, creating jobs, serving in our military, teaching our children, and caring for our family members. President Trump would learn that if he ever sat down with them, as I have, and so many of my colleagues have, and broken bread with them, and listened to their fascinating, challenging, wonderful stories.

Ending DACA is self-defeating, hurts the American economy, and neglects all that makes America unique. Let's fix this.

□ 1215

COMMEMORATING FRANCIS  
BELLAMY

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

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate Francis Bellamy, one of the most influential individuals from Mount Morris, New York. Francis Bellamy is the author of the Pledge of Allegiance.

Tomorrow marks the 125th anniversary of the Pledge of Allegiance, which was first published in a magazine called *The Youth's Companion* on September 8, 1892.

The pledge was initially written as part of a campaign to put American flags in every school in the country. In its original form, it read:

"I pledge allegiance to my flag and the Republic for which it stands, one nation, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all."

In 1923, the words, "the flag of the United States of America" were added. In 1954, Congress added the words, "under God," creating the 31-word pledge we have today.

Bellamy's words are recited millions of times every day and are ingrained in our society as an expression of national pride and patriotism.

CONGRESS MUST PASS LEGISLA-  
TION TO PROTECT DREAMERS

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

Mr. TONKO. Mr. Speaker, ending the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program is inhumane and unAmerican. Whatever your politics on immigration, America's DREAMers did not choose their birthplace or their path early in life. They are innocents, and they have grown up as Americans. They have attended school here alongside our own children. They share our values and our principles. They believe in the American Dream.

Yes, deporting them hurts our economy, and yes, it damages our standing as a leading nation, but at its heart, this is a matter of conscience.

What kind of justice will we give to kids brought here when they were 6 years old, who grew up as Americans and who have no home beyond our shores?

To make them the targets of deportation is a violation of our national conscience.

Congress must act now to pass legislation to protect these DREAMers. A just nation must not take lightly the judgment of the innocent. Let us not discard our friends and our neighbors for the sake of political theater, not when we can instead draw strength of heart and mind and treasure from their experience, their differences, and the many values we share in common.

E pluribus unum. Out of many, we are indeed one.

BRINGING ATTENTION TO  
MONTANA'S WILDFIRES

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

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to bring attention to the wildfires devastating Montana. My heart goes out to those affected by Hurricane Harvey. The disaster has shown the very best of our country, neighbor helping neighbor.

That spirit is alive and well in Montana, too, as we face a massive disaster. Drought conditions are severe. Over 40 wildfires continue to rage, and more than 900,000 acres have burned so far.

As we speak, ash rains down on our homes and our schools, poor air quality threatens the health of Montanans, particularly our children and our elderly, and our livelihoods are at risk.

This photo was taken just a few weeks ago from the south summit of Mount Sentinel as fires raged towards the town of Lolo, Montana.

Sadly, this image is not unique. I met with leaders and firefighters at five wildfires this summer and witnessed the destruction firsthand.

Mr. Speaker, I hope this image and others from back home will make my colleagues more aware of the fires, the devastation they have caused, and the need for relief in the Treasure State.

CONGRESS SHOULD PASS THE  
DREAM ACT

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today for the over 20,000 DREAMers in my district on the central coast of California.

Due to the administration's pledge to end DACA, those young men and women, who have done everything right after they got to America, are now being punished for a choice that they did not make before coming to America.

Their mothers and fathers came to the central coast to work hard and contribute to the economies and communities in the salad bowl of the world and the most scenic place in the world so that their children could have the opportunity to live the American Dream in the best country in the world.

Now, it is clear that DACA doesn't just give them that dream. All that DACA does is give those children the opportunity to come out of the shadows and fulfill that dream. That is why DREAMers work in our businesses, study in our schools, and serve in the military of the only country that they know.

This is why Congress should vote on and pass the Dream Act. If we do our job, we will allow DREAMers to not only do their jobs, we will give them the opportunity to give back to the

communities and country that gave them and their parents so much.

As immigrants, they understand that obligation. Let's show them and let's show this country that Congress understands that obligation as well.

RECOGNIZING CLARION UNIVER-  
SITY'S 150TH ANNIVERSARY

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Clarion University of Pennsylvania as it celebrates 150 years.

In 1859, the people of Clarion County created a proposal for a higher education institution in Clarion. Shortly after, the Civil War erupted and disrupted the Nation, but it did not stop the determination of the Clarion people.

On September 10, 1867, Clarion University was founded as the Carrier Seminary of western Pennsylvania. With no facilities to call home, Carrier Seminary operated as a co-educational program in the old academy building, with Reverend James G. Townsend as principal.

Carrier Seminary then became Clarion State Normal School in 1887. In 1915, the Commonwealth purchased the school, and it became a technical school of junior college rank in 1920.

It opened its doors as a college-level institution in 1929. Since then, Clarion's student body has grown to more than 5,000, its programs have received top level accreditation, and the institution has become a part of Pennsylvania State System of Higher Education.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate Clarion University on reaching this milestone, and I join all in celebrating its rich history and contributions to our area.

AMERICA CAN BE A FAIR AND  
COMPASSIONATE NATION

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

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, last week I visited Norte Vista High School and stood before a room of DREAMers who were desperate to know if they have a future in America, the only country they have ever called home. I had to look each student in the eye and say: I can't make any promises.

The question is not whether we have enough votes in Congress to pass the Dream Act. We all know that we do. The question is not whether passing the Dream Act is the right thing to do. We all know that it is.

The question before this Congress is whether we have the political courage and the basic decency to reject our worst impulses, and protect the most vulnerable members of our society.

In a few months, I hope I can stand before that same room of DREAMers

and tell them that the answer is, yes; yes, America can be a fair and a compassionate nation, and, yes, they are free to realize the promise of this great country.

**TRIBUTE TO LIEUTENANT AARON ALLAN AND DEPUTY CHIEF JIM WATERS**

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

Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our Nation's police officers, who sacrifice for their fellow citizens and selflessly put their lives on the line to keep our communities safe.

Sadly, in late July, right before our August recess, our community of central Indiana suffered terrible losses.

While off duty, Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Deputy Chief Jim Waters was involved in an accident involving a semitrailer. He passed away a few days later on July 27.

Deputy Chief Waters held almost every title in law enforcement in his lifetime, but he was proudest of the titles of son, brother, father, and husband. No matter the job he took on, Deputy Chief Waters was known for working so hard, yet having fun while doing so.

Also in late July, a second Indiana police officer was killed. When responding to an overturned vehicle on Marion County's south side, Southport Police Department's Lieutenant Aaron Allan was fatally shot by the driver he was trying to assist in that overturned vehicle. He, too, passed away on July 27. He was the first Southport police officer to be killed in the line of duty.

As a child, Allan always knew what he wanted to be when he grew up: a police officer. He had a compassionate heart and consistently went out of his way to help those in need, even if his job didn't require it or he was off duty.

I offer my deepest condolences to their families, the Southport and Indianapolis Metropolitan Police Departments, and all who mourn their loss and cherish their memory.

**HONORING DR. ROBERT "BOB" BILLINGSLEA**

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

Mrs. DEMINGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Dr. Robert "Bob" Billingslea of Orlando, who passed away on Friday, September 1.

Dr. Billingslea was the founding executive of Walt Disney's Corporate Urban Affairs and Development department, and served as its vice president until his retirement in 2012. In this position, he led the company's minority outreach efforts, and was a firm believer that diversity drives growth, creativity, and innovation.

Bob's unwavering commitment was evident by his service. He served on nu-

merous organizations and boards, including Historically Black Colleges and Universities, Boys and Girls Clubs, and founded the Orlando Urban League, to name a few.

When Bob walked into a room, people noticed; and when Bob spoke, people listened. Bob Billingslea was smart, impactful, and unforgettable. He made a difference.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing time for this tribute as we celebrate the life of Dr. Bob Billingslea.

**HONORING MISSOURI TASK FORCE 1 FOR THEIR COURAGE AND SELFLESSNESS**

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

Mrs. HARTZLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the brave members of Missouri's Task Force 1, who have risked their lives to help others in the aftermath of Hurricane Harvey.

Missouri's Task Force 1 is one of 28 urban search and rescue teams in the country. Its 210 members are trained to provide emergency response and disaster relief services at a moment's notice.

Last week, as the rains came down and the waters came up in Houston, 47 members of the task force deployed to Texas with a mission: to turn potential stories of tragedy and despair into stories of salvation and hope, and they succeeded.

In just one day during Hurricane Harvey, the team made more than 300 water rescues and evacuations. Deployed to Houston for 14 days, these skilled crewmembers risked their lives to save the lives of others in Houston. Now they are monitoring a possible new deployment to assist after Hurricane Irma.

We should all keep in mind the contributions and rescue efforts of Task Force 1. Their courage and selflessness demonstrated the best of humanity in the worst of times.

I want to thank them for putting their lives on the line to help others in their time of need. You are all worthy of our respect, appreciation, and honor.

□ 1230

**CONGRESS MUST FIX OUR BROKEN IMMIGRATION SYSTEM**

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

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, Congress must act to fix our broken immigration system, including passing legislation to protect DREAMers.

Like many Members of this body, I was deeply disappointed with the President's decision regarding DACA, to take away the promise of possibility that DACA provided young people who were brought to this country as children—many of them just months old—by their parents and have grown up

here. They work here. They go to school here. They contribute to the quality, to the greatness of this country.

The one thing I did believe is right that the President said was that Congress ought to act. I have sat here and watched us name post offices, bring back legislation that we have passed in previous Congresses on suspension and brought them to the floor and debated them for hours. We have time in this House to stand up for 800,000 young people and give them hope that they deserve, to show that this country is as great as we say it is.

When the Speaker was elected, he said he would open up the process. Here is my challenge: Bring the Dream Act to the floor of the House of Representatives. If you believe these DREAMers should be deported, then vote "no," but give them a vote on the floor of this House. That is the moral thing to do, and we should do it now.

**KEEP OUR GOVERNMENT FUNCTIONING EFFICIENTLY AND EFFECTIVELY**

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

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Make America Secure and Prosperous Appropriations Act that the House is considering. This bill is a package of legislation that the Appropriations Committee has diligently worked on over the last several months that will fund our domestic and national security priorities.

This is legislation that prioritizes conservative policies, invests in proven and effective programs, and reduces unnecessary and wasteful spending. It will fund the government in a fiscally responsible way, keeping a lid on spending as we have since taking the House majority in 2010.

It will continue our work of rolling back burdensome, job-killing policies to help our economy grow even faster than we have seen over the last 7 months when we have added more than 1 million jobs.

It includes many items that the House has already passed this summer, like the largest pay raise for our troops in 8 years and the most funding to care for our veterans in our Nation's history.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure to keep our government functioning efficiently and effectively for the American people.

**CULTURE OF CORRUPTION AT WELLS FARGO**

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

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, Wells Fargo is the Nation's third largest bank, with nearly \$2 trillion in assets. In the past several



months, Wells Fargo has engaged in blatant and systemic fraud perpetrated against millions of its own customers by opening fee-generating accounts without customer authorization, changing mortgage terms without customer knowledge, and forcing Wells Fargo auto loan customers into costly insurance products they did not need or want.

Mr. Speaker, Wells Fargo has demonstrated a blatant, egregious culture of corruption, costing their customers tens of millions of dollars in unauthorized fees and financial hardship.

Today I am calling on the Federal Housing Administration to ban, to immediately declare ineligible, Wells Fargo from participation in the Federal mortgage guarantee program. Wells Fargo has violated its public trust and that of millions of its own customers and clients.

#### HONORING THE LIFE AND SERVICE OF FORMER CONGRESSMAN VERN EHLERS

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

Mr. AMASH. Mr. Speaker, with great sadness, the people of west Michigan learned of the recent passing of former Congressman Vern Ehlers.

Vern was a humble man who served our community with honor. Early in his life, Vern moved to Grand Rapids to attend Calvin College. After earning his Ph.D. at Berkeley, he returned to help launch, and later chair, Calvin's Physics Department. His passion for science, technology, and the environment came to define his time at Calvin and tenure in Congress.

In 1993, Vern was elected to Congress and served until his retirement in 2010. Vern was the first research physicist in Congress, and his impressive background contributed to his many achievements.

Vern was a member of the Committees on Education and the Workforce; Science, Space, and Technology; and Transportation and Infrastructure. He served as chairman of the Committee on House Administration, and his portrait now hangs in the committee's main hearing room.

I have staff who worked for Vern, and they all admired his compassion, independent thinking, and nonpartisan record. Colleagues often referred to him as "the smartest man in Congress."

Vern lived as commanded in Micah 6:8: "To act justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with Your God." He placed his hands on this verse each time he was sworn in.

Our community will endeavor always to honor his legacy.

My deepest condolences go out to Vern's wife, Johanna, his children and grandchildren, and to everyone whose lives he touched. May his memory be eternal.

#### SUPPORT THE DREAMERS

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

Mrs. MURPHY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of DREAMers.

When I was just a baby, my parents brought me to this country because they sought freedom, opportunity, and a better life for our family. As a parent now, I know how they must have felt because I, too, would do anything for my children, no matter the risk. That parental instinct to give our children better opportunities than we had is universal and powerful.

DREAMers were brought to this country as children by families who sought a better life. They were just kids and had no role in the decision to leave their native country, and they have done nothing wrong. They demonstrate one of our Nation's most basic promises: the American Dream is available to anyone who is willing to work for it.

The President's decision this week to end DACA will tear families apart. Worse yet, it punishes children who have done nothing to deserve punishment. It is immoral and wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you bring the Dream Act to the floor so we can enact an enduring solution for the 800,000 aspiring Americans who would be hurt by the President's decision.

#### AMERICAN FAMILIES DESERVE ATTENTION AND SUPPORT

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, we have heard a lot about DREAMers today, and we will continue to hear that.

Let us note that we are talking about inviting millions of people to send their children to the United States, millions from around this hemisphere who live in poverty and oppression, and we are saying: If you can get your kids to the United States, they are going to be taken care of.

We have limited resources here, limited in the Federal Government. Our people of every race and every religion and every ethnic group that make up the American family deserve to know that we are caring about them—I am sorry—rather than the children in other countries that come here illegally.

We can expect a flood of new young people if we legalize this, and they will be consuming the healthcare dollars. They will be consuming the education dollars that should go to American children.

This is not being selfish by saying take care of your family first. The American family deserves our attention and our support. We should not be extracting resources, bidding down

their wages, extracting the resources of education and healthcare for people who have come here illegally and invite more people to flood into our country.

No, the DREAMers concept is a nightmare for American young people.

#### HONORING THE SERVICE OF JAMES ANDREWS

(Ms. ADAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor James Andrews, president of the North Carolina AFL-CIO. After four decades of service, James will be retiring on September 15.

He has been a leader since a young age, and while serving our country in Vietnam, he earned a Purple Heart for his brave service.

Upon his return, James organized fellow workers at a plant in Henderson, North Carolina, before joining the AFL-CIO in 1974 as a director of Frontlash, an AFL-CIO youth group. Just a year later, the AFL-CIO recognized James' dedication to the fight for fair working conditions and promoted him to outreach director for the North Carolina federation, making him the first African American to hold a paid, full-time staff position with the State AFL-CIO federation.

After a brief stint working for his union in 1982, he began his position as the treasurer and secretary for North Carolina's AFL-CIO. A little over a decade later, James was elected as president and became the first African American to lead a State federation.

As his service draws to a close, we want to both congratulate and honor him for his unparalleled work on behalf of North Carolina's hardworking families.

James, congratulations, and thank you for your hard work.

#### COMMEMORATING THE LIFE OF KENDRA MURRAY ADAMS

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to commemorate the life of Mrs. Kendra Murray Adams, a loving mother, a wife, daughter, sister, and friend to many, myself included.

I first got to know Kendra when she joined my office in 2005 as an executive assistant. She was a blonde bombshell who was quick-witted, strong-willed, but just as quick to laugh with you and at you, if needed.

Effortlessly funny and graciously caring, it was a joy to get to know her and to have a front row seat to see how this marvelous young lady lived life. Even now, I struggle to find the words to convey how much of a joy and honor it was to know Kendra and to be known by Kendra.

Whether you knew her for years, or just got to meet her, you got the best

of her from minute one. Kendra may have left my office, but she never left my heart.

Sadly, at the end of July, Kendra lost her battle with cancer at the tender age of 39. And although my heart is heavy, I am recalling the final words written by Kendra before her death, where she urged those who loved her to not mourn, but to “live life, to go to the beach, go rock climbing, skydiving, do what you want to do.” This exemplifies her spirit, her courage, and her life which, unfortunately, ended too soon.

Kendra is survived by her beloved twins, her husband, her father, her sister, and my thoughts and prayers are with her and her family and friends. I loved her dearly, and I will miss her deeply and will always remember her.

#### PROTECTING DACA

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the 800,000 DREAMers in our Nation, 200,000 in my State of California.

Now, these DREAMers are students, entrepreneurs, volunteers, and neighbors. They go to school, they work, and they pay taxes. They are young men and women like my constituent, Karem, a DREAMer who recently graduated from the University of California at Berkeley.

Karem now works as a paralegal, helping people like herself navigate our complicated immigration system. Karem came to America when she was only 3 years old.

In a message to my office, she wrote: “The United States is all I’ve ever known.”

I have to tell you, she is as American as I am. Forcing Karem or any hard-working DREAMer out of this country or back into the shadows is heartless and un-American. This is her home.

Deporting DREAMers from the only country they have ever known is an extreme betrayal of our values. We care about family values. Ending DACA breaks families up.

Let me be clear: Now President Trump has turned his back on these innocent young people. Now it is up to Congress to have the courage to do the right thing. I call on Speaker RYAN to bring up the bipartisan and bicameral Dream Act now.

#### PROVIDING FOR FURTHER CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3354, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 504 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 504

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant

to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes.

SEC. 2. (a) No further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution, and available pro forma amendments described in section 4 of House Resolution 500.

(b) Each further amendment printed in the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment except amendments described in section 4 of House Resolution 500, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(c) All points of order against further amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules or against amendments en bloc described in section 3 of this resolution are waived.

SEC. 3. It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of further amendments printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this section shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment except amendments described in section 4 of House Resolution 500, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

SEC. 4. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill, as amended, to the House with such further amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1245

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, it is going to be a good day. It is going to be a good day.

I don’t know if you came down to Washington as a young man. I remember sitting right up there on the second row of the gallery, and I came into the Chamber and I was so excited. It was my first visit to see the people’s House.

The Reading Clerk was standing there at that podium and read and read. I had absolutely no idea what was going on, and here nobody hands you a pamphlet or anything to tell you what is happening on the floor of the House. I thought the activity was going to happen down here, and it was all going on up there at the podium.

That has been 40 years ago now. I now see that however long that conversation happens, it lays the groundwork for what is going to be an even greater conversation here on the floor of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I am fond of saying that if you come to this institution on the right day, you are going to see a festival of democracy take place right here. Today is going to be one of those days.

If you were on the House floor yesterday, you saw us take up the first of these divisions in this appropriations bill. Today, because of the work that my friend from New York and I did with the rest of the members of the Rules Committee right up there last night, we are bringing to the floor the remaining four divisions of H.R. 3354; 224 additional amendments. Division A is the Interior section; division C is the Commerce, Justice, Science section; division D is the Financial Services section; division F is the Labor, HHS, and Education section.

When I was on the floor yesterday, Mr. Speaker, I talked about how proud I was of the work that we have all done here together. This annual appropriations process has been conducted in a more comprehensive fashion this year than in any other year in my memory.

When we get jammed, you end up with one of those long-term, yearlong continuing resolutions that shut out every Member’s voice. In a good year, maybe, you end up with one of those giant leadership-negotiated White House and the leader of the House and the Senate omnibus appropriations bills that shut out all but two or three voices.

This year, the Appropriations Committee, beginning its work way back in April, has worked through every single appropriations bill one by one at the committee level, and we are seeing the culmination of that effort here on the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, it has been since 2010 that the House has finished its work before the September 30 fiscal year deadline. It was the 2009 calendar year. They were doing the work for the 2010 fiscal year. It is hard to get this done, and it doesn’t happen because Democrats are successful or Republicans are

successful. It happens because the collaboration that we have together is successful, and we are seeing the result of that today.

If we pass the underlying rule, we will make in order those 224 amendments, we will begin that process of debating the last four divisions, and we will have the voices of this House heard.

We went until midnight last night, Mr. Speaker. We went until midnight the night before that. I suspect midnight is going to seem early to us where we are headed over the next couple of days. But at the end of that process, Republicans, Democrats, folks from all regions of the country, are going to be able to look each other in the eye and know that—in a way that makes folks back home proud—we worked through each and every appropriations bill and we got our work done on time.

That is why I ran for Congress, Mr. Speaker, to deliver results back home, and that is why I am proud to be standing with my friend from New York today delivering on those promises.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman from Georgia, my good friend, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, what is happening with the appropriations bills is unprecedented. After passing four appropriations bills earlier this year, we are now considering the remaining eight appropriations bills this week in 2 days. That means that we are debating the funding for roughly two-thirds of discretionary Federal spending bills in just over 4 days.

Has any Member here really had the time to read all 1,035 pages of these eight bills? Better yet, has anyone had time to read nearly all the thousand amendments and determine what the impact of each one would be?

This is the appropriations process we are talking about; the process that used to take us days and weeks and was perfectly open so that all Members of the House were able to propose amendments on the floor. These are the bills that fund programs that impact the life of every American every single day.

But we are not giving them any serious consideration they deserve, and the minority has been virtually, literally, I would say, shut out of the process altogether.

When the majority took control of Congress and the White House, they promised regular order. They have not only broken that promise, they have shattered it and stomped on it. Speaker RYAN is the only speaker in the history of tracking statistics to never have had a truly open rule.

An open rule would allow any Member to offer an amendment that complies with the standing rules of the House and the Budget Act. Not a single

one. A bad process, I believe, will lead to a bad product, and these bills are no exception. They are full of provisions that would do real harm to millions of Americans.

Inside these bills, the Dodd-Frank financial reform law, passed in the wake of the biggest recession since the Great Depression, would be tattered. The biggest banks still in control of the people who got us in trouble in the first place would be allowed to run roughshod over the economy again, paving the way for another Great Recession or worse.

Try as we could to find out what would be the substitute for Dodd-Frank to prevent them from doing that again, there is no answer they would be able to do it. Under Dodd-Frank, we have had a record-setting streak of more than 80 consecutive months of private sector job growth. Mr. Speaker, this growth didn't come despite this law; it came because of it.

There is also language here that would ramp up the majority's assault on women's health; provisions that would zero out funding for Title X, the Nation's only Federal program devoted to family planning. More than 4 million women depend on it for access to contraception.

The bills would also eliminate funding for Planned Parenthood, which serves 2.5 million women and men every year. It is relied on not just for contraception, but for services like breast cancer screenings, wellness visits, and STI testing.

The bills would be truly destructive if they ever became law. They don't appear to have the necessary votes to pass the Senate, since there are not 60 Senators willing to vote for this legislation, and that would make one wonder why are we even going through this charade, because we have only 9 legislative days left in the month of September. During those 9 days, we need to raise the debt ceiling to pay the bills we have already incurred, to fund the government for the following year, to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program; the Perkins Loan Program, which many low-income students rely on for their college education; and, very importantly, the Federal Aviation Administration. All of those expire on September 30.

We also need to address the National Flood Insurance Program, which, on its current course, faces a shortfall of more than \$25 billion. And that will expire at the end of this month. We all know the horror of going through Hurricane Harvey, and now Irma, and with two more, as I understand it, starting their aim at us in the Atlantic.

If we are going to do all of this, we have to get back to the orderly and thoughtful process. Congress can't wait for a disaster to always be at its doorstep before acting. We need to abandon legislation by chaos or emergency, which we often do for something that we could have done by scheduling.

Two-thirds of the discretionary spending bills considered in a single

week is absurd and irresponsible, and I would doubt has ever taken place before in the House of Representatives. It is time we took control of the House and got back to regular order, which we talk about all the time, but hardly anybody remembers. We hope for a better day, and we hope for it soon.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

My friend is absolutely right, there is a lot of work to get done. That is why we both ran for Congress, to get that work done. I am incredibly optimistic that we will get that work done.

I wish from time to time we would celebrate our successes as fiercely as we observe our failures. My friend is absolutely right, there was a time in congressional history where appropriations bills came to the floor and any Member could offer any amendment they wanted at any time, and the process could go on for days or weeks or months.

To my friend's point, we can reminisce about those days and celebrate them, but we can't do it at the same time we observe the very limited deadlines that we have now trying to get work done.

It was back on August 24 that the Rules Committee created a deadline and said: We want to have every Member have their voice heard. We want to hear from every single Member on every single appropriations bill to understand what it is you would do differently to have the bills serve America better.

We created that deadline, Mr. Speaker, for exactly the reason my friend from New York suggested, and that is so folks would have the time to look at those amendments, to digest those amendments, to be thoughtful about those amendments.

Now, it turns out even in a body of 435 Members, you can have some repetitive ideas. It turns out a lot of us think a single amendment is a good idea. The Rules Committee looked at amendments and found multiple Members had exactly the same idea. In order to speed the process along, we let one of those Members offer the amendment; we asked the other Members not to.

That is not closing down the process. That is a good use of the American people's time, because we have so much that we must get done together.

Mr. Speaker, for folks who care about openness—and I am one of those Members—I just want to remind you that it is not just the 1,000-plus amendments we looked at in the Rules Committee. It is thousands upon thousands that were worked through the Appropriations Subcommittee process, and then the Appropriations full committee process.

□ 1300

The appropriations process is one of the best opportunities for any Member

in this Chamber to make their priorities known, act on those priorities, change the law of the land for the men and women they serve back home. Every single Member of this Chamber knows of that process, avails themselves of that process, and if we pass this rule, we will make several hundred more amendments in order and complete this process for the first time since 2009.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. ROSEN).

Ms. ROSEN. Mr. Speaker, I am disgusted by House Republicans' continued efforts to end DACA and help this heartless administration tear families apart. Yesterday, House Republicans had a chance to rectify the Trump Administration's despicable decision to betray DREAMers in Nevada and across this country.

Instead, they chose to block the immediate consideration of the bipartisan Dream Act. And then last night, House Republicans in the Rules Committee doubled down on this President's cowardly assault on DREAMers by blocking an amendment that I helped file with my colleagues JULIA BROWNLEY and LUIS CORREA.

That would have prohibited funds from being used to deport DACA recipients. In Nevada, DACA has allowed more than 13,000 young people to come forward, pass background checks, and live and work legally. These young men and women who are brought here as children are patriotic and brave. They include college students, members of our military, and so many others who are contributing to our society.

They fear they will be taken from their homes and their families torn apart. President Trump's decision to end DACA is an affront to everything our Nation stands for and only cements his legacy of shortsighted cruelty.

House Republicans ought to be ashamed of themselves for helping this administration push DREAMers one step closer to deportation. I will continue to fight for our values, our principles, because as Americans, we do not turn our backs on people who represent the best of our Nation.

We must take the Dream Act up without delay.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PALMER). Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. ROHRABACHER), one of our leaders from the great State of California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank you very much for providing me this time. I rise in opposition to this rule, which prohibits a vote of the House of Representatives on an amendment that would prevent the Department of Justice from using its power

and resources to supersede all State laws that have legalized the medical use of cannabis.

For 3 years, States have been shielded from having the will of their voters and their people by a prohibition on the Department of Justice that would prevent the Department of Justice from thwarting the will of the people of the States by superceding those State laws when they have determined in the States that the medical use of marijuana should be permitted with their citizens.

The Rules Committee has, thus, been basically—it will be changing the law of the land for 3 years where the 50 States have been permitted, if they so chose, to have the medical use of marijuana.

After this vote, because of this rule, we have been prevented from again providing that prohibition that passed this House on a number of occasions that would prohibit the Department of Justice from superceding State law. In short, a vote for this rule is anti-States' rights. A vote for this rule is against permitting the people of your State to legalize the medical use of marijuana if the Federal Government, if the DOJ, decides.

A vote for this rule will, thus, prevent medical use of cannabis by our doctors in States that would like to permit their people to benefit from illegal use of medical marijuana. Instead, those doctors now will, as they have been, prescribing opiates. That is right, opiates. Our people have ended up being prescribed opiates because marijuana has not been an option.

It is a vote to cut off our veterans, and our seniors with arthritis, those people who have children who are plagued with seizures, all of these things now are permitted in the States where they have legalized the medical use of marijuana. These people are provided an avenue to at least try this as a method of dealing with these horrible maladies that they have to deal with in their lives, whether they are seizures, or whether they are people who have arthritis, or whether they are our veterans who are coming back.

We need to make sure that the billions of dollars that right now are being invested in medical marijuana businesses and clinics throughout our country, those billions of dollars will go to the benefit of our people. Instead, this rule prevents us from standing in the way of the Justice Department from obliterating those rights in the States.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOODALL. I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, so a vote against this rule is a vote to permit those States to make that decision. The rule, as it is now, prevents us from getting in the way of the Justice Department's obliteration of these rights.

But one of the most important things, whether it is States' rights, or whether it is trying to listen to the seniors who are begging for us to give them some relief from some of their suffering and let them at least try this if the doctors so prescribe, but let us just remember this: that billions of dollars, \$3 billion or \$4 billion have been invested in this industry to provide honest businessmen and doctors the right to try medical marijuana on some of these maladies.

Those \$3 billion will immediately be transferred to the drug cartels in Mexico if this rule goes through. That is what it means. Now, I would suggest that whether it is opiates, or the drug lords down in Mexico, we need to side with the States' rights to make this determination and decide—and to make our determination to let the people decide in those States and let them have the choice there.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule for those reasons.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 3440, the Dream Act, this bipartisan, bicameral legislation. We have thousands of young people who are Americans in every way except on paper.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from New York?

There was no objection.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, in the past 5 years, the DACA program has given nearly 800,000 young men and women who came here as children, and have only known the United States as their home, a shot at the American Dream. It rightfully allowed them to come forward to live, work, and learn in the United States legally, and without fear of deportation.

President Trump, this week, made his most heartless decision yesterday by cruelly rescinding DACA protection for these young DREAMers. These DREAMers now face the painful reality of a President betraying their trust, forcing them back into the shadows, and kicking them out of their homes.

These kids put their faith in our government to protect them. They underwent rigorous background checks and paid the required fees, all for an opportunity to better themselves and their communities. And we are failing them.

I share a similar story as many of these DREAMers. I emigrated to the United States with my parents as a 5-year-old boy from Mexico. This great country since has given me the opportunity to work hard, raise my two children, and serve my country in local

government, the military, and here in Congress.

Terminating DACA and stripping DREAMers of that same hope and opportunity is unconscionable and incompatible with our American values. We are a nation of immigrants and are made stronger by their contributions. Following the President's shameful decision this week, Congress must take action and pass the bipartisan Dream Act which would provide a permanent legislative solution to allow DREAMers to remain in the United States and continue to contribute to our Nation's future.

They are our neighbors, our children's classmates, our coworkers. These are all hardworking and law-abiding individuals. We cannot afford to abandon DACA recipients who have lived in America all of their lives and contribute to this country in many ways.

Ending this program undermines our economic growth and competitiveness, costing our economy \$490 billion in lost GDP over the next decade, in addition to losing potential innovation and entrepreneurship.

This House has already passed the DREAM Act in 2010, and a majority of Senators also supported this legislation. However, it fell short with a filibuster from then-Senator Jeff Sessions, the same Attorney General who announced the termination of DACA this week.

This Congress must now ensure the well-being and future of these 800,000 youth living and working in the United States. I urge my colleagues to stand up for DREAMers by bringing H.R. 3440, the bipartisan Dream Act, immediately to the floor for a vote.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that admonition. As my friends all know, the truth is, the vote in the Senate was a bipartisan vote against the consideration of that bill.

We are going to find a bipartisan solution to this difficult problem and continuing to characterize this as a partisan issue does nothing but harm to our shared cause.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Mrs. ROBY), one of the great leaders of the big freshman class in 2010.

Mrs. ROBY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support the Make America Secure and Prosperous Appropriations Act, and I encourage my colleagues to support this rule.

As a pro-life conservative, I have long fought to make sure that taxpayers' dollars aren't being used to fund abortions or to fund abortion providers. Whether it is in the Appropriations Committee or here on the House floor, I have repeatedly made the cause for increasing protections for life under

the law. Those fights haven't always been easy, and we haven't won every time. But Mr. Speaker, I am pleased that the appropriations bill before us does contain important pro-life provisions.

First, the bill states: "None of the funds made available by this act may be used to conduct or support research using human fetal tissue if such tissue is obtained pursuant to an induced abortion."

We all remember the 2015 scandal that revealed how Planned Parenthood officials were systematically altering abortion procedures in order to preserve the organs of babies to sell them to researchers. I said it at that time, and you don't have to be staunchly pro-life like me to be appalled by the thought of harvesting and trafficking aborted babies' body parts for profit.

Our bill will prevent these atrocities from removing any incentives abortion providers might have to harvest and sell babies' organs. Instead, the bill directs agencies to find research using modern, more efficient alternatives to human fetal tissue.

To be clear, I am a strong supporter of the National Institutes of Health. Their research is critical for development of lifesaving medical breakthroughs. However, I believe we must set a clear line of distinction between what is acceptable and what is not.

Second, the bill expressly prohibits the Department of Health and Human Services from steering Title X public health funding to abortion providers. Of course, the Hyde amendment has long made it against the law to actually pay for abortions with taxpayer dollars. But the Obama administration had a bad habit of pushing hundreds of millions of dollars to Planned Parenthood in forms of grants and reimbursements for other services. This amounts to a pipeline of funding propping up the Nation's largest abortion provider. It is an abuse of taxpayer money, and I am pleased that this bill cuts it off.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my chairman, TOM COLE, for including these important pro-life provisions in our base bill for the first time.

□ 1315

It represents real progress for the pro-life movement, and I will continue to fight to see it through the process.

Mr. Speaker, I am unapologetically pro-life, and I believe that every human life is precious and our laws and policies should reflect that.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank our ranking member for yielding and, really, for her tireless advocacy on behalf of all Americans.

I rise in strong opposition to this rule and the underlying bill, the so-called Make America Secure and Prosperous Appropriations Act.

Mr. Speaker, let's make one thing clear: this bill breaks Republicans' promise to get back to regular order, while blocking the majority of amendments to be considered on the floor. Also, as an African-American woman, I can't help but see how these cuts impact communities of color.

It may be easy to think of budgets in terms of dollar signs and decimal points, but the disturbing truth is that the decisions we make here affect lives. If we are honest, many of these decisions in this bill disproportionately affect Black and Brown lives.

For instance, the bill eliminates the Teen Pregnancy Prevention Initiative, the Racial and Ethnic Approaches to Communities Health Program—just eliminates it—and Title X family planning, which many women of color and men rely on. It eliminates the Health and Career Opportunities Program, which provides training and grants for health careers for minority-serving institutions, and it eliminates the Minority AIDS Initiative, just to name a few. These are just under the Health and Human Services provision.

This bill cuts \$3 billion from the Pell Grant Surplus Program, \$190 million in 21st Century Community Schools, and eliminates the comprehensive literacy program. All of these are critical education programs that predominantly help people and students of color.

I am also disappointed that this bill divests in our workforce, especially for communities of color, by eliminating the proven apprenticeship programs and cutting millions of our Nation's job training programs, including reintegration of ex-offenders—again, majority African-American and Latino ex-offenders—reentering into society. This budget cuts millions from that.

It refuses to make in order Congressman BOBBY SCOTT's amendment to strike the prohibition against using Federal funds for transportation to desegregate public schools. We are talking, still, about desegregating public schools in 2017.

What is worse, I offered an amendment in Rules to combat these devastating cuts to communities of color, and Republicans refused to make them in order. I offered an amendment that would have prohibited funds from being used to implement the policy memo that Attorney General Sessions has presented that rolls back the failed War on Drugs and reinstates the harshest sentences for low-level drug offenses, the majority of whom—guess what—are African Americans.

I offered another amendment that would have expressed the sense of Congress that race-conscious admissions policies, which are designed to achieve a more diverse student body, which allows for the use of race as one factor, only one factor, in admissions—these policies, we have to remember, are beneficial to all students. So the Department of Justice should not take action to limit these benefits.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New York has 16 minutes remaining.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentlewoman from California an additional 1 minute.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding another minute.

Mr. Speaker, we should not be trying to limit students of color access to education, which the Justice Department is trying to do. Affirmative action is critical to mitigating discriminatory practices that prevent students of color from being admitted into the schools of their choice. Attorney General Sessions needs to back off of this. I tried to do this through an amendment to send that message. Of course, that amendment was not made in order.

Congress can help, though, renew their faith in minority communities, and the minority communities can renew their faith in Congress by not accepting this Trump agenda and support clear policies that demonstrate to people of color that our lives also matter in America. Unfortunately, this spending bill does just the opposite.

So I hope the Members will understand the message that we are sending to communities of color. I just mentioned a few of the cuts that have been put into this bill. I hope that we work to rectify the problems with it.

It is past time to get back to regular order. It is past time to move each bill individually, also. It is past time to make strong investments in the American people, which include people of color. It is past time to help grow the economy and to create good-paying jobs for everyone.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the rule and “no” on the underlying bill. There is simply too much at stake.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the comments of my friend from California. She is absolutely right. When Republicans took control of this Chamber, they committed themselves to having a more open process. I was a part of that freshman class that came in to give Republicans a majority, and we have made good on that process. I want to talk about that just for a little bit.

My friend from California serves on the Appropriations Committee, and I thank her for her service, Mr. Speaker. When you want to talk about an open process, that Appropriations Committee went through every single bill one subcommittee at a time, hour after hour, day after day, week after week, indeed, month after month. I am grateful to her for that service. The bill would not be as good as it is but for the men and women who serve on the Appropriations Committee.

But I mentioned earlier, Mr. Speaker, that one of the reasons I was proud to

be carrying the rule today is that we haven’t gotten the appropriations process completed on time since Democratic leadership was able to achieve that back in 2009. They couldn’t do it in their last year in power, 2010. In fact, they didn’t do the appropriations bills at all. They punted it off to the next Republican Congress. But in 2009 they did.

When I talk about that commitment to openness, let’s remember, last time we had this shared success together and my friends on the other side of the aisle were leading, they allowed 17 amendments to the Financial Services bill. We are allowing twice that many today.

When my friends were leading this institution the last time we completed this process, they allowed 13 amendments to the Interior bill. We are allowing six times that many.

When my friends on the other side of the aisle were leading this institution, the last time we successfully completed this process, they allowed five amendments to the Labor-HHS. We are allowing 10 times that many.

When my friends on the other side of the aisle were leading this institution, the last time we successfully completed this process on time, they allowed zero amendments to the Commerce-Justice-Science bill. We allow 49—infinity more.

My friends, can we always do better together? We can. I am grateful to my friends for the hard work they put in showing up day after day to do that better. But this bill is better, and if we pass this rule, we will move to the debate on this bill, and we will complete this process on time in the most open fashion that any of my colleagues have seen in decades.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 2 minutes.

I am really very fond of my colleague over there, and I appreciate his wonderful sunshine attitude.

The fact is we have never seen anything like what we are going through now. Twice, in just the last few months, one amendment by Ms. LEE, to finally get an AUMF so that we could authorize the wars that seem to be going on forever in the name of the United States of America was voted on in committee, passed in committee, and should have been in the bill. Lo and behold, it disappeared. I don’t think we ever did anything like that to my knowledge, and if we did, shame on us.

In this very bill today, there was, again, an amendment presented in committee for the DACA people to be able to get jobs while they are waiting with the Federal Government. I am paraphrasing that because I never saw it, but that is my understanding of what that did. Once again, it was presented at the committee, voted, passed, and should have been in this bill. But before it got to Rules, just like Ms. LEE’s amendment, it just disappeared.

How can you run the Government of the United States by saying that the people do their will through us? We are not sitting here to represent ourselves and do what we want to do and take one from column A and one from column B. We follow rules. That is what we are supposed to do. We have to answer for that.

I want the people of the United States to know that what we are talking about here today is probably not going anywhere. As far as we know, it will not get past the Senate. Now, some miracle may happen. Who knows? Or maybe the whole thing will disappear—I don’t know—with no explanation, by the way.

But we haven’t really done anything here yet except what I would call a crazy amalgamation of what the rules of the House wouldn’t even come close to allowing us to do. Any body, any Congress, any House of Representatives, any legislature anywhere can do what they have to do to get their budget ready if they throw it all in one mix and let one committee, the Appropriations Committee, do it. The other committees had no right to talk about it.

As I pointed out, again, the majority has really cut out the minority completely. Do you think we knew before it got to Rules that those two amendments that I talked about that were terribly important had disappeared? We didn’t know that until it was given to us.

Many times what we get at Rules are emergency meetings, which means one thing: no committee action. We have decided we would like to do this one this week, so let’s call it an emergency.

Enough. Enough already. This is the premier legislative body in the world. The hopes, the dreams, and the aspirations of all Americans lie in this House. We do or we do not do what is in the best interests of the people who sent us here. I promise you it is not in the best interests to cut out all of the population of the United States—about half, almost half. In fact, I believe numerically we got more votes than the other side—just cut us out of the process.

I have already talked about no open rules. If you can’t have an open rule whereby you can talk about amendments, there is nothing else for you to do. We are out of it because Democrats get very few amendments. I don’t think the Rules Committee people get hardly any at all, and then we beg for some of the best ones we would like to be made into order—never happens.

We are pretty discouraged. As a matter of fact, we were talking about maybe we should stage a coup, but I know that is illegal and would not work in the United States of America. So it was kind of a fleeting thought brought about by pure frustration.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. SCOTT had a wonderful amendment. He is the ranking member on the Education and the Workforce Committee and is known throughout the United States for the



work that he does, as is BARBARA LEE, who is probably more well known than almost any other Member of this House. To be treated that way, to have to go back to her district and say, "Well, we tried to do these amendments"—enough already.

We can do it the right way. We used to. When I got here, it was entirely different. The bipartisanship was strong. We all liked each other. It was a pretty wonderful thing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), whose amendments should have been allowed.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the number of amendments that were made in order by the Rules Committee, but I am appalled that the majority chose not to include one of my amendments, No. 63, to division F of H.R. 3354, which would strike a prohibition against using Federal funds for the purpose of transportation needed to desegregate public schools. This language has found its way into every appropriations act since at least 1974.

The language in sections 301 and 302 of division F of the bill really represent a relic of an ugly history when States and school districts across the Nation resisted meaningful integration of public education for decades after the Supreme Court's ruling in *Brown v. Board of Education*. That resistance has worked.

According to the GAO last year, our schools are more segregated by race and class today than they were in 1968. The persistence of these riders, if unchallenged, is morally reprehensible and has no place in 2017. I stand with the Congressional Black Caucus in calling for a total removal of this offensive language in any fiscal 2018 appropriations act.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have a long and proud history in this House, but it is sometimes tough to remember exactly how that history goes, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1330

My friend from New York has her picture up on the wall in the Rules Committee room. If you haven't been up there, Mr. Speaker, you should go see it.

My friend from New York is the first woman to have ever led the United States House of Representatives Rules Committee. She led it ably and proudly for the 4 years that the Democrats were in the majority the last decade.

It is a hard job because, as the chairman of the Rules Committee or the chairwoman of the Rules Committee, you have to make decisions. When the bills come to you from the committees of jurisdiction—the authorizing committees—you often have to completely reorganize those bills. You have to meld those bills together. It is a power-

ful committee because it has a solemn responsibility.

Yes, in the area of Rules Committee jurisdiction and the melding of all of those pieces of legislation is what amendments get added and what amendments get taken away.

My friend from California (Ms. LEE), has an absolutely legitimate gripe, as does my friend from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT). Mr. Speaker, we all think our amendments are the greatest amendments to be known.

Mr. SCOTT led, to his credit, with saying: I am glad so many of my amendments were made in order, but I am appalled my one amendment was kept out.

We all want all of our amendments in. But to my friend from New York's comment that Democrats don't get a fair shake, I will remind you, Mr. Speaker, when my friend was leading the committee, the entire House of Representatives was offered 139 chances to change the appropriations bill in 2009, the last time we completed it.

With PAUL RYAN leading the institution, with my friend from Texas, Pete Sessions, leading the Rules Committee, we made 214 Democratic amendments in order. We have made more minority amendments in order in this process than my friends on the other side made in order for the entire House.

Mr. Speaker, we have nothing to fear from openness. We have nothing to fear from a robust debate. I am so glad that we have had a chance to do that. But history should be reported accurately. The accuracy is: we can always do better. But we are doing better today than we were just a few short years ago.

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

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are really getting somewhere here. What my colleague failed to say is, as far as I know and I imagine as far as he knows, that no committee has ever sent a bill to the Rules Committee completely taking away amendments that had passed in that committee and were legitimately a part of that bill.

In just the last, let's say, 2 or 3 months, two amendments legitimately passed by Democratic members in the proper committee disappeared between that committee and the Rules Committee. If that is not a violation of rules, I don't know how in the world you would ever describe it.

Sure, we had a lot of open rules—I mentioned PAUL RYAN has never had one—which gave everybody an opportunity to do an amendment, all 435 us, if we chose to, but we don't. When you talk about something coming to us from a committee, large bills sometimes don't come to us from committees, but oftentimes they are written somewhere—we are not sure where—but they come to us in an emergency procedure because they have to get to the floor that week.

I am not just talking about improving. I am talking about following the rules of procedure laid down by history, by circumstance, and by geniuses. I am talking about not appropriating those in ways that say: We just don't want that amendment on the list. Pretend it never happened. Throw it in the garbage and maybe nobody will remember it.

We remember. We think that some amendments are a few things that would really move the country forward, and we don't have a chance to get them put in place simply because we are the minority. That is absolutely wrong. It is undemocratic. It is hurtful to the institution and hurtful to America.

We can do better. You and I should pledge right now to work on that. I am game if you are.

Mr. WOODALL. Will the gentlewoman yield?

Ms. SLAUGHTER. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. WOODALL. I will say to my friend that I have no better days than the days that you and I are working together. I absolutely look forward to that.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Reclaiming my time, I don't want to see that anymore. It is an embarrassment when I have to even get up to do my half of the rule and talk about what awful things have happened to us. There are more things that I need to talk about than that.

I think we should cut out the games and the cuteness and all the rest of it and do our job.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND).

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Speaker, I stand here today, as a Member of the United States House of Representatives, embarrassed. At the same time that I am embarrassed, I am also dumbfounded.

I know that there are people at home that are thinking: Why would a Member of Congress, the most prestigious body in the world, be embarrassed, dumbfounded?

Well, I was always taught that if you show me your budget or if you show me your legislation, then you are showing me your values.

Representative SCOTT, my good friend from Virginia, had an amendment that would strike the prohibition that Federal funds could be used to desegregate our public schools in this country.

If you look at the GAO study, there are more schools now that are desegregated than in 1968. We can talk eloquently about the history of the House and what the Democrats did when they were in control and how many amendments were made in order. I am not talking about how many amendments. I am talking about a specific amendment, a specific issue.

We are perpetuating segregation in the United States of America in our

public schools. We are not allowing the States to use funds to promote integration and diversity among our schools.

My State—and I will own this—is still the only State under a Federal desegregation order, because we have not completely desegregated our schools. We still have that ugly history.

With everything going on in this country and school kids probably huddled around a TV right now watching this institution work and they are saying: These are our leaders? We elected them to run this country? Why wouldn't they want me to go to school with other kids of other races?

That is why I am embarrassed. It is wrong. I don't think we should just hide behind procedure, but address the issue and the moral failure and the message that we are sending to our children.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from New York that I do not have other speakers remaining, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

These bills don't have the support they need to pass the Senate. It takes 60 votes to even bring them to the floor. That means that this entire exercise this week has been an exercise in futility. All the while, the clock is ticking and Congress has so much to do, as I have elaborated several times this afternoon, over the next 9 legislative days.

If this process has been good for anything, it is revealing just how broken the legislative process has become under the majority's rule.

Legislation regularly comes to the House floor without any committee consideration. It just goes to rules. The majority even rammed through a healthcare repeal bill not long ago—I am sure everybody remembers that—that would impact one-sixth of our entire economy without first—what we need to do again in regular order—getting a score from the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office.

They are very important. They tell us what cost and what impact it would have on the budget and on the country. So that means we had no idea of the impact of that bill on our markets or what it would cost when voting for it.

The minority is routinely shut out of the process, often unable to get so much as a vote on an amendment on the House floor. When Speaker RYAN assumed the gavel, he promised to return to regular order and an open process. We have been waiting a mighty long time. Every time we offered an amendment to the bill before us in the Rules Committee, we asked that the rule be open; again, giving all Members a chance to affect that bill. Unanimously, we are voted against and we lose all those votes 9-4. That means that both sides will not be able to affect that bill and it means that regular order is as far away as it ever was.

Here we are, less than a month away from the end of the fiscal year, and we

haven't passed a budget resolution through the House. We were supposed to have a budget through the House, the Senate, and the conference—the conference is necessary to reconcile the House and Senate bills—by April 15.

We blew through the debt limit in March and still have not dealt with that. We have yet to have a single open rule in the Rules Committee under the Speaker's leadership. Believe me, I am sure that an awful lot of Members of this House have something to say about what is going on.

It is no wonder that, according to the latest figures from Gallup, 79 percent of the public disapproves of how Congress is doing its job. No wonder.

CBS News highlighted that it costs the taxpayers an estimated \$24 million a week to operate the House of Representatives. They know that they are not getting their money's worth.

They needed 60 votes to repeal and replace healthcare, when there was no replacement in sight. I am not sure how to describe that as a legislative proposal, but what it sounds like to me is a hoax. We are going to fool you that we have really got a replacement here.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the previous question, the rule, and the bill. I hope that my good colleague, Mr. WOODALL, and I can help fix this place to do a little better.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I don't dispute the polling numbers my friend from New York cites. In fact, I am as saddened by those numbers, as she is. But I also feel culpable; not culpable because of the work we are doing today—I think we should be proud—I feel culpable because we all find ourselves in conversations with one another where, instead of building the institution up, we run the institution down.

What my friend from New York said about Ms. LEE's amendment being changed in the Rules Committee, she is absolutely right, the amendment was changed. But, Mr. Speaker, let's be clear: it wasn't changed in some backroom deal with smoke-filled air where no one knows what is happening and can't read the bill. It was noticed. There was an entire paragraph dedicated to saying: Hey, this is unusual. This doesn't happen that often. We want all the cards on the table so everybody knows. Just understand we made this change this time around.

Mr. Speaker, getting the work done in this institution is hard. It leads to conflicting goals. You heard folks from the other side of the aisle say: We are not spending nearly enough time on this bill. We need to make even more amendments in order. And you heard folks on other side of the aisle say: This whole bill is an exercise in futility. I don't know why we are wasting even one moment on it.

It is tough to satisfy both of those concerns simultaneously.

We have got this rule book called the United States Constitution. It doesn't ask a whole lot of the United States Congress. It does ask us to appropriate the money. Under the leadership of both parties, Mr. Speaker, this House has failed to get that done on time year after year.

This year, the bipartisan Appropriations Committee in subcommittee, in full committee, worked tirelessly, as I said, not for days, not for weeks, but for months. One bill at a time. In fact, one line at a time.

That product was brought together by the Rules Committee last month, August 16, Mr. Speaker. That amalgamation of bills was posted on the internet for all the world to see and read. Every Member of this Congress had a chance to bring their ideas about how to make it better.

The Rules Committee got together, looked at those ideas, made more of those ideas in order for debate than we have seen in decades for bills that get completed on time.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentlewoman from New York.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. The Rules Committee did not get together. The majority of the Rules Committee got together. We had no action in that game whatsoever.

□ 1345

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I am always compelled to yield to my friend from New York because I am so fond of her and because her leadership has meant so much to this institution.

My friend has served on the Rules Committee for even longer than I have, and so my friend understands how the Rules Committee works even better than I do.

I don't want to engage my friend in a colloquy, at least not in my closing statement. We should have this conversation on day 1. Please, my friend from New York, give us one more word.

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Speaker, just to speak on accuracy: don't say the Rules Committee got together and went over those. Say the Rules Committee majority got together and went over those. You know, that is all I ask.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I welcome my friend's constructive counsel, but I know for a fact that her calendar looks just like mine does, and that means that we are going in in the early afternoon and we are not getting out till late at night.

Why? Because you and I are sitting just three Members apart listening to Member after Member make their case, and in the spirit of accuracy, don't let it be said that our Members coming and testifying doesn't make a difference because it does. You and I both believe that. We know it to be true, and it is important that it be true.

Those Members come and they testify, they make their case, and then we vote up or down on those amendments.

Mr. Speaker, can we do better? We can. And I will work with absolutely any colleague of any political stripe of any region to do better at any time, but let's do recognize that we made a commitment to ourselves to get this job done for the first time in a decade.

By coming to the floor right now, Mr. Speaker, quarter of 2 on a Thursday afternoon passing this rule, we are going to get this job done together for the first time in a long time.

Will we wake up tomorrow and try to do better? You know that we will. Should we take a moment to thank the folks who helped us get here? You know that we should.

Mr. Speaker, you are surrounded left and right by Members of the House team. The parliamentarians worked tirelessly to approve the amendments, to make sure they are all written and drafted properly. I want to thank the parliamentarian team for the work that they do.

Mr. Speaker, we kick CBO a lot in this place because we don't like their score one day, we like it the next. CBO has to go through these amendments, score these amendments. I am grateful to them for the work they did to make this possible.

Legislative counsel goes through, with each Member of Congress, making sure that every "i" is in the right place, every "t" is crossed. It is not a small task. It is a gargantuan task, and they do it on these big bills day in and day out. I am grateful for that.

You are starting to see some of the appropriators come down, Mr. Speaker. Long after my friend from New York and I have left this Chamber, the appropriations team is going to be here until the wee hours of the morning once again going through each and every line and each and every amendment.

I think about what my friend from Louisiana said about the school children who are turning on C-SPAN and watching this process. I don't know what they think goes into making this happen, but what I know goes into making this happen is a lot of hard work, staff work, Member work, a lot of big hearts, and a lot of big brains sitting down together hashing through these issues.

This rule is worth supporting. The underlying legislation is worth supporting, Mr. Speaker, and I ask all of my colleagues to do exactly that.

The material previously referred to by Ms. SLAUGHTER is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 504 OFFERED BY  
MS. SLAUGHTER

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 4. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3440) to authorize the cancellation of removal and adjustment of status of certain individuals who are long-term United States residents and who entered the United States as children and for

other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Judiciary. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 5. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3440.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is ENTITLED to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he

then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 186, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 457]

YEAS—227

Abraham	Comer	Graves (LA)
Aderholt	Comstock	Graves (MO)
Allen	Conaway	Griffith
Amash	Cook	Grothman
Amodel	Costello (PA)	Guthrie
Arrington	Cramer	Handel
Babin	Crawford	Harper
Bacon	Culberson	Harris
Banks (IN)	Davidson	Hartzler
Barletta	Davis, Rodney	Hensarling
Barr	Denham	Herrera Beutler
Barton	Dent	Hice, Jody B.
Bergman	DesJarlais	Higgins (LA)
Biggs	Donovan	Hill
Bilirakis	Duffy	Holding
Bishop (MI)	Duncan (SC)	Hollingsworth
Bishop (UT)	Duncan (TN)	Hudson
Black	Dunn	Huizenga
Blackburn	Emmer	Hultgren
Blum	Estes (KS)	Hunter
Bost	Farenthold	Hurd
Brady (TX)	Faso	Issa
Brat	Ferguson	Jenkins (KS)
Brooks (AL)	Fitzpatrick	Jenkins (WV)
Brooks (IN)	Fleischmann	Johnson (LA)
Buchanan	Flores	Johnson (OH)
Buck	Fortenberry	Johnson, Sam
Bucshon	Fox	Jones
Budd	Franks (AZ)	Jordan
Burgess	Frelinghuysen	Joyce (OH)
Byrne	Gaetz	Katko
Calvert	Gallagher	Kelly (MS)
Carter (GA)	Gianforte	Kelly (PA)
Carter (TX)	Gibbs	King (IA)
Chabot	Gohmert	King (NY)
Cheney	Goodlatte	Kinzinger
Coffman	Gosar	Knight
Cole	Gowdy	Kustoff (TN)
Collins (GA)	Granger	Labrador
Collins (NY)	Graves (GA)	LaHood

Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Lewis (MN)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Murphy (PA)  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Norman  
Nunes  
Olson

Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Roskam  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)

Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NAYS—186

Adams  
Aguilar  
Barragan  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Correa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Españat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)

Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Lujan, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks

Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Slofren  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suzuki  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Vargas

## NAYS—186

Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky

Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

Walz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch

Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NOT VOTING—20

Bridenstine  
Costa  
Crist  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
DeGette  
DeSantis

Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Garrett  
LaMalfa  
Lowenthal  
Posey  
Ros-Lehtinen

Ross  
Scalise  
Tsongas  
Wagner  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Webster (FL)

## □ 1412

Ms. PINGREE changed her vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ROKITA and Mrs. HARTZLER changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 190, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 458]

## YEAS—222

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Donovan

Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes (KS)  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Handel  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam

Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Lewis (MN)  
LoBiondo  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Murphy (PA)  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Norman  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry

Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Roskam  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford

Sanford  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton

Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

## NAYS—190

Adams  
Aguilar  
Amash  
Barragan  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Correa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Españat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Neal

Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowey  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Lujan, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal

Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rohrabacher  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suzuki  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth  
Young (AK)

## NOT VOTING—21

Bridenstine  
Costa  
Crist  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
DeGette  
DeSantis  
Deutch

Diaz-Balart  
Garrett  
LaMalfa  
Meadows  
Pelosi  
Posey  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross

Scalise  
Tsongas  
Wagner  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE  
The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING) (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1422

So the resolution was agreed to.  
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS  
ACT, 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 500 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3354.

Will the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1424

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. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, with Mr. PALMER 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. 88 printed in part B of House Report 115–295, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. KING) had been disposed of.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 115–295 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 71 by Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

Amendment No. 74 by Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD of California.

Amendment No. 75 by Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

Amendment No. 76 by Mr. CORREA of California.

Amendment No. 77 by Mr. HUNTER of California.

Amendment No. 80, as modified, by Mr. KING of Iowa.

Amendment No. 81 by Mr. CASTRO of Texas.

Amendment No. 84 by Ms. JAYAPAL of Washington.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 71 OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) on which further proceedings were post-

poned and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 205, noes 207, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 459]

AYES—205

Adams	Gallego	Neal
Aguilar	Garamendi	Nolan
Barragán	Gomez	Norcross
Barton	Gonzalez (TX)	O'Halleran
Bass	Gottheimer	O'Rourke
Beatty	Green, Al	Pallone
Bera	Green, Gene	Panetta
Beyer	Grijalva	Pascrell
Bishop (GA)	Gutiérrez	Payne
Blumenauer	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Blunt Rochester	Hastings	Peters
Bonamici	Heck	Peterson
Boyle, Brendan	Herrera Beutler	Pingree
F.	Higgins (NY)	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Himes	Poe (TX)
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Polis
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Bucshon	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Burgess	Jayapal	Raskin
Bustos	Jeffries	Reed
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Rice (NY)
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Richmond
Carbajal	Kaptur	Rosen
Cárdenas	Katko	Roybal-Allard
Carson (IN)	Keating	Ruiz
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Rush
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Kihuen	Sánchez
Ciulline	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schiff
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Schrader
Clyburn	Lance	Scott (VA)
Coffman	Langevin	Scott, David
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Serrano
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Lawrence	Shea-Porter
Cooper	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Correa	Lee	Sinema
Costello (PA)	Levin	Sires
Courtney	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Crowley	Lewis (MN)	Smith (NJ)
Cuellar	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Davis (CA)	Lipinski	Soto
Davis, Danny	LoBiondo	Speier
DeFazio	Loeb sack	Suozi
Delaney	Lofgren	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Takano
DelBene	Lowe y	Thompson (CA)
Demings	Lujan Grisham,	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	M.	Titus
Dingell	Luján, Ben Ray	Tonko
Doggett	Lynch	Torres
Doyle, Michael	MacArthur	Upton
F.	Maloney, Sean	Vargas
Dunn	Matsui	Veasey
Ellison	McCollum	Vela
Engel	McEachin	Velázquez
Eshoo	McGovern	Visclosky
Españalat	McNerney	Walz
Esty (CT)	Meehan	Waters, Maxine
Evans	Meeke s	Watson Coleman
Farenthold	Meng	Welch
Fitzpatrick	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Foster	Moulton	Woodall
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)	Yarmuth
Fudge	Nadler	
Gabbard	Napolitano	

NOES—207

Abraham	Amodei	Banks (IN)
Aderholt	Arrington	Barletta
Allen	Babin	Barr
Amash	Bacon	Bergman

Biggs	Harper	Paulsen
Bilirakis	Harris	Pearce
Bishop (MI)	Hartzler	Perry
Bishop (UT)	Hensarling	Pittenger
Black	Hice, Jody B.	Poliquin
Blackburn	Higgins (LA)	Ratcliffe
Blum	Hill	Reichert
Bost	Holding	Renacci
Brady (TX)	Hollingsworth	Rice (SC)
Brat	Hudson	Roby
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga	Roe (TN)
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Buchanan	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Buck	Hurd	Rohrabacher
Budd	Issa	Rokita
Byrne	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney, Francis
Calvert	Jenkins (WV)	Rooney, Thomas
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	J.
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Roskam
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Cheney	Jones	Rouzer
Cole	Jordan	Royce (CA)
Collins (GA)	Joyce (OH)	Russell
Collins (NY)	Kelly (MS)	Rutherford
Comer	Kelly (PA)	Sanford
Comstock	King (IA)	Schweikert
Conaway	King (NY)	Scott, Austin
Cook	Kinzinger	Sensenbrenner
Cramer	Knight	Sessions
Crawford	Kustoff (TN)	Shimkus
Culberson	Labrador	Shuster
Davidson	LaHood	Simpson
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Smith (MO)
Denham	Lamborn	Smith (NE)
Dent	Latta	Smith (TX)
DesJarlais	Long	Smucker
Donovan	Loudermilk	Stefanik
Duffy	Love	Stewart
Duncan (SC)	Lucas	Stivers
Duncan (TN)	Luetkemeyer	Taylor
Emmer	Marchant	Tenney
Estes (KS)	Marino	Thompson (PA)
Faso	Marshall	Thornberry
Ferguson	Massie	Tiberi
Fleischmann	Mast	Tipton
Flores	McCarthy	Trott
Fortenberry	McCaul	Turner
Fox	McClintock	Valadao
Franks (AZ)	McHenry	Walberg
Frelinghuysen	McKinley	Walden
Gaetz	McMorris	Walker
Gallagher	Rodgers	Walorski
Gianforte	McSally	Walters, Mimi
Gibbs	Messer	Weber (TX)
Gohmert	Mitchell	Wenstrup
Goodlatte	Moolenaar	Westerman
Gosar	Mooney (WV)	Williams
Gowdy	Mullin	Wilson (SC)
Granger	Murphy (PA)	Wittman
Graves (GA)	Newhouse	Womack
Graves (LA)	Noem	Yoder
Graves (MO)	Norman	Yoho
Griffith	Nunes	Young (AK)
Grothman	Olson	Young (IA)
Guthrie	Palazzo	Zeldin
Handel	Palmer	

NOT VOTING—21

Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Ross
Costa	Garrett	Scalise
Crist	Maloney,	Tsongas
Cummings	Carolyn B.	Wagner
Curbelo (FL)	Meadows	Wasserman
DeGette	Pelosi	Schultz
DeSantis	Posey	Webster (FL)
Deutch	Ros-Lehtinen	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1429

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

AMENDMENT NO. 74 OFFERED BY MS. ROYBAL-ALLARD

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from California (Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 170, noes 241, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 460]

AYES—170

Adams	Gallego	Nadler
Aguilar	Garamendi	Napolitano
Barragán	Gomez	Neal
Bass	Gonzalez (TX)	Norcross
Beatty	Gottheimer	O'Rourke
Beyer	Green, Al	Pallone
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Panetta
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Pascrell
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez	Payne
Bonamici	Hanabusa	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan	Hastings	Pingree
F.	Heck	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Himes	Polis
Brown (MD)	Hoyer	Price (NC)
Brownley (CA)	Huffman	Quigley
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Raskin
Capuano	Jayapal	Rice (NY)
Carbajal	Jeffries	Richmond
Cárdenas	Johnson (GA)	Rosen
Carson (IN)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Cartwright	Kaptur	Ruppersberger
Castro (TX)	Keating	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez
Ciilline	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Khanna	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kihuen	Schiff
Clay	Kildee	Schneider
Cleaver	Kilmer	Schrader
Clyburn	Kind	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Krishnamoorthi	Scott, David
Connolly	Kuster (NH)	Serrano
Conyers	Langevin	Sewell (AL)
Correa	Larsen (WA)	Shea-Porter
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Sherman
Crowley	Lawrence	Sires
Cuellar	Lawson (FL)	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lee	Smith (WA)
Davis, Danny	Levin	Soto
DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Speier
Delaney	Lieu, Ted	Swalwell (CA)
DeLauro	Lofgren	Takano
DelBene	Lowenthal	Thompson (CA)
Demings	Lowe	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	Lujan Grisham,	Titus
Dingell	M.	Tonko
Doggett	Luján, Ben Ray	Torres
Doyle, Michael	Maloney,	Vargas
F.	Carolyn B.	Veasey
Ellison	Matsui	Vela
Engel	McCollum	Velázquez
Eshoo	McEachin	Visclosky
Españlat	McGovern	Walz
Esty (CT)	McNerney	Waters, Maxine
Evans	Meeks	Watson Coleman
Foster	Meng	Welch
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Wilson (FL)
Fudge	Moulton	Yarmuth
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Young (AK)

NOES—241

Abraham	Bost	Collins (NY)
Aderholt	Brady (TX)	Comer
Allen	Brat	Comstock
Amash	Brooks (AL)	Conaway
Amodei	Brooks (IN)	Cook
Arrington	Buchanan	Cooper
Babin	Buck	Costello (PA)
Bacon	Bucshon	Cramer
Banks (IN)	Budd	Crawford
Barletta	Burgess	Culberson
Barr	Bustos	Davidson
Barton	Byrne	Davis, Rodney
Bera	Calvert	Denham
Bergman	Carter (GA)	Dent
Biggs	Carter (TX)	DesJarlais
Bilirakis	Castor (FL)	Donovan
Bishop (MI)	Chabot	Duffy
Bishop (UT)	Cheney	Duncan (SC)
Black	Coffman	Duncan (TN)
Blackburn	Cole	Dunn
Blum	Collins (GA)	Emmer

Estes (KS)	Labrador	Roe (TN)
Farenthold	LaHood	Rogers (AL)
Faso	LaMalfa	Rogers (KY)
Ferguson	Lamborn	Rohrabacher
Fitzpatrick	Lance	Rokita
Fleischmann	Latta	Rooney, Francis
Flores	Lewis (MN)	Rooney, Thomas
Fortenberry	Lipinski	J.
Fox	LoBiondo	Roskam
Franks (AZ)	Loebsack	Rothfus
Frelinghuysen	Long	Rouzer
Gaetz	Loudermilk	Royce (CA)
Gallagher	Love	Ruiz
Gianforte	Lucas	Russell
Gibbs	Luetkemeyer	Rutherford
Gohmert	Lynch	Sanford
Goodlatte	MacArthur	Schweikert
Gosar	Maloney, Sean	Scott, Austin
Govdy	Marchant	Sensenbrenner
Granger	Marino	Sessions
Graves (GA)	Marshall	Shimkus
Graves (LA)	Massie	Shuster
Graves (MO)	Mast	Simpson
Griffith	McCarthy	Sinema
Grothman	McCaul	Smith (MO)
Guthrie	McClintock	Smith (NE)
Handel	McHenry	Smith (NJ)
Harper	McKinley	Smith (TX)
Harris	McMorris	Smucker
Hartzler	Rodgers	Stefanik
Hensarling	McSally	Stewart
Herrera Beutler	Meehan	Stivers
Hice, Jody B.	Messer	Suozi
Higgins (LA)	Mitchell	Taylor
Higgins (NY)	Moolenaar	Tenney
Hill	Mooney (WV)	Thompson (PA)
Holding	Mullin	Thornberry
Hollingsworth	Murphy (PA)	Tiberi
Hudson	Newhouse	Tipton
Huizenga	Noem	Trott
Hultgren	Norman	Turner
Hunter	Nunes	Upton
Hurd	O'Halleran	Valadao
Issa	Olson	Walberg
Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo	Walden
Jenkins (WV)	Palmer	Walker
Johnson (LA)	Paulsen	Walorski
Johnson (OH)	Pearce	Walters, Mimi
Johnson, Sam	Perry	Weber (TX)
Jones	Peters	Wenstrup
Jordan	Peterson	Westerman
Joyce (OH)	Pittenger	Williams
Katko	Poe (TX)	Wilson (SC)
Kelly (MS)	Poliquin	Wittman
Kelly (PA)	Ratcliffe	Womack
King (IA)	Reed	Woodall
King (NY)	Reichert	Yoder
Kinzinger	Renacci	Yoho
Knight	Rice (SC)	Young (IA)
Kustoff (TN)	Roby	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—22

Bridenstine	Diaz-Balart	Rush
Costa	Garrett	Scalise
Crist	Meadows	Tsongas
Cummings	Nolan	Wagner
Curbelo (FL)	Pelosi	Wasserman
DeGette	Posey	Schultz
DeSantis	Ros-Lehtinen	Webster (FL)
Deutch	Ross	

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1432

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

AMENDMENT NO. 75 OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 203, noes 211, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 461]

AYES—203

Adams	Gomez	Neal
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Nolan
Barragán	Gottheimer	Norcross
Barton	Green, Al	Norman
Bass	Green, Gene	O'Halleran
Beatty	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Bera	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Beyer	Hanabusa	Panetta
Bishop (GA)	Hastings	Pascrell
Blumenauer	Heck	Payne
Blunt Rochester	Herrera Beutler	Pelosi
Bonamici	Higgins (NY)	Perlmutter
Boyle, Brendan	Himes	Peters
F.	Hoyer	Pingree
Brady (PA)	Huffman	Pocan
Brown (MD)	Jackson Lee	Poe (TX)
Brownley (CA)	Jayapal	Polis
Bustos	Jeffries	Price (NC)
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Raskin
Carbajal	Kaptur	Reed
Cárdenas	Katko	Rice (NY)
Carson (IN)	Keating	Richmond
Cartwright	Kelly (IL)	Rosen
Castor (FL)	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Ruiz
Chu, Judy	Kihuen	Ruppersberger
Ciilline	Kildee	Rush
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Ryan (OH)
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Sánchez
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Sarbanes
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Schakowsky
Clyburn	Lance	Schiff
Cohen	Langevin	Schneider
Connolly	Larsen (WA)	Schrader
Conyers	Larson (CT)	Schweikert
Correa	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
Courtney	Lawson (FL)	Scott, David
Crowley	Lee	Serrano
Cuellar	Levin	Sewell (AL)
Davis (CA)	Courtney	Shea-Porter
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Sherman
DeFazio	Crowley	Sinema
Delaney	Cuellar	Sires
DeLauro	Lipinski	Slaughter
DelBene	LoBiondo	Smith (NJ)
Demings	Loeback	Smith (WA)
DeSaulnier	Lofgren	Soto
Dingell	Lowenthal	Speier
Doggett	Lujan Grisham,	Suozi
Doyle, Michael	M.	Swalwell (CA)
F.	Luján, Ben Ray	Takano
Ellison	Lynch	Thompson (CA)
Engel	MacArthur	Thompson (MS)
Eshoo	Maloney,	Titus
Españlat	McGovern	Tonko
Esty (CT)	McNerney	Torres
Evans	Meehan	Vargas
Ferguson	Meeks	Veasey
Fitzpatrick	Meng	Vela
Foster	Moore	Velázquez
Frankel (FL)	Moulton	Visclosky
Fudge	Murphy (FL)	Walz
Gabbard	Nadler	Waters, Maxine
Gallego	Napolitano	Watson Coleman
Garamendi		Welch

NOES—211

Abraham	Bilirakis	Bucshon
Aderholt	Bishop (MI)	Budd
Allen	Bishop (UT)	Burgess
Amash	Black	Byrne
Amodei	Blackburn	Calvert
Arrington	Blum	Carter (GA)
Babin	Bost	Carter (TX)
Bacon	Brady (TX)	Chabot
Banks (IN)	Brat	Cheney
Barletta	Brooks (AL)	Cole
Barr	Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)
Bergman	Buchanan	Collins (NY)
Biggs	Buck	Comer



Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes (KS)  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Handel  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)

NOT VOTING—19

Bridenstine  
Costa  
Crist  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
DeGette  
DeSantis

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1437

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, due to the impending landfall of Hurricane Irma in Florida, I departed Washington, D.C. to be in my district during this natural disaster.

Had I been present, I would have voted:

- “Yea” on rollcall No. 457.
- “Yea” on rollcall No. 458.
- “Nay” on rollcall No. 459.
- “Nay” on rollcall No. 460.
- “Nay” on rollcall No. 461.

AMENDMENT NO. 76 OFFERED BY MR. CORREA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CORREA) on which further proceedings

were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 182, noes 229, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 462]

AYES—182

Adams  
Aguilar  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamic  
Boyle, Brendan F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Correa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Español  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego

NOES—229

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Brady (TX)  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Coffman

Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes (KS)  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa

NOT VOTING—22

Brat  
Bridenstine  
Costa  
Crist  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
DeGette  
DeSantis  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Garrett  
Hensarling  
Meadows  
Posey  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Webster (FL)  
Scalise  
Shuster  
Tsongas  
Wagner  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1441

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

AMENDMENT NO. 77 OFFERED BY MR. HUNTER

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. HUNTER) 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 245, noes 168, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 463]

AYES—245

Abraham	Gianforte	Murphy (FL)
Aderholt	Gibbs	Murphy (PA)
Aguilar	Gohmert	Newhouse
Allen	Gosar	Noem
Amodel	Gotheimer	Norman
Arrington	Gowdy	Nunes
Babin	Granger	Olson
Bacon	Graves (GA)	Palazzo
Banks (IN)	Graves (LA)	Palmer
Barletta	Graves (MO)	Paulsen
Barr	Griffith	Payne
Barton	Grothman	Pearce
Bera	Guthrie	Perlmutter
Bergman	Handel	Perry
Beyer	Harper	Peters
Biggs	Harris	Pittenger
Bilirakis	Hartzler	Poe (TX)
Bishop (MI)	Hensarling	Poliquin
Bishop (UT)	Herrera Beutler	Ratcliffe
Black	Hice, Jody B.	Reed
Blackburn	Higgins (LA)	Reichert
Blum	Hill	Renacci
Bost	Holding	Rice (SC)
Brady (TX)	Hudson	Richmond
Brat	Huizenga	Roby
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Brownley (CA)	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Buchanan	Hurd	Rohrabacher
Buck	Issa	Rokita
Bucshon	Jeffries	Rooney, Thomas J.
Burgess	Jenkins (KS)	Roskam
Byrne	Jenkins (WV)	Rothfus
Calvert	Johnson (GA)	Rouzer
Carter (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Royce (CA)
Carter (TX)	Johnson, Sam	Russell
Chabot	Jones	Sanford
Cheney	Jordan	Schweikert
Clarke (NY)	Joyce (OH)	Scott (VA)
Coffman	Katko	Scott, Austin
Cohen	Kelly (MS)	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Kelly (PA)	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Kind	Sherman
Collins (NY)	King (IA)	Shimkus
Comer	King (NY)	Shuster
Comstock	Kinzinger	Simpson
Conaway	Knight	Sinema
Connolly	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (MO)
Cook	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Correa	LaMalfa	Smith (NJ)
Costello (PA)	Lamborn	Smith (TX)
Courtney	Lance	Smith (WA)
Cramer	Latta	Smucker
Crawford	Lewis (MN)	Stefanik
Culberson	LoBiondo	Stewart
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Stivers
DelBene	Love	Suoizzi
Denham	Lucas	Taylor
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Tenney
DesJarlais	MacArthur	Thompson (PA)
Donovan	Marchant	Thornberry
Duffy	Marino	Tiberi
Duncan (SC)	Marshall	Tipton
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Trott
Dunn	Mast	Turner
Emmer	McCarthy	Upton
Engel	McCaul	Valadao
Estes (KS)	McClintock	Walberg
Farenthold	McEachin	Walden
Faso	McHenry	Walker
Ferguson	McKinley	Walorski
Fitzpatrick	McMorris	Walters, Mimi
Fleischmann	Rodgers	Weber (TX)
Flores	McNerney	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	McSally	Westerman
Fox	Meehan	Williams
Franks (AZ)	Meeks	Wilson (SC)
Frelinghuysen	Messer	Wittman
Gabbard	Mitchell	Womack
Gaetz	Moolenaar	
Gallagher	Mooney (WV)	
Gallego	Mullin	

Woodall  
Yoder

Yoho  
Young (AK)

NOES—168

Adams	Green, Al
Amash	Green, Gene
Barragan	Grijalva
Bass	Gutiérrez
Beatty	Hanabusa
Bishop (GA)	Hastings
Blumenauer	Heck
Blunt Rochester	Higgins (NY)
Bonamici	Himes
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hollingsworth
Brady (PA)	Hoyer
Brooks (AL)	Huffman
Brown (MD)	Jackson Lee
Budd	Jayapal
Bustos	Johnson (LA)
Butterfield	Johnson, E. B.
Capuano	Kaptur
Carbajal	Keating
Cárdenas	Kelly (IL)
Carson (IN)	Kennedy
Cartwright	Khanna
Castor (FL)	Kihuen
Castro (TX)	Kildee
Chu, Judy	Kilmer
Cicilline	Krishnamoorthi
Clark (MA)	Kuster (NH)
Clay	Labrador
Cleaver	Langevin
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)
Conyers	Larsen (CT)
Cooper	Lawrence
Crowley	Lawson (FL)
Cuellar	Lee
Davidson	Levin
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted
DeFazio	Lipinski
Delaney	Loeb
DeLauro	Loebsack
Demings	Loggren
DeSaulnier	Long
Dingell	Lowenthal
Doggett	Lujan
Doyle, Michael F.	Lujan Grisham, M.
Ellison	Luján, Ben Ray
Eshoo	Lynch
Españal	Maloney, Carolyn B.
Esty (CT)	Maloney, Sean
Evans	Matsui
Foster	McCollum
Frankel (FL)	McGovern
Fudge	Meng
Garamendi	Moore
Gomez	Moulton
Gonzalez (TX)	Nadler
Goodlatte	Napolitano
	Neal

NOT VOTING—20

Bridenstine	Deutch
Costa	Diaz-Balart
Crist	Garrett
Cummings	Meadows
Curbelo (FL)	Pelosi
DeGette	Posey
DeSantis	Ros-Lehtinen
	Ross
	Salise
	Tsongas
	Wagner
	Wasserman
	Schultz
	Webster (FL)

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

□ 1446

Mr. LAWSON of Florida changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 80, AS MODIFIED, OFFERED BY  
MR. KING OF IOWA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

Young (IA)  
Zeldin

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 173, noes 240, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 464]

AYES—173

Abraham	Gibbs	Noem
Aderholt	Gohmert	Norman
Allen	Goodlatte	Nunes
Amash	Gosar	Olson
Arrington	Gowdy	Palazzo
Babin	Granger	Palmer
Bacon	Graves (GA)	Paulsen
Banks (IN)	Graves (LA)	Pearce
Barr	Graves (MO)	Perry
Barton	Griffith	Pittenger
Bergman	Guthrie	Poe (TX)
Biggs	Handel	Poliquin
Bilirakis	Harper	Ratcliffe
Bishop (MI)	Harris	Rice (SC)
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Roby
Black	Hensarling	Roe (TN)
Blackburn	Herrera Beutler	Rogers (AL)
Blum	Hice, Jody B.	Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX)	Higgins (LA)	Rohrabacher
Brat	Hill	Rokita
Brooks (AL)	Holding	Rooney, Francis
Brooks (IN)	Hollingsworth	Rooney, Thomas J.
Buchanan	Hudson	Rothfus
Buck	Huizenga	Rouzer
Budd	Hurd	Royce (CA)
Burgess	Issa	Russell
Byrne	Jenkins (KS)	Rutherford
Calvert	Johnson (LA)	Sanford
Carter (GA)	Johnson, Sam	Schweikert
Carter (TX)	Jones	Sensenbrenner
Chabot	Jordan	Sessions
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Smith (MO)
Coffman	King (IA)	Smith (NE)
Cole	Knight	Smith (TX)
Collins (GA)	Kustoff (TN)	Smucker
Collins (NY)	Labrador	Stewart
Comer	LaMalfa	Taylor
Comstock	Lamborn	Thompson (PA)
Conaway	Latta	Thornberry
Cramer	Long	Tipton
Crawford	Loudermilk	Trott
Culberson	Love	Walberg
Davidson	Lucas	Walch
Dent	Luetkemeyer	Walker
DesJarlais	Marchant	Walorski
Duncan (SC)	Marshall	Walters, Mimi
Duncan (TN)	Massie	Weber (TX)
Dunn	McCarthy	Wenstrup
Emmer	McCaul	Westerman
Engel	McClintock	Williams
Estes (KS)	McEachin	Wilson (SC)
Farenthold	McHenry	Wittman
Faso	McKinley	Womack
Ferguson	McMorris	
Fitzpatrick	Rodgers	
Fleischmann	McNerney	
Flores	McSally	
Fortenberry	Meehan	
Fox	Meeks	
Franks (AZ)	Messer	
Frelinghuysen	Mitchell	
Gabbard	Moolenaar	
Gaetz	Mooney (WV)	
Gallagher	Mullin	
Gallego		

NOES—240

Adams	Bustos	Cooper
Aguilar	Butterfield	Correa
Amodel	Capuano	Costello (PA)
Barletta	Carbajal	Courtney
Barragan	Cárdenas	Crowley
Bass	Carson (IN)	Cuellar
Beatty	Cartwright	Davis (CA)
Bera	Castor (FL)	Davis, Danny
Beyer	Castro (TX)	Davis, Rodney
Bishop (GA)	Chu, Judy	DeFazio
Blumenauer	Cicilline	Delaney
Blunt Rochester	Clark (MA)	DelBene
Bonamici	Clarke (NY)	Demings
Bost	Clay	Denham
Boyle, Brendan F.	Cleaver	DeSaulnier
Brady (PA)	Clyburn	Dingell
Brown (MD)	Cohen	Connolly
Brownley (CA)	Conyers	Doggett
Bucshon	Cook	Donovan

Doyle, Michael F.  
 Duffy  
 Ellison  
 Emmer  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Espallat  
 Esty (CT)  
 Evans  
 Faso  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Foster  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Fudge  
 Gabbard  
 Gallego  
 Garamendi  
 Gianforte  
 Gomez  
 Gonzalez (TX)  
 Gottheimer  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Grothman  
 Gutierrez  
 Hanabusa  
 Hastings  
 Heck  
 Higgins (NY)  
 Himes  
 Hoyer  
 Huffman  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Jackson Lee  
 Jayapal  
 Jeffries  
 Jenkins (WV)  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Joyce (OH)  
 Kaptur  
 Katko  
 Keating  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Kelly (PA)  
 Kennedy  
 Khanna  
 Kihuen  
 Kildee  
 Kilmer  
 Kind  
 King (NY)  
 Kinzinger  
 Krishnamoorthi  
 Kuster (NH)  
 LaHood  
 Lance  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lawrence  
 Lawson (FL)  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lewis (MN)  
 Lieu, Ted  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loeb sack  
 Lofgren  
 Lowenthal  
 Lowey  
 Lujan Grisham, M.  
 Lujan, Ben Ray  
 Lynch  
 MacArthur  
 Maloney,  
 Carolyn B.  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Marino  
 Mast  
 Matsui  
 McCollum  
 McEachin  
 McGovern  
 McKinley  
 McNeerney  
 Meehan  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Moore  
 Moulton  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Newhouse  
 Nolan  
 Norcross  
 Torres  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Payne  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Pingree  
 Pocan  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Raskin  
 Reed  
 Reichert  
 Renacci

**NOT VOTING—20**

Bridenstine  
 Costa  
 Crist  
 Cummings  
 Curbelo (FL)  
 DeGette  
 DeSantis  
 Deutch  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Garrett  
 Meadows  
 Pelosi  
 Posey  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Ross  
 Scalise  
 Tsongas  
 Wagner  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Webster (FL)

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR**

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

□ 1450

So the amendment, as modified, was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

**AMENDMENT NO. 81 OFFERED BY MR. CASTRO OF TEXAS**

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

**RECORDED VOTE**  
 The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 183, noes 230, not voting 20, as follows

[Roll No. 465]

**AYES—183**

Adams  
 Aguirre  
 Barragan  
 Bass  
 Beatty  
 Bera  
 Beyer  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Blumenauer  
 Blunt Rochester  
 Bonamici  
 Boyle, Brendan F.  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brown (MD)  
 Brownley (CA)  
 Bustos  
 Butterfield  
 Caputo  
 Carballo  
 Cardenas  
 Carson (IN)  
 Cartwright  
 Castor (FL)  
 Castro (TX)  
 Chu, Judy  
 Cicilline  
 Clark (MA)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Connolly  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Correa  
 Courtney  
 Crowley  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny  
 DeFazio  
 Delaney  
 DeLauro  
 DelBene  
 Demings  
 DeSaulnier  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doyle, Michael F.  
 Ellison  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Espallat  
 Esty (CT)  
 Evans  
 Foster  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Fudge  
 Gabbard  
 Gallego  
 Garamendi  
 Gomez  
 Gonzalez (TX)  
 Gottheimer  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Gutierrez  
 Hanabusa  
 Hastings  
 Heck  
 Higgins (NY)  
 Himes  
 Hoyer  
 Huffman  
 Jackson Lee  
 Jayapal  
 Jeffries  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Kaptur  
 Keating  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Kennedy  
 Khanna  
 Kihuen  
 Kildee  
 Kilmer  
 Kind  
 Krishnamoorthi  
 Kuster (NH)  
 Lujan Grisham, M.  
 Lujan, Ben Ray  
 Lynch  
 Maloney,  
 Carolyn B.  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Matsui  
 McCollum  
 McEachin  
 McGovern  
 McNeerney  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Moore  
 Moulton  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Nolan  
 Norcross  
 O'Halleran  
 O'Rourke  
 Panetta  
 Pallone  
 Pascrell  
 Payne  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Pingree  
 Pocan  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Raskin  
 Reed  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Ross  
 Scalise  
 Tsongas  
 Wagner  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Webster (FL)

**NOES—230**

Abraham  
 Aderholt  
 Allen  
 Amash  
 Amodei  
 Arrington  
 Babin  
 Bacon  
 Banks (IN)  
 Barletta  
 Barr  
 Barton  
 Bergman  
 Biggs  
 Bilirakis  
 Bishop (MI)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Blum  
 Bost  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brat  
 Brooks (AL)  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Buchanan  
 Buck  
 Bucshon  
 Budd  
 Burgess  
 Byrne  
 Calvert  
 Carter (GA)  
 Carter (TX)  
 Chabot  
 Cheney  
 Coffman  
 Cole  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY)  
 Comer  
 Comstock  
 Conaway  
 Cook  
 Costello (PA)  
 Cramer  
 Crawford  
 Cuellar  
 Culberson  
 Davidson  
 Davis, Rodney  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DesJarlais  
 Donovan  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)  
 Dunn  
 Emmer  
 Estes (KS)  
 Farenthold  
 Faso  
 Ferguson  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Fleischmann  
 Flores  
 Fortenberry  
 Foss  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Gaetz  
 Gallagher  
 Gianforte  
 Gibbs  
 Gohmert  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (LA)  
 Graves (MO)  
 Griffith  
 Grothman  
 Guthrie  
 Handel  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hensarling  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Hice, Jody B.  
 Higgins (LA)  
 Hill  
 Holding  
 Hollingsworth  
 Hudson  
 Huelskamp  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurd  
 Issa  
 Jenkins (KS)  
 Jenkins (WV)  
 Johnson (LA)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones  
 Jordan  
 Joyce (OH)  
 Katko  
 Kelly (MS)  
 Kelly (PA)  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kinzinger  
 Knight  
 Kustoff (TN)  
 Labrador  
 LaHood  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Lance  
 Latta  
 Lawson (FL)  
 Lewis (MN)  
 LoBiondo  
 Long  
 Loudermilk  
 Love  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 MacArthur  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Marshall  
 Massie  
 Mast  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McHenry  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McSally  
 Meehan  
 Messer  
 Mitchell  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Mullin  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Newhouse  
 Noem  
 Norman  
 Nunes  
 Olson  
 Palazzo  
 Palmer  
 Paulsen  
 Pearce  
 Perry  
 Peterson  
 Pittenger  
 Poe (TX)  
 Poliquin  
 Ratcliffe  
 Reed  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Rice (SC)  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita  
 Rooney, Francis  
 Rooney, Thomas J.  
 Roskam  
 Rothfus  
 Rouzer  
 Royce (CA)  
 Russell  
 Rutherford  
 Sanford  
 Schweikert  
 Scott, Austin  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Marshall  
 Massie  
 Mast  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McHenry  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McSally  
 Meehan  
 Messer  
 Mitchell  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Mullin  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Newhouse  
 Noem  
 Norman  
 Nunes  
 Olson  
 Palazzo  
 Palmer  
 Paulsen  
 Pearce  
 Perry  
 Peterson  
 Pittenger  
 Poe (TX)  
 Poliquin  
 Ratcliffe  
 Reed  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Rice (SC)  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Ross  
 Scalise  
 Tsongas  
 Wagner  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Webster (FL)

**NOT VOTING—20**

Bridenstine  
 Costa  
 Crist  
 Cummings  
 Curbelo (FL)  
 DeGette  
 DeSantis  
 Deutch  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Garrett  
 Meadows  
 Pelosi  
 Posey  
 Ros-Lehtinen  
 Ross  
 Scalise  
 Tsongas  
 Wagner  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Webster (FL)

**ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR**

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

□ 1454

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

**AMENDMENT NO. 84 OFFERED BY MS. JAYAPAL**

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

**RECORDED VOTE**

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 180, noes 230, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 466]

AYES—180

Adams	Gomez	Neal
Aguilar	Gonzalez (TX)	Nolan
Barragan	Gottheimer	Norcross
Bass	Green, Al	O'Halleran
Beatty	Green, Gene	O'Rourke
Bera	Grijalva	Pallone
Beyer	Gutiérrez	Panetta
Bishop (GA)	Hanabusa	Pascrell
Blumenauer	Hastings	Payne
Blunt	Heck	Perlmutter
Bonamici	Higgins (NY)	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan	Himes	Pocan
F.	Hoyer	Polis
Brady (PA)	Huffman	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Jackson Lee	Quigley
Brownley (CA)	Jayapal	Raskin
Bustos	Jeffries	Rice (NY)
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Capuano	Johnson, E. B.	Rosen
Carbajal	Kaptur	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Keating	Ruiz
Carson (IN)	Kelly (IL)	Ruppersberger
Cartwright	Kennedy	Rush
Castro (TX)	Khanna	Ryan (OH)
Chu, Judy	Kihuen	Sánchez
Cicilline	Kildee	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kilmer	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kind	Schiff
Clay	Krishnamoorthi	Schneider
Cleaver	Kuster (NH)	Schrader
Clyburn	Langevin	Scott (VA)
Cohen	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Connolly	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Conyers	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Cooper	Lawson (FL)	Shea-Porter
Correa	Lee	Sherman
Courtney	Levin	Sires
Crowley	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted	Loeb sack
Davis, Danny	Loeb sack	Lofgren
DeFazio	Lofgren	Lowenthal
Delaney	Lowenthal	Speier
DeLauro	Lowe	Suo zzi
DelBene	Lujan Grisham,	Swalwell (CA)
Demings	M.	Takano
DeSaulnier	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
Dingell	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Doggett	Maloney,	Titus
Doyle, Michael	Carolyn B.	Tonko
F.	Maloney, Sean	Torres
Ellison	Matsui	Vargas
Engel	McCollum	Veasey
Eshoo	McEachin	Vela
Espallat	McGovern	Velázquez
Esty (CT)	McNerney	Visclosky
Evans	Meeks	Walz
Foster	Meng	Waters, Maxine
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Watson Coleman
Fudge	Moulton	Welch
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Wilson (FL)
Gallego	Nadler	Yarmuth
Garamendi	Napolitano	

NOES—230

Abraham	Buchanan	Denham
Aderholt	Buck	Dent
Allen	Bucshon	DesJarlais
Amash	Budd	Donovan
Amodei	Burgess	Duffy
Arrington	Byrne	Duncan (SC)
Babin	Calvert	Duncan (TN)
Bacon	Carter (GA)	Dunn
Banks (IN)	Carter (TX)	Estes (KS)
Barletta	Chabot	Farenthold
Barr	Cheney	Faso
Barton	Coffman	Ferguson
Bergman	Collins (GA)	Fitzpatrick
Biggs	Collins (NY)	Fleischmann
Bilirakis	Comer	Flores
Bishop (MI)	Comstock	Fortenberry
Bishop (UT)	Conaway	Fox
Black	Cook	Franks (AZ)
Blackburn	Costello (PA)	Frelinghuysen
Blum	Cramer	Gaetz
Bost	Crawford	Gallagher
Brady (TX)	Cuellar	Gianforte
Brat	Culberson	Gibbs
Brooks (AL)	Davidson	Gohmert
Brooks (IN)	Davis, Rodney	Goodlatte

Gosar	Love	Roskam
Gowdy	Lucas	Rothfus
Granger	Luetkemeyer	Rouzer
Graves (GA)	MacArthur	Royce (CA)
Graves (LA)	Marchant	Russell
Graves (MO)	Marino	Rutherford
Griffith	Marshall	Sanford
Grothman	Massie	Schweikert
Guthrie	Mast	Scott, Austin
Handel	McCarthy	Sensenbrenner
Harper	McCaul	Sessions
Harris	McClintock	Shimkus
Hartzler	McHenry	Shuster
Hensarling	McKinley	Simpson
Herrera Beutler	McMorris	Sinema
Hice, Jody B.	Rodgers	Smith (MO)
Higgins (LA)	McSally	Smith (NE)
Hill	Meehan	Smith (NJ)
Holding	Messer	Smith (TX)
Hollingsworth	Mitchell	Smucker
Hudson	Moolenaar	Stefanik
Huizenga	Mooney (WV)	Stewart
Hultgren	Mullin	Stivers
Hunter	Murphy (PA)	Taylor
Hurd	Newhouse	Tenney
Issa	Noem	Thompson (PA)
Jenkins (KS)	Norman	Thornberry
Jenkins (WV)	Nunes	Tiberi
Johnson (LA)	Olson	Tipton
Johnson (OH)	Palazzo	Trott
Johnson, Sam	Palmer	Turner
Jones	Paulsen	Upton
Jordan	Pearce	Valadao
Joyce (OH)	Perry	Walberg
Katko	Peters	Walden
Kelly (MS)	Peterson	Walker
Kelly (PA)	Pittenger	Walorski
King (IA)	Poe (TX)	Walters, Mimi
King (NY)	Poliquin	Weber (TX)
Kinzinger	Ratcliffe	Wenstrup
Knight	Reed	Westerman
Kustoff (TN)	Reichert	Williams
Labrador	Renacci	Wilson (SC)
LaHood	Rice (SC)	Wittman
LaMalfa	Roby	Womack
Lamborn	Roe (TN)	Woodall
Lance	Rogers (AL)	Yoder
Latta	Rogers (KY)	Yoho
Lewis (MN)	Rohrabacher	Young (AK)
Lipinski	Rokita	Young (IA)
LoBiondo	Rooney, Francis	Zeldin
Long	Rooney, Thomas	
Loudermilk	J.	

NOT VOTING—23

Bridenstine	DeSantis	Ros-Lehtinen
Castor (FL)	Deutch	Ross
Cole	Diaz-Balart	Scalise
Costa	Emmer	Tsongas
Crist	Garrett	Wagner
Cummings	Meadows	Wasserman
Curbelo (FL)	Pelosi	Schultz
DeGette	Posey	Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 1511

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

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Chair, due to the impending landfall of Hurricane Irma in Florida, I departed Washington, D.C. to be in my district during this natural disaster.

Had I been present, I would have voted:

“Nay” on rollcall No. 462.

“Yea” on rollcall No. 463.

“Yea” on rollcall No. 464.

“Nay” on rollcall No. 465.

“Nay” on rollcall No. 466.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 4 OFFERED BY MR. ROGERS OF KENTUCKY

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to House Resolution 500, as the designee of Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, I offer amendments en bloc.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BOST). The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 4 consisting of amendment Nos. 90, 93, 100, 102, 103, 104, 105, 108, 109, 111, and 117, printed in part B of House Report 115-295, offered by Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky:

AMENDMENT NO. 90 OFFERED BY MRS. LOWEY OF NEW YORK

Page 858, line 11, after the dollar amount insert the following: “(reduced by \$10,000,000) (increased by \$10,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 93 OFFERED BY MR. MITCHELL OF MICHIGAN

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

LIMITATION ON CONFERENCE ATTENDANCE

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to attend the Canadian Water Resources Association's National 2018 Conference, “Our Common Water Future: Building Resilience through Innovation”.

AMENDMENT NO. 100 OFFERED BY MR. VALADAO OF CALIFORNIA

Page 890, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,500,000) (increased by \$1,500,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 102 OFFERED BY MR. LYNCH OF MASSACHUSETTS

Page 898, line 1, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$4,545,000)”.

Page 902, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$4,545,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 103 OFFERED BY MR. FOSTER OF ILLINOIS

Page 899, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$10,000,000) (increased by \$10,000,000)”.

AMENDMENT NO. 104 OFFERED BY MR. BUDD OF NORTH CAROLINA

Page 1001, beginning on line 1, after “individuals” insert “, including family members of Palestinians.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 105 OFFERED BY MRS. TORRES OF CALIFORNIA

Page 1056, line 18, insert “except for funds made available for the International Commission against Impunity in Guatemala or the Mission to Support the Fight against Corruption and Impunity in Honduras,” after “and Honduras.”.

AMENDMENT NO. 108 OFFERED BY MR. TROTT OF MICHIGAN

At the end of division G (before the spending reduction account), insert the following:  
SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the of funds made available by this division may be used by the Department of State to close or merge the Office of International Religious Freedom.

AMENDMENT NO. 109 OFFERED BY MR. SCHNEIDER OF ILLINOIS

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to close the Office of the Special Envoy to Monitor and Combat Anti-Semitism of the Department of State or to merge such Office with any other office or entity in the Department of State.

AMENDMENT NO. 111 OFFERED BY MR. TED LIEU OF CALIFORNIA

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds appropriated or otherwise made available by this Act may be used to close the Office of Global Criminal Justice of the Department of State or to merge such Office with any other office or entity in the Department of State.

AMENDMENT NO. 117 OFFERED BY MR. MEEKS OF NEW YORK

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

SEC. \_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to reduce the number of fellows in the Charles B. Rangel International Affairs Program, the Thomas R. Pickering Foreign Affairs Fellowship Program, or the Donald M. Payne International Development Fellowship Program below current levels.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 500, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment within the en bloc amendments as a step to protect the Great Lakes.

Ontario Power Generation, a Canadian energy company, has proposed to build an underground nuclear waste facility along the shores of Lake Huron, which borders my district.

Their plan is nothing short of irresponsible. Any failure at this site would have devastating impacts on Michigan and Canada, which rely on the Great Lakes for drinking water, tourism, and commerce.

Canada and OPG have displayed intransigence in the face of the near universal objection of my constituents, and many of the residents of the Great Lakes region. My amendment serves to further highlight to the Canadian Government the gravity of this issue.

□ 1515

The International Joint Commission was developed to resolve binational water disputes between the United States and Canada, yet they have not addressed this critical risk to the Great Lakes. My amendment would prohibit staff from attending or participating in an annual Canadian water resources conference, ironically, titled, "Our Common Water Future."

Prohibiting staff from attending this conference does not substantially relate to the IJC's core mission of protecting shared waters, but it sends an important message to our neighbors in Canada. It is time for the Canadian Government to take our concerns seriously regarding this potential threat to our precious Great Lakes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SCHNEIDER), who is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which is included in this en bloc package.

My amendment would protect the Office of the Special Envoy to monitor and combat anti-Semitism and ensure its continued operation.

Anti-Semitism not only still exists today, but it is on the rise in many places around the world. Just last month, a motorist in France yelled, "Kill the Jew," as he advanced with a knife toward a Jewish male who was wearing a Star of David necklace.

Keeping this office intact, appointing a special envoy, and providing adequate staff is incredibly important as we continue to fight anti-Semitism around the world.

I would like to thank my colleagues for including my amendment in the en bloc package, and I ask them all to join me in voting for it.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. VALADAO).

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of my amendment, which ensures critical funding for ongoing demining projects in Nagorno-Karabakh.

As a result of land mines laid during the Nagorno-Karabakh war, the men, women, and children of the region have lived their lives under the constant threat of crippling injury or death from an exploding mine. Not only have many families in Nagorno-Karabakh lost loved ones as a result of land mine accidents, families have had their entire livelihoods destroyed from economic and societal consequences.

Since 2000, the HALO Trust, an organization dedicated to restoring communities threatened by various weapons of war, has cleared more than approximately 90 percent of the minefields scattered throughout Nagorno-Karabakh. According to the organization, \$8 million will be required to make the region mine-free by 2020. My amendment will help secure \$1.5 million to be used as an important downpayment for this effort.

Mr. Chairman, ensuring families in Nagorno-Karabakh can live without fear of land mine accidents is indisputable, and I urge my colleagues in the House of Representatives to support my amendment.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), who is a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer my amendment to this appropriations bill.

This amendment would strengthen the International Commission against Impunity in Guatemala, CICIG, and the Mission to Support the Fight against Corruption and Impunity in Honduras. Specifically, it would exempt both institutions from the conditions that Congress has placed on U.S. assistance to Central America.

I am strongly supportive of conditions on aid to Central America, but the conditions must not interfere with the work of CICIG and MACCIH, which have been valuable allies in the fight against corruption and have helped the people of Honduras and Guatemala work toward a more secure and prosperous future.

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

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of this amendment. I do support the en bloc amendment, and I

appreciate the chairman's inclusion of amendments from Democratic Members as well.

I am very pleased that the en bloc includes a procedural amendment to allow me to discuss the deportation status of Mr. Jakiw Palij, a former Nazi guard. I had filed an amendment that would have directly addressed the deportation status of Mr. Jakiw Palij, but it was ruled out of order by the Rules Committee.

The U.S. State Department must ensure that justice is served and that Mr. Palij is held accountable for his crimes. He served as a guard at the Nazi Trawniki camp. This camp was the site of untold atrocities, including the death of thousands of blameless victims at the hands of the Nazi regime. Mr. Palij's role at the Trawniki camp served the Nazi regime by trapping men, women, and children in inhumane conditions, where they waited for their untimely deaths.

After the Holocaust, Mr. Palij came to the United States, where he omitted his service at the Nazi camp, and eventually he became a U.S. citizen. When his crimes during the Holocaust came to light, the United States stripped him of his citizenship, but he continues to reside in New York, as Poland, Germany, and Ukraine have each declined to take him.

I believe that it is time for Mr. Palij to be held accountable for his crimes. So, again, I thank the chairman for including this in the en bloc amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Would the Chair advise whether or not amendment No. 103 is included in the en bloc?

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the Clerk will redesignate amendments en bloc No. 4.

There was no objection.

The Clerk redesignated amendments en bloc No. 4.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I urge the adoption of amendments en bloc, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 91 printed in part B of House Report 115-295.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 861, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(decreased by 30,000,000)".

Page 861, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(decreased by 30,000,000)".

Page 898, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by 30,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 500, the gentleman

from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

My submitted amendment, No. 91 to division G, the State and Foreign Ops Appropriations bill, transfers \$30 million to the International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement account, or INCLE. The proposed \$30 million transfer would allow INCLE funding to remain consistent with 2017 levels.

One notable program that INCLE assists is the Merida Initiative. As we all here know, our Nation is reeling from an out-of-control opioid epidemic. My district in western Pennsylvania, like so many throughout the United States, has been particularly hard hit. According to the DEA, overdoses in Pennsylvania rose by 37 percent last year. Attorney General Sessions recently said that drug overdoses are the top lethal issue in the country today.

Across the border in Mexico, our neighbor is suffering from massive levels of violence and murder, mostly fueled by drug trafficking organizations, and the violence levels are increasing. Mexico's monthly murder rate has now reached a 20-year high.

Mr. Chairman, the Merida Initiative is a partnership between the United States and the Mexican Government that combats drug cartels and organized crime in Mexico. It also helps to strengthen the Mexican justice system by fostering the rule of law and respect for human rights.

Mr. Chairman, the majority of heroin and other narcotics, including fentanyl, smuggled into the U.S. come through Mexico or pass through it. Preventing drugs from ever crossing the border is a crucial step to healing our Nation.

In order to reduce the flow of narcotics coming over the border, we need to do everything we can to help our international law enforcement partners fight drug traffickers in their own country. The United States had previous successes with these types of drug interdiction programs, particularly in Colombia in the 1990s. We can replicate that success in Mexico if we invest in the INCLE and in our foreign law enforcement allies.

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

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

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, whatever priority or alternative use of these funds is being proposed, I can't imagine that it would compete with where this money is being taken away from. The \$30 million that has been identified would be taken away from the Fulbright Program, which is one of the most effective programs of public

diplomacy the United States has ever produced.

Authorized by William Fulbright, it has established cultural exchange for decades between the United States and countries around the world and done so much good in terms of projecting American values abroad and inviting people from other countries to come here to the United States to learn about our Nation and what we stand for.

I admit that I am biased. I had the privilege and honor, back in 1984, to go to Greece on a Fulbright scholarship, and I saw firsthand the benefits of that program.

There are 37 current and former heads of state or government and 57 Nobel laureates who are alumni of the Fulbright Program. The various programs of international cultural exchange are a signature of international exchange that we have in this country. It is really the crown jewel of those programs, and to take any money away from the program, I think, is a very serious mistake.

I would also add that investment in the Fulbright Program leverages a tremendous amount of additional resources when you look at what other countries have put into the equation. The program now operates in 165 countries around the world, and 49 of those countries match or exceed the funding that the United States puts into the program.

So, in other words, we have invited countries around the world to step up and partner with us through the Fulbright Program on international exchange. They have taken that invitation seriously, and they have put significant resources behind it, which has kept the program strong even though funding, recently, here in this country has been flat.

If anything, we should be increasing our investment in a program like this at a time when public diplomacy and making sure that people around the world understand who we are and what we stand for should be a number one priority.

I urge my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, to reject this amendment. I think it is a mistake. There are 1,300 U.S. colleges and universities, half of which are public and more than 125 of which are minority serving, that now benefit from hosting Fulbright scholars here in the United States.

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, this amendment should not be viewed as any criticism of the merits of the Fulbright Program. I don't have any. But we are talking about prioritization. The INCLE program has been cut by \$36 million.

□ 1530

We are in the throes of a catastrophic opioid epidemic in this country, and Mexico is suffering from untold violence. The headlines tell the story:

"Mexico's bloody drug war is killing more people than ever." LA Times, July 22, 2017.

"26 people killed in northern Mexico gunfight as drug cartel violence continues to rise." LA Times, July 5, 2017.

"Mexico City has mostly been spared from grisly drug violence. Now that may be changing." The Washington Post, July 26, 2017.

"U.S. warns of rise in drug cartel violence in Chihuahua." El Paso Times, July 7, 2017.

"Acapulco is now Mexico's Murder Capital." The Washington Post, August 24, 2017.

"The Deadliest Assignment: Reporting in Mexico." CBS News, August 21, 2017.

"Gunmen Kill Prominent Mexican Journalist Who Covered Drug Cartel." The New York Times, May 15, 2017.

"Another journalist has been gunned down in Mexico—the eighth killed this year." LA Times, July 31, 2017.

"A Mexican reporter was in a program to protect journalists. He was still killed." LA Times, August 23, 2017. He was the 10th journalist killed this year.

Then, there are the headlines in my district:

"Cambria County coroner again 'sounding the alarm' as OD deaths accelerate." Johnstown Tribune Democrat, February 14, 2017.

"A young couple died of overdose, police say. Their baby died of starvation days later." The Washington Post, December 25, 2016.

"Beaver County overdose deaths still on the rise in 2017." Beaver County Times, May 25, 2017.

"Allegheny County drug overdose deaths surge to 613 in 2016, breaking record." Pittsburgh Post-Gazette, April 6, 2017.

"Heroin overdose of 11-year-old Pittsburgh girl not a sign of childhood epidemic, experts says." TribLive, May 5, 2017.

"Mother grieves for son, asks God to 'damn heroin.'" Johnstown Tribune Democrat, March 5, 2016.

Mr. Chairman, we have budget constraints. We need to be putting the resources where the problem is. We have an opioid epidemic in this country. We have violence in Latin America. The funds that I seek to move into INCLE will help to stem these crises.

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

Mr. SARBANES. Mr. Chairman, I certainly don't quarrel with the concerns and priorities that my colleague has set forth. Let's find resources to address those issues, but let's not take them from a proven valuable program like the Fulbright Program.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my colleague's effort to boost funding for a successful assistance program such as the Merida Initiative. The flow of drugs into the United



States is a serious concern and more emphasis should be put on both the demand and supply side of the issue. However, I cannot support an amendment to take from another very successful program such as the Fulbright Program.

The Fulbright Program is our flagship public diplomacy program. It has run for over 70 years and boasts more than 370,000 alumni that are now in leadership positions and have a positive connection with the United States. These alumni include 37 current or former heads of state, 57 Nobel Laureates, 82 Pulitzer Prize winners, 29 MacArthur Fellows Foundation, 16 Presidential Medal of Freedom recipients, and thousands of leaders across private, public, and non-private sectors.

There are 1,300 U.S. institutions that actively participate in the Fulbright Program, either receiving or sending students to become global citizens, a requirement in today's interconnected economy.

In our challenging times, Mr. Chairman, we cannot hinder such an effective diplomatic tool as the Fulbright Program.

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

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Chairman, again, this amendment is not meant to bring a detraction to the Fulbright Program. Even with the amendment, the Fulbright Program will be funded at more than \$200 million to support the initiatives that the opponents to the amendment would cite.

Again, I talk about priorities. I talk about the grips of the crisis that we are seeing in this country and our neighbor to the south, Mexico. We need to be working together to address this problem. Programs like the Merida Initiative are key to solving both the crisis in Mexico and the crisis here in the United States.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS).

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. AUSTIN SCOTT OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 92 printed in part B of House Report 115-295.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 864, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

Page 898, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 500, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would increase the appropriations for the Western Hemisphere regional security cooperation account by \$10 million and reduce the appropriation for contributions to the international organizations account by \$10 million.

These funds will be appropriated to the International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs account and are available for 2 years. Thus, the State Department would have to obligate the funds within that timeframe.

Mr. Chairman, we lose between 4,000 and 5,000 of our fellow Americans to drug overdoses every month. This amendment reallocates \$10 million to the International Narcotics and Law Enforcement Affairs account at the State Department. This will provide additional resources to combat the dangerous and illegal actions of transnational criminal organizations by supporting the efforts of the Government of Colombia in enhancing regional security capabilities to provide training and technical assistance to partners in Central and South America.

Over the years, Colombia has made continuous progress in abating narcotics trafficking through various eradication operations and law enforcement efforts. Between 2009 and 2013, Colombia trained more than 22,000 military and law enforcement officers from Central America and the Caribbean countries in security operations and human and drug trafficking interdiction.

By increasing funding for training and assistance activities conducted by Colombian police and military forces, we enable Colombia to train even more regional police forces to function independently.

As it is here in the U.S., local law enforcement serves as the foundation for interdiction and counter-drug operations in Central American and Caribbean countries. Our strategic partnership with Colombia is aimed at producing both short- and long-term results in regional security.

Over time, Colombian training and expertise provided to underdeveloped regional police forces will decrease reliance on U.S. funding. Part of this progress includes the development of Colombia's rural police force, where a vast majority of narcotics are grown, produced, and prepped for export to the United States.

Just a few months ago, I had the opportunity to visit the Joint Interagency Task Force South and

SOUTHCOM's headquarters in Florida to hear and see firsthand the challenges that migrant and drug interdiction within the Caribbean region pose on homeland and national security.

I can tell you that it was an eye-opening experience, and I appreciate even more the work our Federal and local enforcement agencies are doing in interdiction and intervention.

When it comes to stemming the flow of narcotics to the United States, a big part of overcoming the challenges we face is ensuring that our strategic partners have the support they need to continue their efforts to tackle these threats head-on.

We must continue to support these efforts. They play a critical role in not only reducing the drug flow over our borders, but promoting stability and peace throughout Central and South America.

It is no secret that the United States faces a drug epidemic that touches all corners of our Nation. This amendment is just one more contribution to a multieffort, multinational approach to all law enforcement personnel involved in these efforts, as well as our allies in the region. I thank them for the important work they do in reducing the flow of drugs into the United States.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, unfortunately, would harm American leadership on the global stage, cutting our investment in the international organizations account by \$10 million.

Mr. Chairman, this bill already underfunds diplomacy and development when we should be investing more in these critical components of our national security. Cutting resources for our work in international organizations would take us further in the wrong direction.

Just so we are clear about which international organizations we are talking about, they are NATO, the World Health Organization, and the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Do we really want to damage the effectiveness of these organizations and our ability to lead from within them?

Congress just passed critical sanctions on Russia. NATO is the main organization defending Europe against Vladimir Putin's aggression. But instead of bolstering the NATO alliance, this amendment would only reinforce the reluctance to support the North Atlantic Alliance by some in the administration. This should worry lawmakers on both sides of the aisle as well as Americans at home following the debate.

How about the World Health Organization? The last time I looked, the World Health Organization was fighting the Zika and Ebola outbreaks. Do

we now want to slash its funding and undermine its role of responding to the next major pandemic? I can assure you that the diseases we don't combat abroad today eventually will reach our shores.

North Korea is threatening the globe with nuclear weapons. Iran remains not far behind. So I cannot fathom why we would want to cut funding for the IAEA, given its crucial role in monitoring nuclear safety around the world.

Of course, this amendment would also reduce our support for the U.N. regular budget. Withholding this funding could cause the United States to fall behind at the U.N., further diminishing our standing in the world, calling into question our commitment as a global leader, and ceding ground to Vladimir Putin and others who are happy to expand their reach but who do not share our values.

In fact, even a senior administration official, our own Ambassador to the United Nations, Nikki Haley, has said on many occasions that while she supports efforts to reform the U.N., she does not support a "slash and burn" approach.

This amendment, unfortunately, is a "slash and burn" approach, Mr. Chairman, and I urge my colleagues to join me in opposing it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), my esteemed colleague who is the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee and a fellow New Yorker.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

I agree with the gentleman's sentiments to put greater emphasis and engagement with our Southern neighbors.

The United States can and should be very involved with the issues in our own backyard, especially those involving crime and drug smuggling. However, to fund this increased engagement, this amendment takes a further cut from the contributions to the international organizations account, which funds our assessed contributions to the U.N. and other international bodies. This account is already \$188 million below our current enacted level and will put us in further arrears to our international partners.

I also think it is important to note that the offset proposed by the gentleman's amount would also come at the expense of our support to regional partners, such as the Organization of American States, the Pan American Health Organization, and the Inter-American Institute for Cooperation on Agriculture.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is trying to put money in place for something with which I agree. It is not that I disagree with it, but I disagree with where he is taking the money from. I think that is the problem with it.

Hopefully, we can, when it comes to a final budget, include both of these. But to borrow from Peter to pay Paul, I think is not a good idea.

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

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would just reiterate that it removes less than 1 percent of the account. So 99 percent of the account remains in place.

It will help reduce the flow of drugs into the United States. We will lose between 4,000 and 5,000 Americans not next year, but next month.

Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

□ 1545

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman has offered, I think, a reasonably good amendment, and we would like to see it adopted, so I urge an "aye" vote.

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

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

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, there is bipartisan consensus that our foreign assistance should be as effective and efficient as possible. That is why I am deeply concerned that several amendments offered by myself and my colleagues to address the destructive policies facing women's health were blocked from consideration on this bill.

We know the disastrous effects of the global gag rule, which force reproductive health providers to choose between receiving U.S. funds or providing comprehensive healthcare. But this bill would exponentially increase the damage of the global gag rule by expanding its application to all global health assistance.

It is unconscionable to insert abortion politics into lifesaving programs that prevent pandemics, lower rates of maternal and child deaths, and treat those suffering from malnutrition, HIV, AIDS, and malaria.

Since May, organizations have been trying to ensure compliance with unclear guidance. Most do not yet know the impact on their programs or whether they will be able to find new partners in hard-to-serve areas.

Expanding this policy without knowing the impact is senseless and will jeopardize lives. The bill also prohibits funding for UNFPA, a primary U.S. partner ensuring women fleeing violence have safe maternal care.

The United States neither can nor should conduct programs in every country. We currently conduct bilateral family planning programs in 34 countries. By contributing to UNFPA, we can help women in nearly 100 additional countries get access to needed services.

This bill ignores the fact that family planning is the most effective way to prevent abortion and unwanted pregnancies, and it decimates the effectiveness of our global programs for millions.

Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), my colleague on the State, Foreign Operations Subcommittee who has been an effective, aggressive advocate on a whole range of issues and an invaluable member of our committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank our ranking member for yielding, but also I just want to thank her for her tireless leadership on our subcommittee and full committee. You truly are a champion for all Americans, especially women and girls not only in our own country but all around the world. So it is really too bad we have to stand here and even debate this again, but thank you again for your leadership.

I am proud to speak in support of our ranking member's amendment to strike two poison pill riders in this bill.

Now, my colleagues and I have offered amendments to strike these ideological—that is what they are—provisions both in the full Appropriations Committee and again during the Rules Committee. It is outrageous, quite frankly, that the majority refuse to allow these amendments to even come to the floor for a debate.

Now, I have fought long and hard against the global gag rule, which denies family planning funding to organizations who want to help women plan their families. We have been fighting this now for at least, myself, two decades.

This cruel policy is really a political football putting lives at risk just to score a few cheap political points. President Trump and this Republican majority have taken this extreme policy to the limits, expanded it to all global health funding.

Let me be clear. This policy will cost lives. This administration's actions have consequences, and, sadly, it is the most vulnerable women and girls who will pay the price. The expanded global gag rule also undermines our longstanding bipartisan foreign aid priorities like fighting gender-based violence and ending AIDS.

On top of that, this bill includes a prohibition of funding for UNFPA, again, based on pure ideology. UNFPA works in some of the most dangerous

places, giving care to those who need it the most. They treat victims of sexual violence and provide menstrual hygiene services and maternity care in humanitarian crisis settings.

I visited many times UNFPA projects all around the world, and I have seen firsthand the tremendous impacts these programs have on the lives of those they serve. Defunding these programs truly will kill women.

I urge my colleagues to reject these harmful riders, reject this bill, and get back to regular order. It is time to stop trying to push through these really untenable bills that really are very dangerous to women and girls throughout the world and babies.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMBORN) assumed the chair.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate concur in the House amendment to the Senate amendment numbered 6 to the bill (H.R. 601) "An Act to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of assistance provided under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to promote quality basic education in developing countries, to better enable such countries to achieve universal access to quality basic education and improved learning outcomes, to eliminate duplication and waste, and for other purposes.", with an amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

#### DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 94 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BOST). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 94 printed in part B of House Report 115-295.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 874, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$35,300,000)".

Page 1140, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$35,300,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 500, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the opportunity to speak about my amendment to the State and Foreign Operations division of H.R. 3354.

Mr. Chairman, we are facing some tough choices. Our Nation is nearly \$20 trillion in debt. We are going to debate lifting the debt ceiling in the coming days. Simply put, we cannot afford to continue recklessly spending on duplicative and wasteful programs.

The United States Institute of Peace is a perfect example of a duplicative program that must be reexamined. The Institute's charter states that the organization was established to promote international peace and the resolution of conflict among the nations and peoples of the world without recourse to violence.

These are laudable and worthy goals, but it sounds a lot like the mission statement of another taxpayer-backed diplomatic organization, the United States Department of State.

The State Department's operational mission is to create a more secure, democratic, and prosperous world for the benefit of the American people and the international community. Why is Congress funding an independent think tank that supports the same mission as another Federal Government agency?

The U.S. Institute of Peace is far from the only organization on the ground working to foster peace across the globe. Since its inception, the U.S. Institute of Peace has awarded thousands of grants to other peace organizations. There are also more than 150 colleges and universities offering peace studies programs across the United States.

Why are we earmarking an additional \$35.3 million in public funds to support a think tank that duplicates the State Department's mission, uses its public funds to support other peace-promoting organizations, and can raise millions of dollars in private funds to promote its own work?

For this reason, Members on both sides of the aisle have supported ending this program. In fact, this same amendment was offered by a Democratic member from New York to an appropriations bill in 2011. The amendment passed with a strong bipartisan vote.

The White House recently proposed eliminating Federal funding to the Institute noting that it duplicates not only other Federal programs but also nonprofit and private sector organizations.

In addition to the duplicative nature of its work, the Institute's authorization has expired. The underlying funding contained in the bill is not even allowed under House rules.

The authorization process is vital to ensuring that the American taxpayer is protected from waste. At the very least, we should withhold funding until the Institute is reauthorized.

Our kids and grandkids are relying on us to find a solution to this problem rather than continuing to dig the hole deeper. I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, each and every one of us has a moral obligation to challenge ourselves to make this little piece of real estate that we call Earth better for generations yet unborn.

USIP does good and great work by teaching people around the world to strive to create a society at peace with itself and its neighbors.

We spend millions and billions of dollars on guns, bombs, and missiles. Can we spend just a few pennies, a few dimes, a few dollars on peace?

This world, this planet is, not ours to hoard, waste, and destroy. Mr. Chairman, I ask you: What is wrong with supporting the way of peace, the way of love, the way of nonviolence? What is wrong with teaching communities to respect the dignity and the worth of every human being? What is wrong with preventing conflict and keeping our military personnel safe and out of harm's way?

Mr. Chairman, on the question of preventing war and on the challenge of keeping peace, there should be no price tag, but USIP does good and great work on a shoestring budget. It is a small agency which teaches the way of peace, the way of love. Their small staff help communities solve problems through dialogue rather than weapons.

Mr. Chairman, this is not the first time that we consider an amendment to abolish the U.S. Institute of Peace, but I hope this will be the last. I urge each and every one of my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chairman, first I want to thank the gentleman from Colorado for the amendment and the committee for the opportunity. The U.S. Institute of Peace is intended to be a nonpartisan independent national institute funded by Congress, and I question both the nonpartisan nature of the Institute and the need, quite honestly, for the Federal Government to fund it now, at least \$1 billion over these many years at \$35 million a year, and, as the gentleman from Colorado said, in a duplicative effort.

Nobody is against peace and nobody is against love. The question is: Do we need a State Department doing it at the cost of billions of dollars and then this other organization doing the exact same work at a cost of another \$35 million annually when we are \$20 trillion in debt and more, maybe up to \$200 trillion in unfunded liabilities? And then to add insult to injury, regarding the nonpartisan independent nature that the taxpayers are forced to fund, on January 5th of 2016, on an episode of C-SPAN, Manal Omar, the acting vice president for the Middle East and Africa Center conducted a highly divisive,

partisan attack on then-leading Republican primary candidate Donald Trump and the Republican party as a whole.

Some of her more egregious statements include: “What Trump is doing is inciting violence, make no mistake about it. He has blood on his hands.” And “Trump and other Republican rhetoric have validated that type of violence against Muslims. It has given them an excuse to actually turn the negative rhetoric into violence.”

□ 1600

Her comments followed the violent attacks in San Bernardino and Paris.

To my knowledge, no punitive action was taken against Ms. Omar, and she continues to serve as the associate vice president for the Middle East and Africa Center at USIP.

I wrote the Institute a letter in that regard inquiring as to her status, whether there would be punitive measures taken for this obvious partisan and vicious attack on the Republican Party and the candidate that was then leading, and, of course, I didn't hear back until, oh, I don't know, 2 days ago, when we saw that there was an amendment to defund the U.S. Institute of Peace.

Again, Mr. Chairman, to add insult to injury, this place spends \$35 million, including telling the American people what they should think about their politicians. That is not their mission, that is not what we are paying for, and that is why we should stop paying for it.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair would remind Members that remarks in debate may not engage in personalities toward the President, including by repeating remarks carried elsewhere that would be improper if spoken in the Member's own words.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS), the chairman of the State, Foreign Operations Subcommittee.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in respectful disagreement with my colleague who offered this amendment.

The United States Institute of Peace works to help prevent, reduce, and resolve violent conflicts abroad. The Institute works alongside our military, our diplomats, and development experts in some of the most conflict-affected and fragile environments, including Iraq, Afghanistan, Tunisia, South Sudan, and Ukraine. Eliminating the U.S. Institute of Peace would hamper our efforts to stabilize these areas and to prevent further outbreaks of conflict.

The Institute also works with local leaders and other partners to find solutions to religious freedom and to mitigate the rise of extremism and persecution.

Let me point out, too, that the staffer the gentleman just mentioned in his remarks is no longer with the Institute. She is gone.

Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote on this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. GRANGER), a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Chairman, today I rise in strong opposition to this amendment.

As a former chairwoman of the State, Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I worked very closely with the U.S. Institute of Peace. From firsthand experience, I can tell you how important their mission is. They send staff to some of the most volatile areas of the world to promote peace.

For instance, in Afghanistan, the Institute facilitated peaceful elections in 2014, despite Taliban calls for violence.

Also, in 2015, the Institute facilitated a local Sunni and Shia agreement in Iraq that averted bloodshed and let 380,000 internationally displaced people return home.

Let's not forget that it was under President Ronald Reagan that the Institute of Peace was created.

Funding the Institute of Peace is an important investment. It is for these reasons that I strongly urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ROTHFUS). The gentleman has 1 minute remaining.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE), a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the U.S. Institute of Peace gives people in conflict abroad the skills and techniques to solve their conflicts without resorting to violence.

The Institute owes its creation to the many men and women who came before us and worked hard in its creation during the Reagan administration. One of the early founders and board members at the start was Father Ted Hesburgh, who many in this body knew as the president of the University of Notre Dame. Father Ted, as we all called him, sadly, passed away in 2015.

Back in 2011, when the Institute was similarly threatened, he wrote this: “. . . That Congress would seek to eliminate funding for the United States Institute of Peace is abhorrent and unthinkable.”

“. . . As a man of faith and reason, I know that we need to balance our budget. But I also know that you cannot balance a budget on the backs of our men and women in uniform. Nor can we take the risk of making our country less safe. We need the tools of diplomacy and peacebuilding to stop international conflict before it starts and to manage its aftermath.”

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD an op-ed Father Hesburgh wrote, dated February 27, 2011.

[From the Washington Post, Feb. 27, 2011]

THE U.S. CAN'T TURN ITS BACK ON PEACE

(By Ted Hesburgh)

Some would say that by the time you have lived almost a century, you have seen it all. But what I saw the House of Representatives do with its continuing resolution is beyond the pale. That Congress would seek to eliminate funding for the United States Institute of Peace is abhorrent and unthinkable.

Congress should know better: The last century marked the most violent and destructive era in human history. Wars great and small cut short the lives of more than 100 million people. We learned a great deal from those wars and, fortunately, we now have a vibrant and active field of peacebuilding. As recent events have shown, there is hopeful progress for peaceful management of conflict but more violence is certain to come in a world where disputes are fueled by religious intolerance, ethnic divisions, failing states, terrorism, intractable territorial conflicts and the uncontrolled proliferation of highly destructive weaponry. The young field of international conflict management is just beginning to bear fruit.

Now is not the time, in the face of global adversity, to cut peace. The United States must be a leader in nonviolent international management. This conflict-ridden world needs an organization committed to peace-making: one that can deploy teams of specialists to conflict zones; create and implement methods of resolving disputes before guns are drawn; and train leaders who can mediate conflicts and make civil societies work. That is why Congress created the U.S. Institute of Peace in 1984. President Ronald Reagan's wise investment continues to pay dividends in the training and education of peacemakers, facilitators, trainers and other experts.

As a man of faith and reason, I know that we need to balance our budget. But I also know that you cannot balance a budget on the backs of our men and women in uniform. Nor can we take the risk of making our nation less safe. We need the tools of diplomacy and peacebuilding to stop international conflict before it starts and to manage its aftermath. We have wonderful institutions in the State Department and the Pentagon but they alone cannot deal with every foreign affairs issue. There are times when you need nongovernmental organizations, legislative agencies and the help of those who have relationships on the ground in conflict zones to run interference or to pave the way for officials. We must never suffer from pride and hubris, thinking that only Washington has the answers.

All the global conflicts raging around us may have seemed of little consequence to earlier generations. In the new century, however, even small conflicts risk growing to a scale that can destroy lives and economies around the world. In the U.S. Institute of Peace we have an organization that understands the sources of violence as well as the tools to prevent international conflict.

If the United States is serious about peace-making, its citizens and national leaders must defend the institutions that are doing the hard work of transitioning societies from war to peace. The U.S. Institute for Peace should have a permanent home in the nation's capital from which to teach, inspire and prepare current and future generations of peacemakers—and to be a symbol of America's commitment to reducing violent international conflict in the 21st century.

We must, as a nation, show courage, steadiness of purpose and commitment to core principles. We cannot afford the alternatives.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter

from many of our colleagues supporting the U.S. Institute of Peace.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, March 27, 2017.

Hon. HAL ROGERS,

*Chair, Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations and Related Programs, House Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.*

Hon. NITA LOWEY,

*Ranking Member, Subcommittee on State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs, House Committee on Appropriations, Washington, DC.*

DEAR CHAIRMAN ROGERS AND RANKING MEMBER LOWEY: We write in strong support of the valuable contribution made by United States Institute of Peace (USIP) to our country's strategic interests abroad and encourage you to support \$37,884,000 to USIP for fiscal year 2018. This is the same level requested by USIP in FY 2017.

Founded by Congress in 1984, USIP applies cost-effective, practical solutions in conflict zones around the world with the mission of preventing, mitigating and resolving violent conflict. USIP's work is grounded in its commitment to education and training while honing best practices in challenging environments.

For example, in Iraq USIP has brokered peace agreements in Tikrit and Kirkuk among tribal leaders in areas liberated from ISIS. After ISIS' 2014 massacre of as many as 1,700 Shia military personnel at former Camp Speicher near the city of Tikrit, USIP and its grassroots Iraqi partners facilitated dialogues among local tribal and religious leaders resulting in an inter-tribal agreement that formed the critical basis for the return by mid-2016 of more than 360,000 displaced residents.

At a time when current estimates place the cost of violent conflict globally at more than \$13 trillion, USIP serves as an important element of the national security toolbox. The U.S. government must have a full range of options for preventing and resolving violent international conflicts. It is critically important that Congress continue to support USIP and its proven, successful record of reducing conflict while advancing U.S. interests.

We believe you share our understanding that USIP's work helps reduce the impact of violent conflict in places where American security interest are top priorities. As always, we appreciate your previous support for USIP, and we look forward to working with you during the FY 2018 appropriations process.

Sincerely,

John Lewis, Joseph Crowley, Eliot L. Engel, G.K. Butterfield, Alcee L. Hastings, Lucille Roybal-Allard, Joe Courtney, Janice D. Schakowsky, Albio Sires, Timothy J. Walz, Doris O. Matsui, Peter Welch, Sanford D. Bishop, Jr., Bobby L. Rush, Al Lawson, Jr., Seth Moulton, Keith Ellison.

James P. McGovern, Denny Heck, Joseph P. Kennedy III, Pramila Jayapal, Jamie Raskin, Elizabeth H. Esty, Alma S. Adams, Mark DeSaulnier, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Earl Blumenauer, Donald S. Beyer, Jr., Scott H. Peters, Brendan F. Boyle, Sander M. Levin, Michael E. Capuano, Bill Foster, Mark Pocan, Susan A. Davis.

Raúl M. Grijalva, Nanette Diaz Barragán, Tony Cárdenas, Bradley Scott Schneider, Anthony G. Brown, Bonnie Watson Coleman, Juan Vargas, Norma J. Torres, Jared Polis, Stephanie N. Murphy, Sean Patrick Maloney, Julia Brownley, Jerrold Nadler, Diana DeGette, Eleanor Holmes Norton, Peter A. DeFazio, Elijah E. Cum-

mings, Danny K. Davis, Henry C. "Hank" Johnson.

Gerald E. Connolly, Ben Ray Lujan, Barbara Lee, Gwen Moore, Adam Smith, Steve Cohen, Paul Tonko, Eddie Bernice Johnson, Judy Chu, John Conyers, Jr., John Garamendi, William R. Keating, Coleen Hanabusa, Adam B. Schiff.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members in this body to vote for peace and to oppose this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, the comments of a single individual should not be an excuse to eliminate funding for an entire institution. My understanding is that individual has already offered her resignation.

The United States Institute of Peace is one of the best tools the United States has to bring people together—government officials, civil society practitioners, and defense experts—to creatively solve problems that are some of the world's thorniest issues. Congress created USIP for this purpose in 1983.

USIP applies practical solutions directly in conflict zones and provides analysis, education, and resources to those working for peace. USIP has specialized teams of mediators, trainers, and others in some of the world's most dangerous places, including Iraq and Afghanistan, equipping others with the skills necessary to prevent or resolve their own violent conflicts before they threaten the United States.

In 2015, USIP facilitated a local Sunni-Shia accord and decree that averted bloodshed and let 380,000 internally displaced persons return home.

In Burma, they trained civic leaders, government officials, and police to help achieve a peaceful 2015 election for a more democratic government during a delicate transition from autocratic rule to democracy.

USIP works on the ground with local partners on the root causes of conflict that all too frequently result in America's military gains of diplomatic and development investments going to peace.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), the ranking member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend for yielding to me.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. To completely eliminate funding for the United States Institute of Peace would be a serious mistake.

Let me thank Mrs. LOWEY for the wonderful work she is doing here and JOHN LEWIS for his leadership. JOHN is an American hero. I think we should listen to what JOHN has to say.

For anyone who doesn't know what the USIP does, it saves lives, lives of

U.S. servicemembers, military personnel, and civilians around the world.

The United States Institute of Peace stops conflicts before they start and works to defuse crises. The Institute provides conflict resolution teams and skills that are vital to our diplomats and our military forces serving in conflict zones abroad. They are often quiet successes, rarely grabbing headlines. After all, a war that doesn't happen won't draw near the attention of a raging conflict.

Military leaders agree. On September 1, a distinguished group of retired three- and four-star flag officers who have served our country valiantly during some of its most challenging conflicts wrote to Speaker RYAN and Leader PELOSI expressing deep concerns about efforts here in the House to eliminate funding for USIP.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD the letter.

SEPTEMBER 1, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House,  
House of Representatives.*  
Hon. NANCY PELOSI,  
*Minority Leader,  
House of Representatives.*

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN AND MINORITY LEADER PELOSI: As retired three and four star flag officers who have served our country during some of its most challenging conflicts, from Vietnam to Iraq and Afghanistan, we are writing to express our deep concern over proposed amendments to the current FY 2018 appropriations bill now before the House of Representatives that would eliminate funding for the U.S. Institute of Peace.

We serve on the Institute's Senior Military Advisory Group which, in addition to advising USIP's leadership on current and future conflicts, also guides Institute efforts to partner effectively with our military in conflict zones. USIP has a long and robust record of working closely with its federal partners—including the Department of Defense—to focus on national security priority areas where it brings distinctive capabilities to bear.

USIP works on the ground with local partners on the root causes of conflict that all too frequently result in America's military gains or diplomatic and development investments going to waste. For example, in Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Tunisia, Nigeria, and across the Sahel in Africa, USIP engages at a local level to thwart ISIS' ability to recruit and destabilize America's most important allies in the struggle against extremism. USIP's high impact approach gives people the tools to help solve their own problems so America is not drawn into these conflicts.

No other agency provides these services, and USIP's approach is highly cost effective. In Mahmoudiya, Iraq, for example—a region so violent it was known as the "Triangle of Death"—USIP partnered with the Army's 10th Mountain Division in 2007 to forge a tribal accord that halted attacks on U.S. and Iraqi forces and drastically reduced casualties. The Army was able to withdraw more than 2,800 troops—80 percent of its deployment in the region—thus saving more than \$150 million per month. That initiative cost USIP approximately \$1 million. A decade later, despite pressure from ISIS, Mahmoudiya remains relatively calm, largely on the basis of that peace accord.

As citizens and former soldiers, we believe deeply in the mission of the U.S. Institute of Peace as an essential element of our national

security architecture. Please ensure that it remains fully funded and capable of continuing its critical work to further U.S. interests and save lives in the world's most challenging conflict zones.

Sincerely,

General GEORGE W. CASEY,  
Jr., USA (Ret.),  
*Chief of Staff of the  
United States Army  
(‘07-‘11).*

Ambassador KARL W.  
EIKENBERRY, LT General,  
USA (Ret.),  
*U.S. Ambassador to  
Afghanistan (‘09-  
‘11), Deputy Chair-  
man, NATO Military  
Committee (‘07-‘09),  
Commander, Com-  
bined Forces Com-  
mand-Afghanistan  
(‘05-‘07).*

General CARTER HAM, USA  
(Ret.),  
*Commander, U.S. Afri-  
ca Command (‘11-  
‘13), Commander,  
U.S. Army, Europe  
(‘08-‘11).*

Ambassador DOUGLAS  
LUTE, LT General, USA  
(Ret.),  
*United States Perma-  
nent Representative  
to NATO (‘13-‘17),  
National Security  
Council, The White  
House (‘07-‘10).*

General GREGORY S.  
MARTIN, USAF (Ret.),  
*Commander, Air Mate-  
rial Command (‘03-  
‘05), Commander,  
U.S. Air Forces in  
Europe (‘00-‘03).*

General RAYMOND T.  
ODIERNO, USA (Ret.),  
*Chief of Staff of the  
United States Army  
(‘11-‘15), Com-  
mander, United  
States Joint Forces  
Command (‘10-‘11),  
Commander, United  
States Forces-Iraq,  
Operation Iraqi  
Freedom (‘10).*

General CHARLES F. WALD,  
USAF (RET.),  
*Deputy Commander,  
U.S. European Com-  
mand (‘02-‘06).*

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, USIP is neither a Republican nor a Democratic institution. The Institution was created in 1984 by bipartisan legislation signed into law by President Reagan. Since then, USIP has saved the United States billions of dollars by investing in peace. Let me share just one short example of the incredible work that USIP has done.

After 52 years of war and more than a quarter million lives lost, Colombia's armed conflict ended with the signing of a peace agreement last year in Cartagena. The peace agreement was reached, in no small part, thanks to the incredible work of the United States Institute of Peace and its chief of operations in Colombia, Ginny Bouvier. Under her leadership, USIP trained female mediators, religious organizations, Afro-Colombian leaders,

and many others in methods to support peaceful resolution of conflict.

Ginny recently passed away, far too young, at the age of 58, but I would like to believe that her legacy of peacebuilding in Colombia can live on through continued congressional support for USIP.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting this harmful amendment.

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

Mr. BUCK. I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 95 OFFERED BY MR. ENGEL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 95 printed in part B of House Report 115-295.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 880, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$209,000,000)".

Page 898, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$209,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 500, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chairman, let me start by thanking my colleagues and fellow co-chairs of the House Tuberculosis Elimination Caucus, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. I am grateful for their support of this measure and for their work to combat tuberculosis around the world. This bipartisan amendment would help move that work forward.

Mr. Chairman, America's investments in global health are not hand-outs. Combating disease around the world isn't just some pet project to make us feel good about ourselves. When we invest in global health, we are investing in our own security and leadership on the global stage. After all, infectious diseases don't respect borders, and when we fail to fight a dangerous illness or respond to a pandemic overseas, we risk having to respond once it reaches our shores.

At the same time, healthier communities are more protective, more stable communities. Healthier countries are stronger partners on the world stage. And when the United States helps to advance those conditions, we are showing the world what kind of country we are, what American values demand of us.

The reality is we should be investing more in these efforts. One area where we need a lot more support is in the fight against tuberculosis.

TB kills more people worldwide than any other infectious disease. This is es-

pecially heartbreaking, Mr. Chairman, because we know how to prevent TB, and we know how to cure it. We know how to cure it, and people are still dying. That is just unfathomable.

Yet, in 2015, 1.8 million people died from this disease, 10.5 million more became infected. One in ten TB patients is also HIV positive, making tuberculosis the top killer of people living with HIV. Countries with a high prevalence of TB can see their GDP shrink by 4 to 7 percent.

The World Health Organization tells us we need an additional \$2 billion every year to control tuberculosis. My amendment would help to make up part of that shortfall, ramping up USAID's global health programs by \$209 million. That would bring our investment in TB assistance to \$450 million.

□ 1615

These efforts have a proven track record, Mr. Chairman. In the countries where we are working on the problem, incidence of TB has dropped by nearly one-fifth since 2000, more than twice as fast as countries where we haven't been involved. That is tens of thousands of precious lives saved, and we played a major role in that.

My amendment won't wipe out this disease, Mr. Chairman, but it will save lives, it will build on past successes and move us in the direction of putting a stop to this killer once and for all.

I ask all Members to support this bipartisan amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chair, this amendment would cut funding for the International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement Affairs account by \$209 million. That is a 16 percent reduction in the fight against narcotics.

There is already money in the bill for TB, \$241 million, which is the same as current levels, and that exceeds the last Obama request and the first Trump request for TB. It also includes another \$1.35 billion for the Global Fund to fight a combination of HIV/AIDS, malaria, and TB, which includes additional funding for TB programs. So there is already money in the bill for TB.

This would cut the International Narcotics Control and Law Enforcement Affairs account by \$209 million, a 16 percent cut, when it is not really needed.

Funding for this account supports counterdrug and law enforcement activities, strengthens the rule of law, and increases border security.

Mr. Chairman, I just came back with my subcommittee from a trip to Ukraine and Georgia, and I understand by seeing it firsthand the importance of our assistance that helps governments combat corruption and improve the rule of law.



A portion of this funding also helps partners in our own hemisphere fight drug trafficking and violent crime before it reaches the border of the United States.

Undoubtedly, every agency can do more with more, but the allocation for this bill was cut by 17 percent from last year. And rather than cut every account by 17 percent, we deliberately and carefully considered each program, and directed the funding recommendations to reflect our priorities. Among those priorities is funding for TB, which is held at last year's level. This means, of course, that other accounts and programs took a disproportionately higher cut to make that possible.

I know the gentleman wants more funds for TB, and I sympathize with him in that desire. I can assure him that preserving last year's level of funding puts TB in a very rarefied position in this bill, because it is treated well.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Chair, let me just say that I hear what the chairman is saying. I certainly am a strong supporter of international narcotics funding, but the question is: Where do you put the money?

The International Narcotics funding account is well funded and even has money in the pipeline from previous years. Meanwhile, TB control is hugely underfunded and continues to kill more people worldwide than any other disease. That is why the funding is necessary. So by passing my amendment, we can save thousands of lives from this preventable, curable disease.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY).

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my colleague from New York's amendment. TB is the biggest killer of people worldwide, yet the current strategies for combating the disease are not keeping pace with the burden and complexity.

In an increasingly connected world, TB will increase its threat to U.S. citizens directly. Without investments in new technologies and building the systems to diagnose and treat active infections, we risk failing even further. Already, scientists estimate 2 million children have been infected with multidrug-resistant TB. We can and should be doing more to fight this known disease.

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

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

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I rise today in support of this amendment to increase funding of bilateral tuberculosis (TB) assistance, and I want to thank Representatives ENGEL (D-NY) and GREEN (D-TX) for joining me. The three of us are Co-Chairs of

the Tuberculosis Elimination Caucus and have long worked toward that goal. This includes domestically, such as in the State of Alaska, which suffers from high per-capita TB rates in the United States, but also internationally.

The U.S. Agency for International Development does a tremendous amount of work across the globe providing aid. One of its most important battles is against TB, which kills more people worldwide than any other infectious disease. In 2015 this amounted to 1.8 million people dying, out of the 10.4 million affected. This is more than HIV and Malaria combined. To make things worse, TB is preventable and curable.

Imagine if the Centers for Disease Control came out and said next year there is going to be a new disease. That this disease is going to infect over 10 million people and kill almost 20 percent of them in just one year. I imagine we would take it very seriously.

This is not an old world disease. TB is real and it is deadly. Pandemics of infectious disease in recent years have shown us the need to combat them ahead of time, not wait until it arrives at our shores. We have come a long way in combating TB, but more work needs to be done.

This amendment makes that possible and I urge its adoption.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 96 OFFERED BY MS. FRANKEL OF FLORIDA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 96 printed in part B of House Report 115-295.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 889, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$8,500,000)".

Page 898, line 9, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$8,500,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 500, the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chair, this bill inexplicably defunds UN Women.

What is UN Women?

UN Women was created by the United Nations in 2010 to direct activities on gender equality issues. The organization helps meet the most urgent needs of women and girls by supporting women's full participation in their country's political, economic, and social life.

So as I said, this bill inexplicably takes away funding, \$8.5 million, that we are trying to get back from this very important program. I think this defunding of this is wrong, it is unwise, it is immoral.

Let me tell you what happens when we abandon the UN Women, because this is what we are walking away from: providing services for survivors of

human trafficking. We are walking away from registering women to vote and participate in their political system, including women in the peace-making process. We are walking away from combating child bride kidnapping and fighting child marriage. That is what we are walking away from today.

I know we have a lot of issues here in this country. We have been battling the hurricanes, and I know our hearts go out to all those impacted.

There is something else that has been going on in this world for years now, which is the greatest humanitarian crisis that we have seen since World War II, and that is what is happening in Syria. You have millions of people fleeing into neighboring countries, running away from rape, from murder, from chemical attacks.

What is the United States doing?

Oh, well. We are abandoning the Muslims, we are trying to build the walls, while we have great allies like Jordan, for example, who have now taken in over a million Syrian refugees, including this very young girl who was at a program that I had an opportunity to visit when I was in Jordan at a facility run by the UN Women where they are working with women to give them skills, to teach them.

This young girl fled her home in Syria under rocket fire, leaving her family, her brother killed, and fleeing to Jordan, where she is now learning to be a journalist. We are defunding programs like that in this bill.

So we are putting so many women's lives at risk, like Zaad, the girl I just talked about, leaving women and girls vulnerable to sex trafficking, poverty, homelessness, and hunger; and we say we want to try to bring stabilization to these regions across the world.

Let me tell you what research shows. Research shows that when women are empowered, economies grow and societies are more stable with less violence. And our own U.N. Ambassador, Nikki Haley, said:

We want to make sure that our governments support girls and support women, and we should encourage every country to support these basic rights.

So what are we doing today?

We are defunding UN Women. As I said, it is inexplicable and it is wrong. I think it is actually idiotic.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), who I think can elucidate even more on this subject.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I thank my good friend, who has certainly worked with many women, and women who focus on the needs of women around the world, and I thank her very much for this very important amendment, and that is why I am rising in support of my colleague's amendment.

One of the deficiencies of the fiscal year 2018 State and Foreign Operations bill we are considering is the treatment of international organizations that serve U.S. interests and help our own resources reach farther and deeper. My

colleague raises the important contribution of UN Women and of U.S. support for its work.

UN Women ensures that the critical role of women is part of the international dialogue and that the effects of policies are considered on both women and men before they are implemented.

UN Women works in complex environments like Afghanistan with the treatment of women and their involvement in the economy and political systems.

There are these reasons and so much more as to why I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and UN Women. I really am urging my friends on the other side of the aisle, as this process continues, that we look to renew the funding.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time, and I respectfully withdraw this amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to section 4 of House Resolution 500, as the designee of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chair, I rise to engage the gentleman from Kentucky in a colloquy.

Mr. Chairman, Chicago Bridge & Iron Company, CB&I, is a major international engineering procurement and construction firm with headquarters in The Woodlands, Texas, where I live. Their headquarters is a mere mile from my home.

The company employs nearly 34,000 people across the United States, and more than 1,000 people in the Eighth Congressional District of Texas.

CB&I built a world class petrochemical refinery in the Republic of Colombia for Colombia's state-owned company, valued at nearly \$8 billion.

A commercial dispute has arisen as a result of construction of the refinery. And in an attempt to gain leverage, entirely unfounded and unprincipled criminal charges have been filed against current and former CB&I executives, both of whom are U.S. citizens.

Is it the intent of the committee, Mr. Chairman, that the Secretary of State should report to the Committee on Appropriations on any efforts by the Colombian Government to use its criminal process against any United States citizen to advance commercial or political objectives?

Is it further the intent of the committee that the Department of State should engage with Colombia to examine and report on allegations by United States citizens of procedural or substantive due process of law violations relative to commercial disputes?

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. I thank the gentleman from Texas for bringing this issue to our attention. The committee takes seriously reports of Americans abroad being treated unfairly, denied due process, or being used as political pawns.

□ 1630

Colombia is a friend and ally of the United States and an important trading partner. We expect the Government of Colombia to ensure our citizens are treated fairly in their courts. The committee will follow up on this matter with the Department of State to ensure our Embassy is engaged on this issue. And I thank the gentleman for bringing this matter to our attention.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 97 printed in part B of House Report 115-295.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 889, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$12,000,000)".

Page 902, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$81,600,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 500, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I thank the members of this committee for allowing the opportunity to present this amendment. The extraordinary work of Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. ROGERS, as well as Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN and other members of the Appropriations Committee, are deeply appreciated by all of us.

This amendment adds an additional \$12 million to the Economic Support Fund to increase assistance to the Ethiopian-Israeli community.

Through the Middle East Partnership Initiative, our Embassy in Tel Aviv is already engaged in a number of valuable partnerships with the Ethiopian community in Israel. These programs are commendable, and I hope that their funding remains robust.

My amendment would extend a modest amount of aid toward a different subset of the community, Ethiopian-Israeli youth.

Israel's Ministry of Education recently completed a long-term review to determine how to best meet the needs of the community. The plan that was presented and adopted included approximately \$20 million for programs to improve integration of the Ethiopian community into Israeli society, focusing principally on education and, more specifically, language and math skills. Israeli organizations that have focused on this area for years have had great successes.

My first visit to Israel was, rather ironically because of today's events, with Mrs. LOWEY and other Members. During that period of time, we visited one of the areas where Ethiopian Jews were being absorbed. And since that time, I have followed actively Israel's continuing courageous concerns with reference to those from not only areas that are right there, but as far away as Ethiopia.

They work with American philanthropic organizations such as the Jewish Federations of North America, and private stakeholders, but, even with the new government funding, do not have sufficient resources to meet the needs of these communities.

Supporting this type of programming would be a logical and effective way to continue improving upon our country's bilateral relationship and would build upon programs that are already implemented on the ground.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. As I mentioned in my statement, Mr. Chairman, the bill before us today contains \$3.1 billion in a Foreign Military Financing program funded for Israel, which fully funds the last year of the current memorandum of understanding with Israel.

This amendment would reduce the Foreign Military Financing program account by more than \$80 million. In addition to Israel, this account provides funds for Egypt, Jordan, Tunisia, Colombia, and Ukraine. The President's budget request proposed deep cuts to this account, which we clearly rejected in the committee mark.

I should also note that the bill already provides over \$6 billion for humanitarian assistance. I do appreciate the gentleman's desire to help the Ethiopian-Israeli community, but I cannot support an \$80 million cut to security assistance. So I urge a "no" vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 98 printed in part B of House Report 115-295.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 889, line 6, after the first dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$20,000,000)”.

Page 902, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$72,600,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 500, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, my amendment adds \$20 million to the Economic Support Fund for the purpose of providing critically needed humanitarian aid to peoples persecuted by ISIS. These groups include Yazidi survivors of sexual slavery, as well as Christian, Shabak, and other religious and ethnic minorities.

Footnote right there, Mr. Chairman. I found it interesting in the past few weeks that the Rohingya in Myanmar, formerly Burma, are, literally, expelled from their country. While I, as well as others, am proud of Aung San Suu Kyi, and the extraordinary work that she did, and her Nobel Prize, I am puzzled by the continuing conduct which mimics genocide in that area, and this is not about that, but I would be remiss if I didn't mention it.

There are a lot of examples I could highlight to stress the importance of this amendment, but I want to focus briefly on the Yazidi. The crimes committed by the Islamic State against the Yazidi are amongst the most horrible we have heard of—mass executions, organized kidnapping, child soldiers, and sexual slavery. At the height of its power, the Islamic State sold girls and women in the open at slave markets.

In a recent article titled “Freed From ISIS, Yazidi Women Return in ‘Severe Shock,’” The New York Times quotes Dr. Nagham Nawzat Hasan, a Yazidi gynecologist who has treated over 1,000 of the rape victims. He describes the victims as virtually “unconscious” and “in severe shock and psychological upset.”

Thousands of women remain enslaved, and those who have escaped or been rescued, for them, the road to recovery is daunting.

As we debate how best to spend hundreds of millions of dollars in humanitarian aid, we must ensure this community is provided with support. Time is of the essence, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “yes” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Florida for raising this important issue. The plight of religious and eth-

nic minorities persecuted by ISIS has been, and remains, a priority for this committee, including the need for psychosocial support services to those affected by the crisis. That is why ample funding has been provided to assist communities affected by ISIS, including persecuted religious and ethnic minorities.

The fiscal year 2017 Security Assistance Appropriations Act provided over \$1 billion for programs to counter ISIS and address the needs of those affected by ISIS. Funding was also provided in the fiscal year 2017 regular appropriations bill.

Finally, we included language on this very issue in the fiscal year 2018 bill, including designating \$10 million for programs to protect vulnerable and persecuted religious minorities. The amendment, however, would reduce the Foreign Military Financing account by more than \$70 million. This account funds our friends and allies like Israel, Egypt, Jordan, Tunisia, Colombia, Ukraine. The President's budget request proposed deep cuts to this account, which we clearly rejected in the committee mark.

In short, we have already addressed the gentleman's concerns, and I cannot support such a large cut to security assistance.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “no” vote, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I am very pleased to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the ranking member of this distinguished committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chairman, I want to express my appreciation to my colleague who is always there to speak out against injustice and to help respond to the tremendous challenges we have. I was as shocked as the gentleman had been, frankly, on the recent actions in Burma or Myanmar, and I look forward to addressing that with him as well.

The reports from the ISIS-controlled areas are truly horrific, especially for the women and children who have been most vulnerable to the horrors of ISIS control. In these cases, support for the emotional and mental recovery of victims is as important as the standard humanitarian assistance of food, shelter, and water.

I look forward to continuing to work with the gentleman to address these issues because we have to speak out and act and respond to these horrors.

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

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I urge a “no” vote, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 99 printed in part B of House Report 115-295.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 889, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(reduced by \$12,000,000)”.

Page 1140, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert the following: “(increased by \$12,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 500, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, yesterday, we voted \$8 billion for the tragedies in the Gulf Coast. I wake up this morning and I find out we are supposed to vote for another \$8 billion, which is fine. But I think, as a result, we should also look extra hard to find ways to see if, in the bill as it passed out of the Appropriations Committee, maybe we can spend a little less somewhere.

I have a very modest suggestion for cutting a little bit of spending here. I would like a 1 percent reduction in the Economic Support Fund. This was in the Trump budget, combined with another fund, and subject to a 40 percent cut, I think because President Trump wanted to make good on his promise to put America first.

I realize political reality is such that we will not get the 40 percent cut that President Trump wanted, but I ask for a small, approximately 1 percent, cut of \$12 million.

Part of the money of the Economic Support Fund goes for universities abroad. Sometimes these universities have, like our own universities, a little bit of an anti-American, perhaps anti-Israeli bent; and for that reason, I think there is no question but that we should eagerly look forward to the chance to cut the spending in the Economic Support Fund by 1 percent, particularly in light of the fact that we have now a \$20 trillion debt and, particularly, because later today, I bet, after spending \$8 billion yesterday, we are going to go for another \$8 billion today.

Mr. Chair, I would like to ask for support for this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1645

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chairman, the overseas scholarship programs are popular among our Members because most of these programs support American educational institutions abroad.

Students that participate and receive an education based on American values help shape their societies. They are more likely to embrace democratic principles, counter extremism, and foster greater economic opportunity. These programs are an important part of the so-called soft power of America.

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

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, we love the chairman. We just feel that we are kind of broke here, and a 1 percent cut on something going for programs abroad would not be out of line.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. 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 question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GROTHMAN. 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 Wisconsin will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 101 OFFERED BY MR. PAULSEN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 101 printed in part B of House Report 115-295.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk as the designee of the gentleman from New York (Mr. DONOVAN).

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 896, line 17, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$15,000,000)".

Page 907, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$15,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 500, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chairman, first I would just like to thank Subcommittee Chairman ROGERS and Ranking Member LOWEY, along with the full committee and Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and their staff for their willingness to help with this amendment, as well as for all the hard work that they have done in putting together this important funding bill.

I also want to recognize Congressman DONOVAN, who is not able to be here today, but I offer this amendment along with him because it does seek to increase funding for the U.S. African

Development Foundation by \$15 million, bringing it up to the \$30 million that it was awarded back in fiscal year '17.

The U.S. African Development Foundation is an independent U.S. government agency that excels at doing development differently. It uses small grants to focus on ventures in the fields of food security, healthcare, education, and technology. Our taxpayer money is maximized to its full potential, as host African governments invest a share of their own money in this grant program. These grant programs are leading to self-sufficiency and entrepreneurship in countries that are plagued by conflict across the world.

In fact, the Center for Global Development has ranked the USADF second only to the Millennium Challenge Corporation on the maximizing foreign efficiency scale.

Mr. Chairman, the U.S. African Development Foundation represents the very best of modernized foreign assistance because they are so innovative, and I am honored to support it. I hope the rest of my colleagues will join me in supporting this amendment as well.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chair, I really appreciate the gentleman's concern, but not enough to support his amendment. As he knows, the administration proposed to close the United States African Development Foundation.

Given the significant reduction in our subcommittee's allocation, it would be very easy to agree to the administration's request. The bill before us, however, does not close the foundation, but instead doubles the requested amount.

If our conference allocation is more generous, then perhaps we can be more generous with the foundation. Until then, however, the bill, as reported out of committee, strikes, I think, the appropriate balance of assistance and diplomacy.

Mr. Chair, I urge a rejection of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN). The amendment was rejected.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands amendment No. 106 will not be offered.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 107 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MR. YOHO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 110 printed in part B of House Report 115-295.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chairman, I rise as the designee of the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN), and I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_. None of the funds appropriated by this Act may be made available in support of the United Nations Human Rights Council, the United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, or the United Nations Relief and Works Agency.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 500, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chair, this is a simple, straightforward amendment that would limit the taxpayers' burden of hundreds of millions of dollars to the bodies at the United Nations that work against America's interests and the interests of our ally, Israel.

Since its reformation as the Human Rights Council about 10 years ago, this U.N. agency has operated with a singular focus to isolate and delegitimize one of America's closest friends and allies, Israel.

In fact, Israel stands alone as the only Nation to have an entire agenda, Item 7, devoted solely to it.

Israel is the only democracy in the Middle East, but one would never know that if you only saw what came out of the Human Rights Council. In fact, while Israel is targeted repeatedly for unwarranted criticism, some of the world's worst human rights abusers are ignored.

When the body that was created to promote and protect global human rights has its agenda driven by the very worst human rights abusers, you have to stop and ask: How does this make sense? And why should the United States continue to legitimize this agenda by remaining part of that body?

The same goes for the U.N.'s Office for High Commissioner for Human Rights, which serves as the secretariat for the Council.

There is an endemic and systemic anti-Israeli bias and agenda at the Council, and it is the High Commissioner's Office that serves and fuels this agenda. In fact, this is the office that is currently putting together the BDS blacklist for the Council, and the High Commissioner has signaled his intent to publish this list. This effectively puts the Human Rights Council and the High Commissioner at the forefront of the anti-Israeli boycott, divestment, and sanctions movement. There is simply no justification for the American taxpayers to fund this sort of activity aimed at isolating and delegitimizing our ally, Israel, and harming our national interests.

There is also no justification for the American taxpayers to support our participation at a body that enables human rights abusers. When Cuba, Venezuela, China, Saudi Arabia, Burundi, and others are allowed to sit on the Human Rights Council and dictate

its direction, you know that the body has strayed far from its mandate.

In fact, these countries use the Council to actually shield themselves from criticism, turning the body meant to promote and protect human rights into a tool for the world's worst despots to hide the atrocities that are coming at home.

Mr. Chair, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

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

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of Congresswoman ROSLEHTINEN's amendment No. 110 to the State and Foreign Operations appropriations bill, and I appreciate the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO) for taking leadership on this as well.

This amendment would prohibit funds from contributing to a number of United Nations agencies that endlessly single out our ally, the State of Israel, for poor treatment.

There are numerous issues with these agencies, but as for UNRWA, the very size of the agency is an underlying problem. UNRWA was created to address the short-term needs of refugees, but it has perpetuated the problem.

As of July 1, 2014, UNRWA had 30,252 employees for 5½ million registered persons in a number of Middle Eastern countries and territories, compared to the U.N. High Commission for Refugees staff of 7,700 in 2013, which provides support for 42.9 million refugees in more than 100 countries. The proportion is just way out of scale when you compare those kinds of agencies. UNRWA is out of control.

Additionally, UNRWA's grounds have been used to store rockets. Israel has been fired upon from UNRWA facilities, and UNRWA has employed individuals affiliated with Hamas, a designated terrorist organization. These are just a few examples of how U.N. agencies have mismanaged funds. It is unacceptable that American taxpayer dollars contribute to this problem.

I thank the Congressman and Congresswoman for offering this important amendment, and I hope that my colleagues support it so that the United Nations can get to helping individuals who need it the most.

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Chair, by passing this amendment, Congress will send a very clear message to these agencies and to the entire U.N. that the status quo is no longer, that we want to see the reforms that we want to address now before we return to full participation.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this amendment in an effort to change the status quo at the U.N. by starting with the most egregious of the entities, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from New York is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chair, the agencies listed in this amendment are by no means perfect, and on multiple occasions I have condemned some of their actions, both publicly and behind closed doors. But I do believe we lose the ability to influence both agencies' agendas towards the United States' priorities if we cut off all U.S. funding.

Despite my past criticisms of their significant shortcomings, I continue to believe that each of these agencies plays a pivotal role in providing critical services for the Palestinian people. We should never lose focus on helping the people who need aid the most.

We should also think strategically about U.S. interests. The United Nations Relief and Works Agency is an effective alternative to Hamas. Each year, the agency provides health services to more than 3 million individuals, and education to half a million students in the West Bank and Gaza. Cutting off funding will simply strengthen Hamas by driving countless individuals into Hamas-controlled schools and services.

Additionally, the Human Rights Council and the High Commissioner for Human Rights highlight the voices of the oppressed and underserved globally and have elevated the rights of women and sexual assault victims.

□ 1700

As human rights are increasingly threatened around the globe, now is not the time to walk away from these agencies. I oppose the amendment because I strongly believe that here in Congress we must do all we can to preserve and advance U.S. interests and influence. This amendment would diminish U.S. influence at a time when our Nation's global standing is already slipping.

Mr. Chair, how many minutes do I have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman has 3 minutes remaining.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. ROGERS).

Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I want to take this time briefly to address the concerns the gentleman from Florida has raised with regard to these organizations, many of which I share. That is why the base bill includes some pretty tough conditions on these organizations. In fact, these conditions have never been stronger with regard to the U.N. Human Rights Council.

No funds can be provided until the Secretary of State certifies to Congress that participation in the Council is, one, in the national security interest of the United States and, two, the Council is taking significant steps to remove Israel as a permanent agenda item and increase transparency in the election of its members to the Council.

We raised these issues, Mr. Chairman, with Ambassador Haley when she appeared before our committee. We all

know she is actively engaging in these matters, and our conditions give her additional tools which she can use to get the Council to make some real reforms.

Next, the bill prohibits funds for the U.N. Relief and Works Agency until the Secretary can certify to the Congress that this organization is conducting regular inspections of its installations to ensure they are only used for humanitarian purposes and that the content of educational materials does not induce excitement. These conditions provide Secretary Tillerson with leverage to demand accountability and reform.

Also, we should be mindful that the President is reengaging with Israel and the Palestinians on a Middle East peace deal, which we all know is difficult and a very complicated task. Prohibiting funds to UNRWA at this time may have an adverse impact on those delicate processes the President and his team have before them.

This committee has and will continue to follow these issues very closely. It is a top priority, and the tough conditions in the bill reflect that.

I thank the gentleman for yielding time to me.

Mr. MEEKS. Mr. Chair, I yield 50 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, cutting off funds to UNRWA would force it to shut down. If UNRWA shuts down, they will not be able to operate, and all of the services that it provides will fall to the predominant power, which is Hamas. I don't think this is what the gentleman wants.

The fact of the matter is UNRWA, right now, provides education, food, shelter, and a whole host of services in very dire conditions. Over the last number of years, we have seen 90 percent of the tap waters not fit for human consumption, rolling blackouts 20 to 22 hours a day, and UNRWA, in this context, is making sure that necessities like education and economic opportunity exist.

It would be counterproductive to cut off UNRWA because somebody is going to have to help the refugees.

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

As stated, now is not the time to walk away from the U.N. Human Rights Council. This amendment would do nothing to change the agencies for the better. It would only weaken our ability to influence the advancements we want to see. We can't be leaders if we are not at the table.

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

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

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

Mr. YOHO. 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 Florida will be postponed.

The Chair understands that amendment No. 112 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 113 OFFERED BY MR. GAETZ

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 113 printed in part B of House Report 115-295.

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, I wish to introduce amendment No. 113.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to provide assistance to any of the following:

(1) The Dalal Mughrabi High School for Girls-Gaza.

(2) The Dalal Mughrabi High School for Girls-Hebron.

(3) The Dalal Mughrabi Elementary School for Girls-Hebron.

(4) The Shadia Abu Ghazaleh School for Girls-Gaza.

(5) The Shadia Abu Ghazalah High School for Boys-Jabaliya.

(6) The Khalil Al-Wazir (Abu Jihad) Elementary School for Girls-Hebron.

(7) The Martyr Khalil Al-Wazir Elementary School for Boys-Hebron.

(8) The Martyr Khalil Al-Wazir Elementary School for Boys-Jenin.

(9) The Abu Jihad High School for Boys-Jenin.

(10) The Abu Jihad High School for Boys-Hebron.

(11) The Salah Khalaf Elementary School for Girls-Gaza.

(12) The Salah Khalaf Junior High School-Gaza.

(13) The Martyr Abu Iyad School-Rafah.

(14) The Salah Khalaf School-Tulkarem.

(15) The Martyr Ahmed Yassin School for Boys-Jenin.

(16) The Martyr Abdullah Azzam Elementary School for Boys-Jenin.

(17) The Abu Ali Iyad High School for Girls-Qalqilya.

(18) The Martyr Nash'at Abu Jabara High School for Girls-Tulkarem.

(19) The Abu Ali Mustafa Elementary School for Boys-Jenin.

(20) The Abu Ali Mustafa Elementary School for Girls-Jenin.

(21) The Mustafa Hafez Elementary School for Boys-Khan Younis.

(22) The Mustafa Hafez School-Gaza.

(23) The Martyr Izzat Abu Al-Rubb High School-Jenin.

(24) The Martyr Izz Al-Din Al-Qassam High School for Boys-Yaa'bad.

(25) The Martyr Izz Al-Din (Al-Qassam) Elementary School-Jenin.

(26) The Martyr Osama Al-Najjar School-Khan Yunis.

(27) The Kamal Adwan High School for Boys-Rafah.

(28) The Martyr Saa'd Sayel Elementary School for Boys-Nablu.

(29) The Amin Al-Husseini Elementary School-El-Bireh.

(30) The Hassan Salameh Junior High School for Girls-Gaza.

(31) The Hassan Salameh Elementary School-Gaza.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 500, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ) and a Mem-

ber opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

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

Mr. Chairman, it does not advance the interests of the United States to fund schools that incite terror and hate throughout the world. Thirty-four of those such schools exist in Judea and Samaria, the area currently controlled by the Palestinian Authority, and this amendment would defund 34 schools that are named after terrorists, killers, and Nazi collaborators. I will provide a few examples.

Dalal Mughrabi led the coastal road massacre by hijacking a bus. She killed 37 people, including 12 children, and injured another 70. Three schools are named after her. Two students attending one of these schools were interviewed on March 27, 2014. They said: "Dalal Mughrabi is a great leader. She walks among us, and I'm personally proud to attend the Dalal Mughrabi School."

A second little girl who attended that school said: "My life's ambition is to reach the level of the martyr fighter Dalal Mughrabi."

Khalil al-Wazir headed the PLO terrorist organization's military wing. He planned attacks that killed over 125 Israelis. Five schools are named after him.

Salah Khalaf led the Black September terrorist organization. He planned the murder of 11 Israeli athletes at the Munich Olympics and the murder of two American diplomats in the Sudan. Four schools are named after him.

Abdullah Azzam was cofounder of al-Qaida, the mentor of Osama bin Laden, known as the "Father of Modern Jihad."

Abu Ali Iyad was the head of the Fatah military in the 1960s. A high school for girls carries his name.

Amin al-Husseini was a Nazi collaborator during World War II. He moved to Berlin where he served as a Hitler associate. In Yugoslavia, he was designated a war criminal. When the Nazi offered to free some Jewish children, Al-Husseini prohibited their release, resulting in 5,000 Jewish children being sent to the gas chambers. An elementary school is named after him.

Hassan Salameh was also a Nazi operative. He was sent by the Nazis during World War II to poison the water supply in British-controlled areas near Tel Aviv. Two schools are named after him.

Mr. Chairman, I care deeply for the education of our youth, but we have to demand that curriculums be reformed so that the schools that American taxpayers fund do not promote hate.

Mr. Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I also applaud the leadership of Representative GAETZ on this important amend-

ment No. 113 to the State, Foreign Operations, and Related Programs Appropriations bill.

This commonsense amendment prohibits American taxpayer dollars from supporting Palestinian elementary schools that are named for Palestinian terrorists who have murdered innocent human beings. Many of these terrorists have murdered children who are no different than the very children in the schools named after them.

Dalal Mughrabi, as was mentioned earlier, a Palestinian terrorist, blew herself up on a bus in 1978, killing 37 Israelis, including 13 children. Her name is plastered on countless elementary schools, summer camps, and memorials around Palestinian Authority-controlled territories in Israel.

I applaud Denmark, Norway, and other countries that have frozen funds from U.N.-affiliated Palestinian organizations that name their buildings after terrorists like Dalal Mughrabi.

The United States Congress should have undivided moral clarity on this issue in this year's appropriations bill. We cannot use taxpayer dollars to fund Palestinian incitement to murder innocents, and that is why I introduced legislation to stop sending American aid to the Palestinian Authority until they end their practice of financially supporting terrorists and the families of terrorists. We must end U.S. contributions to the PA's campaign of incitement wherever we find it.

I thank Mr. GAETZ for offering this important amendment, and I hope it passes with unanimous support, as it should.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 114 printed in part B of House Report 115-295.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 115 printed in part B of House Report 115-295.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 116 printed in part B of House Report 115-295.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 118 printed in part B of House Report 115-295.

□ 1715

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMBORN) having assumed the chair, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, 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. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.



DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS  
ACT, 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 504 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3354.

Will the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) kindly resume the chair.

□ 1719

## IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, with Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia (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. 113 printed in House Report 115-295 offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ) had been disposed of.

Pursuant to House Resolution 504, no further amendment to the bill, as amended, shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115-297, amendments en bloc described in section 3 of House Resolution 504, and available pro forma amendments described in section 4 of House Resolution 500.

Each further amendment printed in the report shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, may be withdrawn by the proponent at any time before action thereon, shall not be subject to amendment except as described in section 4 of House Resolution 500, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Appropriations or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in the report not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Appropriations or their respective designees, shall not be subject to amendment, except as described in section 4 of House Resolution 500, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question.

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR.  
CALVERT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 504 and as the designee of the gentleman

from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), I offer amendments en bloc. A list of the included amendments included in the en bloc is at the desk and has been agreed to by both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 1 consisting of amendment Nos. 3, 7, 9, 10, 11, 16, 17, 19, 20, 22, 23, 25, 26, 34, 35, 47, 48, 49, 58, and 79, printed in House Report No. 115-297, offered by Mr. CALVERT of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 3 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF  
FLORIDA

Page 8, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$500,000) (increased by \$500,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 7 OFFERED BY MR. COURTNEY  
OF CONNECTICUT

Page 15, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$300,000) (increased by \$300,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 9 OFFERED BY MR. CICILLINE  
OF RHODE ISLAND

Page 15, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 39, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 10 OFFERED BY MR. CLYBURN  
OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Page 16, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 16, line 24, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

Page 39, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 11 OFFERED BY MR. HECK OF  
WASHINGTON

Page 16, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,500,000)".

Page 39, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,500,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 16 OFFERED BY MR.  
O'HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Page 31, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,000,000)".

Page 39, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 17 OFFERED BY MS. PLASKETT  
OF VIRGIN ISLANDS

Page 39, line 1, after the dollar amount insert "(reduced by \$995,000)".

Page 40, line 11, after the first dollar amount insert "(increased by \$995,000)".

Page 40 line 11, after the second dollar amount insert "(increased by \$977,000)".

Page 40, line 25, after the dollar amount insert "(increased by \$18,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 19 OFFERED BY MRS. CAROLYN  
B. MALONEY OF NEW YORK

Page 39, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$2,000,000)".

Page 109, line 5, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$2,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 20 OFFERED BY MR. BRENDAN F.  
BOYLE OF PENNSYLVANIA

Page 43, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,911,000)".

Page 104, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,911,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 22 OFFERED BY MR. WELCH OF  
VERMONT

Page 63, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$5,399,000)".

Page 64, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$4,399,000)".

Page 64, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$4,399,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 23 OFFERED BY MR. MAST OF  
FLORIDA

Page 63, line 6, insert "(increased by \$1,086,000)" after the dollar amount.

Page 64, line 1, insert "(decreased by \$1,086,000)" after the dollar amount.

AMENDMENT NO. 25 OFFERED BY MR. SOTO OF  
FLORIDA

Page 64, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$468,000) (increased by \$468,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 26 OFFERED BY MR. MAST OF  
FLORIDA

Page 64, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 67, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 74, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 34 OFFERED BY MR. POLIS OF  
COLORADO

Page 81, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$12,371,000)".

Page 85, line 19, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$12,371,000)".

Page 86, line 11, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,989,000)".

Page 86, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,382,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 35 OFFERED BY MR.  
O'HALLERAN OF ARIZONA

Page 95, line 13, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$47,000,000) (increased by \$47,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 47 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON  
LEE OF TEXAS

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to limit outreach programs administered by the Smithsonian Institution.

AMENDMENT NO. 48 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON  
LEE OF TEXAS

At the end of division A, before the short title, add the following new section:

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act for the "DEPARTMENT OF INTERIOR—NATIONAL PARK SERVICE—NATIONAL RECREATION AND PRESERVATION" may be used in contravention of section 320101 of title 54, United States Code.

AMENDMENT NO. 49 OFFERED BY MS. JACKSON  
LEE OF TEXAS

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available in this Act may be used may be used to eliminate the Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnership.

AMENDMENT NO. 58 OFFERED BY MS. POLIQUIN  
OF MAINE

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to enforce the export permission requirements of section 9(d)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1538(d)(1)) for members of the phylum Echinodermata commonly known as sea urchins and sea cucumbers.

AMENDMENT NO. 79 OFFERED BY MS. SPEIER OF  
CALIFORNIA

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

## LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, administer, or enforce the proposed rule entitled "Special Regulations, Areas of the National Park Service, Golden Gate National Recreation Area, Dog Management" published by the National Park Service in the Federal Register on February 24, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 9139 et seq.; Regulation Identifier No. 1024-AE16).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman

from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. HECK).

Mr. HECK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment helps our local communities preserve and restore important historic sites through a successful Federal-State partnership.

For more than 40 years, the Historic Preservation Fund has helped our States and Native Tribes leverage funds to revitalize communities and create opportunities for economic growth.

In my district, for example, the Historic Preservation Fund was recently used to rehabilitate Olympia's historic Stoker House, which is now home to a small clinic that provides much-needed mental health counseling services.

This year, funds were also used for Washington State's Youth Heritage Project in Tacoma, which introduced high school students to the maritime heritage of the Puget Sound region.

This amendment would simply restore Historic Preservation funding to last year's levels. It is a small but effective Federal program that deserves continued support.

This is a bipartisan amendment, and I am thankful to have the support of the co-chairs of the Historic Preservation Caucus, Congressmen TURNER and BLUMENAUER, along with Congressmen SMITH, COURTNEY, and KEATING.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have no opposition to this en bloc amendment moving forward, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the en bloc, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Maine (Mr. POLIQUIN).

Mr. POLIQUIN. Mr. Chairman, I am thrilled to rise today to speak on behalf of my amendment which will remove unnecessary, redundant, and burdensome regulations from our sea urchins and sea cucumbers industry in the great State of Maine.

Now, we have some of the most hard-working people, Mr. Chair, in our State, and some of them—about 600 or so of them—along with the processing part brave the cold, dark waters of the great State of Maine and dive for sea urchins and cucumbers and harvest them on a regular basis year-round. It is a process that is dangerous, but these delicacies are sold all around the world, mostly in the Far East, and we need to make sure our government helps these individuals work this ter-

rific fishery that has been doing so well in the past.

Now, I want to thank my colleague, CHELLIE PINGREE, who represents the First District. I represent the Second District of Maine. She has been very helpful. We have worked together for quite some time on this issue in a bipartisan way to make sure, Mr. Chairman, that we don't have too many regulations that are unnecessary and expensive such that we can make sure this part of our fishery is healthy and goes forward.

So, again, I appreciate, Mr. Chairman, very much your giving me this opportunity to speak on behalf of my amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I have no other speakers present at this time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I have no other speakers. I rise in support of the amendments en bloc, and I urge its adoption.

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chair, thank you for this opportunity to speak in support of my amendment to Division A of H.R. 3354, the "Interior and Environment Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2018."

Let me also thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their leadership in shepherding this bill to the floor.

Among other agencies, this legislation funds the Smithsonian Institution, which operates our national museums, including the Air and Space Museum; the Museum of African Art; the Museum of the American Indian; and the National Portrait Gallery.

The Smithsonian also operates another national treasure: the National Zoo.

Mr. Chair, my amendment is simple but it sends a very important message from the Congress of the United States.

The Jackson Lee Amendment simply provides that:

"Sec. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available in this Act may be used to limit outreach programs administered by the Smithsonian Institution."

This amendment is identical to an amendment I offered to the Interior and Environment Appropriations Act for FY2008 (H.R. 2822) that was approved by voice vote on July 7, 2016.

Mr. Chair, the Smithsonian's outreach programs bring Smithsonian scholars in art, history and science out of "the nation's attic" and into their own backyard.

Each year, millions of Americans visit the Smithsonian in Washington, D.C.

But in order to fulfill the Smithsonian's mission, "the increase and diffusion of knowledge," the Smithsonian seeks to serve an even greater audience by bringing the Smithsonian to enclaves of communities who otherwise would be deprived of the vast amount of cultural history offered by the Smithsonian.

The Smithsonian's outreach programs serve millions of Americans, thousands of communities, and hundreds of institutions in all 50 states, through loans of objects, traveling exhibitions, and sharing of educational resources via publications, lectures and presentations, training programs, and websites.

Smithsonian outreach programs work in close cooperation with Smithsonian museums and research centers, as well as with 144 affiliate institutions and others across the nation.

The Smithsonian's outreach activities support community-based cultural and educational organizations around the country.

They ensure a vital, recurring, and high-impact Smithsonian presence in all 50 states through the provision of traveling exhibitions and a network of affiliations.

Smithsonian outreach programs increase connections between the Institution and targeted audiences (African American, Asian American, Latino, Native American, and new American) and provide kindergarten through college-age museum education and outreach opportunities.

These outreach programs enhance K-12 science education programs, facilitate the Smithsonian's scholarly interactions with students and scholars at universities, museums, and other research institutions; and disseminate results related to the research and collections strengths of the Institution.

The programs that provide the critical mass of Smithsonian outreach activity are:

1. the Smithsonian Institution Traveling Exhibition Service (SITES);
2. the Smithsonian Affiliations, the Smithsonian Center for Education and Museum Studies (SCEMS);
3. National Science Resources Center (NSRC);
4. the Smithsonian Institution Press (SIP);
5. the Office of Fellowships (OF); and
6. the Smithsonian Associates (TSA), which receives no federal funding.

To achieve the goal of increasing public engagement, SITES directs some of its federal resources to develop Smithsonian Across America: A Celebration of National Pride.

This "mobile museum," which will feature Smithsonian artifacts from the most iconic (presidential portraits, historic American flags, Civil War records, astronaut uniforms, etc.) to the simplest items of everyday life (family quilts, prairie schoolhouse furnishings, historic lunch boxes, multilingual store front and street signs, etc.), has been a long-standing organizational priority of the Smithsonian.

SITES "mobile museum" is the only traveling exhibit format able to guarantee audience growth and expanded geographic distribution during sustained periods of economic retrenchment, but also because it is imperative for the many exhibitors nationwide who are struggling financially yet eager to participate in Smithsonian outreach.

For communities still struggling to fully recover from the economic downturn, the ability of museums to present temporary exhibitions, the "mobile museum" promises to answer an ever-growing demand for Smithsonian shows in the field.

A single, conventional SITES exhibit can reach a maximum of 12 locations over a two- to three-year period.

In contrast, a "mobile museum" exhibit can visit up to three venues per week in the course of only one year, at no cost to the host institution or community.

The net result is an increase by 150 in the number of outreach locations to which SITES shows can travel annually.

And in addition to its flexibility in making short-term stops in cities and towns from coast-to-coast, a "mobile museum" has the

advantage of being able to frequent the very locations where people live, work, and take part in leisure time activities.

By establishing an exhibit presence in settings like these, SITES will not only increase its annual visitor participation by 1 million, but also advance a key Smithsonian performance objective: to develop exhibit approaches that address diverse audiences, including population groups not always affiliated with mainstream cultural institutions.

SITES also will be the public exhibitions' face of the Smithsonian's National Museum of African American History and Culture, as that new Museum comes online.

Providing national access to projects that will introduce the American public to the Museum's mission, SITES in FY 2008 will tour such stirring exhibitions as NASA ART: 50 Years of Exploration; 381 Days: The Montgomery Bus Boycott Story; Beyond: Visions of Planetary Landscapes; The Way We Worked: Photographs from the National Archives; and More Than Words: Illustrated Letters from the Smithsonian's Archives of American Art.

To meet the growing demand among smaller community and ethnic museums for an exhibition celebrating the Latino experience, SITES provided a scaled-down version of the National Museum of American History's 4,000-square-foot exhibition about legendary entertainer Celia Cruz.

Two 1,500-square-foot exhibitions, one about Crow Indian history and the other on basket traditions, will give Smithsonian visitors beyond Washington a taste of the Institution's critically acclaimed National Museum of the American Indian.

Two more exhibits, "In Plane View" and "Earth from Space," provided visitors an opportunity to experience the Smithsonian's recently opened, expansive National Air and Space Museum Udvar-Hazy Center.

For almost 30 years, The Smithsonian Associates—the highly regarded educational arm of the Smithsonian Institution—has arranged Scholars in the Schools programs.

Through this tremendously successful and well-received educational outreach program, the Smithsonian shares its staff—hundreds of experts in art, history and science—with the national community at a local level.

The mission of Smithsonian Affiliations is to build a strong national network of museums and educational organizations in order to establish active and engaging relationships with communities throughout the country.

There are currently 138 affiliates located in the United States, Puerto Rico, and Panama.

By working with museums of diverse subject areas and scholarly disciplines, both emerging and well-established, Smithsonian Affiliations is building partnerships through which audiences and visitors everywhere will be able to share in the great wealth of the Smithsonian while building capacity and expertise in local communities.

The National Science Resources Center (NSRC) strives to increase the number of ethnically diverse students participating in effective science programs based on NSRC products and services.

The Center develops and implements a national outreach strategy that will increase the number of school districts (currently more than 800) that are implementing NSRC K–8 programs.

The NSRC is striving to further enhance its program activity with a newly developed sci-

entific outreach program introducing communities and school districts to science through literacy initiatives.

In addition, through the building of the multi-cultural Alliance Initiative, the Smithsonian's outreach programs seek to develop new approaches to enable the public to gain access to Smithsonian collections, research, education, and public programs that reflect the diversity of the American people, including underserved audiences of ethnic populations and persons with disabilities.

For all these reasons, Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of the Jackson Lee Amendment and thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their courtesies, consideration, and very fine work in putting together this excellent legislation.

Mr. Chair, I also want to thank you for this opportunity to speak in support of my amendments to Division A of H.R. 3354, the Interior and Environment Appropriations Act for Fiscal Year 2018 and to commend Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their leadership in shepherding this bill through the legislative process.

Among other agencies, this legislation funds the U.S. Forest Service, the National Park System, and the Smithsonian Institution, which operates our national museums including the National Zoo.

Mr. Chair, my amendment is simple but it sends a very important message from the Congress of the United States.

The Jackson Lee Amendment emphasizes the importance of Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnerships and urban forests, and preserves our ability to return urban areas to healthy and safe living environments for our children.

Similar amendments were offered and accepted in the Interior and Environment Appropriations Acts for Fiscal Year 2017 (H.R. 2822), Fiscal Year 2008 (H.R. 2643), and Fiscal Year 2007 (H.R. 5386), and were adopted by voice vote.

Mr. Chair, surveys indicate that some urban forests are in serious danger.

In the past 30 years alone, we have lost 30 percent of all our urban trees—a loss of over 600 million trees.

Eighty percent (80 percent) of the American population lives in the dense quarters of a city.

Reforestation programs return a tool of nature to a concrete area that can help to remove air pollution, filter out chemicals and agricultural waste in water, and save communities millions of dollars in storm water management costs.

I have certainly seen neighborhoods in Houston benefit from urban reforestation.

In addition, havens of green in the middle of a city can have beneficial effects on a community's health, both physical and psychological, as well as increase property value of surrounding real estate.

Reforestation of cities is an innovative way of combating urban sprawl and deterioration.

Mr. Chair, a real commitment to enhancing our environment involves both the protection of existing natural resources and active support for restoration and improvement projects.

Several years ago, American Forests, a leading conservation group, estimated that the tree cover lost in the greater Washington metropolitan area from 1973 to 1997 resulted in an additional 540 million cubic feet of storm water runoff annually, which would have taken more than \$1 billion in storm water control facilities to manage.

Trees breathe in carbon dioxide, and produce oxygen.

People breathe in oxygen and exhale carbon dioxide.

A typical person consumes about 38 lb of oxygen per year.

A healthy tree, say a 32 ft tall ash tree, can produce about 260 lb of oxygen annually—two trees supply the oxygen needs of a person for a year!

Trees help reduce pollution by capturing particulates like dust and pollen with their leaves.

A mature tree absorbs from 120 to 240 lbs of the small particles and gases of air pollution.

Trees help combat the effects of "greenhouse" gases, the increased carbon dioxide produced from burning fossil fuels that is causing our atmosphere to "heat up."

Trees help cool down the overall city environment by shading asphalt, concrete and metal surfaces.

Buildings and paving in city centers create a heat-island effect.

A mature tree canopy reduces air temperatures by about 5–10 degrees Fahrenheit.

A 25 foot tree reduces annual heating and cooling costs of a typical residence by 8 to 12 percent, producing an average annual savings of \$120 per American household.

Proper tree plantings around buildings can slow winter winds, and reduce annual energy use for home heating by 4–22 percent.

Mr. Chair, trees play a vital role in making our cities more sustainable and more livable.

The Jackson Lee Amendment simply provides for continued support to programs like Urban Wildlife Refuge Partnerships that reforest our urban areas.

For all these reasons, Mr. Chair, I urge adoption of the Jackson Lee Amendment and thank Chairman CALVERT and Ranking Member MCCOLLUM for their courtesies, consideration, and very fine work in putting together this legislation.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115–297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 2, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$12,000,000)".

Page 66, line 2, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$12,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will restore \$12 million in cuts to the already underfunded Superfund Enforcement program, with an equivalent cut to Bureau of Land Management's oil and gas leasing program.

Superfund Enforcement is the epitome of Federal fiscal responsibility. It ensures that polluters pay for the cleanup and the mess they have caused.

For over 35 years, EPA's Superfund Enforcement program has enabled thousands of site investigations at cleanups and has required viable responsible parties to either conduct the work or pay for the cleanups of these Superfund sites, in other words, hold parties accountable for the action and correction of their activities.

□ 1730

Any cuts to these funds clearly places corporate interests over that of the health and financial well-being of the American people.

According to the EPA, the Superfund Enforcement program's efforts to negotiate settlement agreements and issue order for cleanup work accounts for approximately 69 percent of all the cleanup work currently underway at Superfund sites around this country.

For every dollar the Superfund Enforcement program spends, private parties commit \$8 toward cleanup work. The enforcement funding is essential in saving taxpayer dollars and the scarce resources of the Superfund trust fund to address truly abandoned and orphaned sites.

As of August 1, 2017, there were 1,845 Superfund sites in the country. These sites include dangerous and toxic substances not just in my backyard but in everybody's backyard.

Perhaps not surprisingly, Superfund sites tend to be located near lower income communities and around communities of color. Approximately 53 million people live within 3 miles of a Superfund site in this country, and 46 percent of them live in poorer communities and communities of color. Fifteen percent of those residents live below the poverty level.

According to a National Association of Clean Air Agencies report: "Without EPA's enforcement, companies could avoid reporting, or minimize the reported amount of toxic materials released to the environment."

Following one of the most catastrophic hurricanes to hit Texas, the EPA found that 13 Superfund sites have been flooded or could face damage as a result of Hurricane Harvey.

Administrator Pruitt has repeatedly tried to justify his cuts to the agency by claiming that he wants the agency to go "back to the basics." I can't think of anything more fundamental than cleaning up the most toxic sites in the Nation to protect the health of the people who live nearby in those communities.

Restoring the ability of the EPA to self-sustain its core mission should be a no-brainer for those on both sides of the aisle. In order to restore the funding, my amendment will make a modest cut to the BLM's oil and gas program. This program is a massive giveaway to the very polluters that have made the existence of the Superfund program a necessity.

Currently, 7,950 drilling permits are approved and not being used. There are 14.4 million acres of public land under lease and not producing. There is no justification to dole out more taxpayer money in order to expedite and speed up the permitting or leasing practices when we have that amount not being used and over close to 15 million acres under lease, as we speak.

A report by Oil Change International recently found that the U.S. Government provided about \$6 billion annually in financial support to the oil, gas, and coal industries between 2013 and 2015. Meanwhile, oil giant ExxonMobil's profits more than doubled in the first quarter of this year, which equaled \$4.1 billion in profits for just that one quarter. They certainly did not need more taxpayer money while communities across the United States continue to be exposed to toxic and hazardous pollution.

My amendment restores, in part, EPA's core mission to protect the public health of the American people and to hold all polluters responsible and liable for the environmental and health risks they cause.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. MITCHELL). The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I certainly appreciate the gentleman's support for robust funding of the Superfund program, particularly the cleanup program.

There is a need for Congress to make progress to address the backlog of 1,300 sites on the national priority list. The bill proposes to do so with a \$47.6 million increase for cleanup work. However, the amendment proposes merely to increase EPA's enforcement budget by \$12 million, with a stated objective of reducing BLM's oil and gas management program.

The committee wrote a balanced bill, and I support the wise use of Federal oil and gas resources. Therefore, I oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, this is a prudent, necessary protection of public health and the environment. I urge a "yes" vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I ask Members to vote "no" on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 115-297.

AMENDMENT NO. 5 OFFERED BY MR. BACON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 5 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 8, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,974,000)".

Page 10, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$4,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BACON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. BACON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to offer amendment No. 5. I plan to ask unanimous consent to withdraw the amendment. However, before I do, I would ask to engage Chairman CALVERT in a brief colloquy.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CALVERT. I would be happy to engage the gentleman from Colorado in a colloquy.

Mr. BACON. The Fish and Wildlife Service has a backlog of 49 species waiting to be down-listed or delisted. This issue is further compounded by the fact that an additional 839 species are overdue for their mandatory 5-year status review to determine if ESA protections need to continue.

It is no wonder why States are frustrated that species are put on the list and rarely removed. To be more effective in species conservation, the Fish and Wildlife Service must address this backlog so States can better focus their recovery efforts.

I respect the committee's progress made on this front, but I hope we can make further efforts to ensure the Fish and Wildlife Service is an effective ally in species conservation under EPA.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CALVERT. I thank the gentleman for his comments and for his amendment, and I fully agree with his concerns about the backlogs, but I have concerns with the proposed offset and appreciate the intention to withdraw it.

The committee has made a concerted effort in recent years to fix these problems and has increased the recovery account by almost \$4 million over the last 2 years.

Under House Republican pressure over the past 7 years, the Fish and Wildlife Service has delisted more species than all other previous years combined, but, clearly, we still have a long way to go.

The Service has been directed and funded to complete all 5-year reviews within the period required by law, and the committee will continue to press the Service to see that they eliminate these backlogs.

I thank the gentleman again for raising this issue, and I pledge to work with him on this.

Mr. BACON. I thank the gentleman for his feedback and efforts, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my amendment No. 5.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Ranking Member LOWEY, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. O'HALLERAN).

Mr. O'HALLERAN. Mr. Chairman, my amendments address critical health needs in Indian Country by providing the Bureau of Indian Affairs and the Indian Health Service additional funding to complete projects.

My first amendment ensures communities, including the Hopi Tribe in my district, have resources for funding to complete their arsenic medication project.

My second amendment fulfills part of our trust relationship with federally recognized Tribes by ensuring Indian Health Service clinics and hospitals opening this year receive staffing and operations funding.

In my district, the Gila River Health Care Red Tail Hawk Health Center is scheduled to be opened, but has not received staffing or operation funding. These healthcare facilities are badly needed to increase access to healthcare in the community.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands (Ms. PLASKETT).

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Chairman, I am asking that we include my provision for raising funds for the Department of the Interior's assistance to territories in this en bloc amendment.

This is a very modest uptick of the \$1 million in Federal support for the United States territories, namely the Virgin Islands, Guam, Northern Mariana Islands, and American Samoa. It is crucial that the Federal Government keep its commitment to address the pressing needs of Americans living in these territories as we face grave natural disaster and security threats.

Right now, thousands of people are feeling the effects of one of the most catastrophic hurricanes ever to strike the Caribbean region. Hurricane Irma has toppled buildings and leveled many homes. Making the Virgin Islands whole again will require massive and coordinated efforts spanning a long period of time.

Much of the Federal Government's support for Americans in U.S. terri-

ories comes out of this territorial assistance account, with funding channeled toward necessary community facilities like schools, hospitals, and critical infrastructure systems. This support is imperative.

After this hurricane, one of our hospitals is partially destroyed. The other faces egregious deferred maintenance issues due, in part, to an extremely high proportion of uncompensated care because the territories face inequitable treatment in Federal health programs like Medicaid and Medicare.

Construction or repair to schools and hospitals account for much of the capital improvement project expenditures that come directly out of this assistance to the territories' account.

We are asking that the territories receive the same funding that they have received previously, and please approve this amendment to reverse this cut as a simple matter of fairness to the territories.

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

AMENDMENTS EN BLOC NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. CALVERT OF CALIFORNIA

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, pursuant to section 3 of House Resolution 504, as the designee of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN), I rise to offer amendments en bloc No. 2. The list of the amendments included in the en bloc is at the desk and has been agreed to by both sides.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendments en bloc.

Amendments en bloc No. 2 consisting of amendment Nos. 1, 6, 24, 28, 33, 52, 54, and 70 printed in House Report 115-297, offered by Mr. CALVERT of California:

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MS. MCSALLY OF ARIZONA

Page 2, line 25, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$316,000)".

Page 64, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$364,700)".

AMENDMENT NO. 6 OFFERED BY MR. MAST OF FLORIDA

Page 8, line 16, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,200,000)".

Page 21, line 07, after the dollar amount, insert, "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 24 OFFERED BY MR. MAST OF FLORIDA

Page 63, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$979,000)".

Page 104 line 10, after the dollar amount, insert, "(increased by \$979,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 28 OFFERED BY MS. MCSALLY OF ARIZONA

Page 64, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$3,831,000)".

Page 81, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

Page 81, line 10, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$3,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 33 OFFERED BY MR. MCKINLEY OF WEST VIRGINIA

Page 80, line 21, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$9,500,000)".

Page 81, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

Page 81, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$5,000,000)".

AMENDMENT NO. 52 OFFERED BY MR. BYRNE OF ALABAMA

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 54 OFFERED BY MR. BURGESS OF TEXAS

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency to hire or pay the salary of any officer or employee of the Environmental Protection Agency under subsection (f) or (g) of section 207 of the Public Health Service Act (42 U.S.C. 209) who is not already receiving pay under either such subsection on the date of enactment of this Act.

AMENDMENT NO. 70 OFFERED BY MR. EMMER OF MINNESOTA

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) and the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) each will control 10 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER).

Mr. EMMER. I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to support this en bloc amendment because it contains language I offered to support the hardworking people of Minnesota.

Our amendment halts a last-minute effort by the previous administration that would restrict all leasing, exploration, and potential development of approximately 234,000 acres of Federal land in northeast Minnesota.

If this ban were to take effect, it would have a devastating impact on the economy of my State, as well as our Nation as a whole.

Minnesota's Department of Natural Resources has estimated there are roughly \$500 billion worth of minerals in the area proposed for withdrawal, in addition to nearly \$3 billion in royalty revenues for Minnesota's Permanent School Trust Fund, which would support almost 900,000 K-12 students statewide.

Through this amendment, we have a real opportunity to get the Federal Government out of the way so this land can remain available for future development to bring much-needed jobs and revenue to the great State of Minnesota.

These efforts have garnered the support of more than 60 members of the Minnesota Legislature, from both parties I might add. We also have the backing of Chairman BISHOP of the House Natural Resources Committee, as well as the chairman of the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee, Representative PAUL GOSAR.

□ 1745

The National Mining Association, Mining Minnesota, and the Congressional Western Caucus are in favor of the amendment, and it could not be more in line with the current administration's priorities to create jobs and reinvigorate the American economy.

Because we know that somehow, somewhere, someone will find a way to mine the precious metals in this area in a safe and environmentally responsible way—

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Chairman, when that happens, Minnesota deserves to have that opportunity and the jobs and economic prosperity that will ensue.

Again, I thank the chairman for the opportunity to speak in support of my amendment, and I encourage everyone to support the en bloc package.

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

I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. KILMER).

Mr. KILMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this block of amendments, and I do appreciate that this block seeks to increase funding to address the National Park Service's \$11.3 billion backlog of deferred maintenance.

I firmly believe that we need to increase annual appropriations for our parks, but funding shouldn't come at the expense of other critical agency accounts.

In my neck of the woods, the Olympic National Park, alone, has \$150 million in backlogged maintenance needs, so we are not going to accomplish this enormous goal a few million dollars at a time. The real solution is for Congress to provide a robust and dedicated funding source, and that is why I partnered with Representative HURD and my fellow Washingtonian, Representative REICHERT, to introduce the National Park Service Legacy Act, which will create a dedicated source of funding to address the National Park Service maintenance backlog. This bipartisan and bicameral bill is funded through unobligated mineral royalties and would generate up to \$500 million, annually, through 2047.

So, if we are serious about addressing the overwhelming maintenance backlog in our national parks, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and join me in support of the National Park Service Legacy Act.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to all these amendments included in the en bloc. Many of them use offsets from accounts in the Environmental Protection Agency of the Fish and Wildlife Service, and they are already severely underfunded.

I am particularly troubled by one amendment to this group that threatens our Nation's most visited wilder-

ness area. Let me tell you why I oppose the Emmer amendment.

The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, located in northern Minnesota, is one of the last truly wild places in America. These 1.1 million acres of unspoiled woodlands and more than 1,000 pristine lakes are beloved by adventurers, canoers, and sportsmen from all across our country. This national treasure lies in the vast Rainy River Watershed and flows north into Voyageurs National Park and onward towards Canada.

Recently, there has been a push to conduct sulfide-ore copper mining less than 3 miles from the Boundary Waters Wilderness. This mining threatens to irreplaceably damage the waters, the wildlife, and the landscape. Sulfur ore mining is the most toxic industry in America, polluting waterways with acid drainage that contains arsenic, mercury, and lead.

In 2014, the Mount Polley sulfide-ore mine in British Columbia failed, dumping billions of liters of toxic sludge and leaving permanent environmental damage in its wake.

To protect the boundary waters from this type of destruction, the Forest Service acted last December and launched a thorough environmental analysis with public engagement to assess what type of mining, if any, is appropriate on Federal lands and this watershed for the next 20 years. The Trump and the Obama administrations have both agreed we need a thorough, scientific-based assessment of the best management of this sensitive ecosystem and conservation of our boundary waters.

The Emmer amendment upends this careful process. It pushes aside the Forest Service's ongoing study. It mandates that dangerous copper and sulfide mining will be allowed in the watershed, regardless of the conclusions of this environmental study, and it intentionally ignores a public process that hundreds of thousands of Americans weighed in on with comments on both sides of the issue. In my opinion, this amendment sets a horrible precedent, wastes taxpayer dollars already invested in this study, and threatens a national treasure, and it should never become law.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the en bloc and urge its adoption.

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chair, let me start by acknowledging my colleagues, Representatives EMMER and NOLAN. I'm proud to call both of you my friends, but I'm speaking tonight because I disagree with this amendment.

We can be open to new types of mining in Minnesota when the necessary environmental reviews are met, like in the case of Polymet, which I support.

Taconite mining is part of Minnesota's DNA. However, the copper-nickel mining being proposed on the edge of the Boundary Waters

Canoe Area is not taconite mining, and has never been done before in Minnesota. Earlier this year, the Trump administration said it would allow the current environmental review process to proceed to completion. I support that decision, and I oppose this amendment's effort to defund an ongoing environmental review to protect one of Minnesota's natural treasures. Indeed, it's one of our country's most spectacular wilderness areas.

The Boundary Waters is Minnesota's Yellowstone. Hundreds of thousands of Americans visit on fishing and canoe trips annually. Some of the best memories of my life have taken place in the Boundary Waters, both as a child and now as a parent with my daughters.

The public process that is underway after hundreds of thousands of people weighed in with their comments, should not be ignored and tossed aside. And, a science-based assessment of the best management practices of this sensitive ecosystem should be adhered to. We owe it to future generations to understand the impact copper-nickel mining poses to Minnesota's most precious water and land before we put it at risk.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendments en bloc offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

The en bloc amendments were agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 8 OFFERED BY MS. MCSALLY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 8 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 15, line 13, after the first dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$9,692,000)".

Page 15, line 15, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$9,692,000)".

Page 64, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$12,078,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentlewoman from Arizona (Ms. MCSALLY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Arizona.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in favor of my amendment to the Make America Secure and Prosperous Appropriations Act.

This amendment would approve access to America's prized treasures by increasing the National Park Service's Facility Maintenance and Operations account by \$9.7 million, bringing the funding amount up to the fiscal year 2017 enacted level. In doing so, this amendment will help address the long-standing deferred maintenance needs of the Park Service.

Currently, the National Park Service has an \$11.9 billion backlog, which is a figure that has increased steadily since 2009. According to the most recent NPS deferred maintenance report, the Yosemite National Park, in Chairman CALVERT's home State, has a backlog of \$555 million. Yellowstone has a backlog of \$716 million across three States.



The Grand Canyon's backlog of \$350 million makes up a large portion of my home State's—Arizona—delayed and deferred projects. In fact, Arizona has one of the largest backlogs of any State in the country: \$565 million.

This problem doesn't only impact the crown jewels of the park system. In my district, maintenance projects require attention at the Saguaro National Park of approximately \$12.9 million, of which the Chiricahua National Monument in Cochise County faces roughly \$10.3 million in needed restoration projects.

Mr. Chairman, this country and my State is home to some of the world's most renowned landscapes and natural beauty. By providing this modest funding increase to address some of the backlog across the Nation, my amendment will ensure Americans have unimpaired access to their national parks and that the enjoyment of these wonders is available for future generations.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I must oppose this amendment that takes more money away from an already starved Environmental Protection Agency. The EPA's main operating account is already cut by \$240 million.

The EPA plays a critical role in keeping Americans safe both during natural disasters like Hurricane Harvey and on a day-to-day basis. I know this because the EPA, right now, is cleaning up a toxic waste site that has been recently discovered in my congressional district.

Unfortunately, the very air we breathe and the water we drink is endangered by the funding and policy decisions that are made in this bill, and their consequences will be negatively felt in communities across this Nation.

Now, this amendment would increase funding for the National Park Service, something I do support. I have just been to Glacier National Park, where I saw their backlog, and I agree wholeheartedly that we should be investing in our parks, but it cannot be done at the expense of our public health.

Republicans have chosen to put forward an omnibus bill that leaves nearly \$5 billion of nondiscretionary funds on the table. So rather than gutting the EPA farther, we should be using all the resources available to us and working on a bipartisan budget agreement.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, I move to strike the last word.

The Acting Chair. The gentleman from California is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the gentlewoman's amendment. I certainly urge Members to support it.

This bill maintains the increases provided last year for deferred maintenance and increases the construction account by \$10 million. This amendment will further our efforts to address the longstanding deferred maintenance needs.

I urge an "aye" vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCSALLY. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate your support of the amendment, and I would ask all Members on both sides of the aisle to support our national parks and support this amendment.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 12 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 13 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 28, line 17, strike "3" and insert "6".

MODIFICATION TO AMENDMENT NO. 13 OFFERED BY MR. GRIFFITH

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be modified in the form I have placed at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read the modification as follows:

Insert at the end the following:

Page 28, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$75,000,000)".

Page 64, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$80,000,000)".

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

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is modified.

Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the consideration of what was two amendments that we just merged into one because they went hand-in-glove.

My amendment restores critical funding to three additional Appalachian States, the same number of States currently funded by the Abandoned Mine Reclamation Fund, for the

reclamation of abandoned mine lands in conjunction with economic and community development and reuse goals.

Now, let me explain the program quickly.

This was the brainchild of Chairman ROGERS a couple of years back, and what the idea was, originally, when they did the Abandoned Mine Land program, you could just restore the land. They came up with the concept in the hard-hit devastated areas of central Appalachia that we should not only allow it to be a restoration of the land, but that that land could be used and looked at as an economic purpose, a reuse the community could use for community development or economic development, and that was important.

Funding for these reclamation grants was first established in fiscal year 2016, but it was originally provided only to the three Appalachian States with the greatest amount of unfunded reclamation needs.

Unfortunately, that didn't, of course, reach all the States, and so last year, an additional three States were added, those States being Virginia, Ohio, Alabama, the original three being Pennsylvania, West Virginia, and Kentucky.

This year, as things were working through, Virginia, Ohio, and Alabama were not currently included. My amendment basically makes sure they are included. We have worked with the team on the Appropriations Committee to word it correctly. We think we have got it worded correctly so that we now have the ability to add in all three States.

I think this is important. Folks often say to us: Those of you in coal country, in central Appalachia, need to transition your economy. Well, we can't transition our economy if we have huge blocks of land which we can't use because they are unusable due to prior acts that left them in a condition where we know they need to be reclaimed, but you can't reclaim them looking at economic development.

So this is a way to retool. Chairman ROGERS came up with it. We would like to extend it to the other States that would be greatly helped by this, the three that I mentioned previously, Ohio, Alabama, and Virginia, and that is what my amendments do.

I would ask all to support this amendment to help those areas that are economically devastated in central Appalachia and expand on a program which is already showing signs of success.

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

□ 1800

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose an amendment that takes more money away from the EPA.

As I mentioned before, this bill already severely cuts the EPA's main operating account by \$240 million. The air we breathe and the water we drink are endangered by the policy decisions that are being made in this bill. The consequences will be felt in communities across the Nation. I understand, for many, cutting the EPA is an easy target, but I want my colleagues to understand what this amendment would actually be cutting, if adopted.

This account funds programs that are important to both sides of the aisle, including permitting for construction projects across the country, toxic risk prevention, parts of the successful Brownfields Program, and pesticide licensing.

So I understand that the money would direct more funding to States in Appalachia. Appalachia is suffering. They are suffering from the raging environmental harm caused by coal mining. But, unfortunately, I cannot support any deeper cuts to the EPA.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I understand the gentleman's overall goal is to continue funding for the AML pilot project, consistent with a fiscal year 2017 enacted level, and structure for the six Appalachian States.

Therefore, we can accept this package of amendments at this time, work toward maintaining funding for 6 States in a final fiscal year 2018 enacted bill. If we are able to achieve that goal, I hope we can count on the gentleman's support to pass both this House package and to enact the 2018 end-of-year spending bill.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage my colleagues to adopt this amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, once again, I appreciate the challenges that the gentleman is suffering in his State and throughout Appalachia, but I cannot support any more deeper cuts to the EPA, so I must oppose the amendment.

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

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Chairman, I ask my colleagues to help us transition the economy in central Appalachian support to the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment, as modified, offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH).

The amendment, as modified, was agreed to.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr.

JODY B. HICE) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN and Interior Subcommittee Chairman CALVERT for their efforts on this legislation, and I thank them for the opportunity to speak today.

I am committed to pursuing a comprehensive all-of-the-above energy strategy, and I would like to take this time to engage in a colloquy on section 438 of this bill, pertaining to offshore wind development. As a representative from a coastal area, I want to ensure that all offshore energy development is pursued in a pragmatic manner.

Section 438 restricts funding for the Department of the Interior to administer offshore wind leases within 24 nautical miles off the coast of Maryland. This language hinders offshore wind development by imposing unprecedented and burdensome requirements on three existing leases.

Typically, offshore wind turbines are constructed roughly 12 nautical miles from the coastline, which is generally out of sight from shore. By doubling the setback, section 438 unreasonably restricts these projects and sets a poor policy precedent for future development.

Furthermore, modifying the terms and conditions of the leases violates the sanctity of the lease and creates considerable uncertainty for companies pursuing any offshore wind project.

It is critical that we establish regulatory and contractual certainty in all areas of natural resource development. America's offshore wind industry is in its infancy, and the policies and precedents that we set today will affect investment long into the future.

The language contained in section 438 is concerning for this reason, and I look forward to working with the gentleman from Maryland in the future to find a more appropriate solution.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HARRIS) for the purpose of a colloquy.

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Chairman, I thank Mr. CALVERT for allowing me time to discuss an issue that is important to my constituents in Ocean City, Maryland.

I am proud that Ocean City is home to beautiful beaches and views and, as a result, a booming tourism industry.

I sought the inclusion of section 438 to respond to concerns of Ocean City residents regarding the visibility of the proposed wind turbines offshore. By siting turbines within 24 nautical miles from the shoreline, I am concerned that our beach economy and tourist experience will be compromised. I believe every effort must be made to minimize the impact of this project on the Ocean City view shed.

This large scale project requires full consideration of the needs and opinions of the local community. I look forward to working with my colleagues to develop a practical solution to this challenge.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, as I mentioned at our full committee markup, I understood that my colleague, Dr. HARRIS, was offering his amendment to address local concerns from his residents with respect to the visibility of offshore turbines. With all of these offshore projects, many varying viewpoints need to be taken into account. I appreciate that we have been able to discuss many of these views and concerns here today.

It is my hope that we can work with the authorizing committees of jurisdiction, the administration, and all interested stakeholders to identify some better solutions as we move forward through the fiscal year 2018 process.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. TIPTON). The Chair understands that amendment No. 14 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 15 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 28, line 8, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$32,491,000)".

Page 64, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$32,491,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman of the subcommittee for the opportunity to offer this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, prior to the enactment of the Surface Mining Control and Reclamation Act of 1977, coal mining played an important role in the United States for nearly 2 centuries, providing critical energy and jobs for our Nation.

However, across Pennsylvania and throughout Appalachia, we continue to have great needs in reclaiming our abandoned mine lands and restoring our waters that have been impacted by historical mining activities.

Since 1977, we have made great gains in restoring our historical mine lands, but much more work still needs to be done.

The Federal Office of Surface Mining has estimated that the unfunded liabilities of abandoned mine lands across the Nation exceeds \$10 billion, with nearly half of that obligation located in Pennsylvania.

To complement the funding from the AML trust fund, which was established through SMCRA, this legislation contains appropriations for the AML pilot program in order to support additional

funding for abandoned mine lands for areas that need assistance most.

This program provides grants to States “to accelerate the remediation of AML sites with the economic and community development end uses in mind.”

Unfortunately, this legislation provides \$32 million less for the pilot program compared to last year’s level.

My amendment is simple and would not increase Federal spending. The amendment would restore funding for the Abandoned Mine Land Reclamation pilot program to its 2017 level by reallocating funds from the EPA’s Environmental Programs and Management by the same amount.

Mr. Chairman, where these funds are coming from is very consistent with the mission of that account that it would be taken from. But the difference is that by putting this into the AML pilot program with a laser focus, we are focused on environmental concerns that have been identified, and we are funding remediation techniques that are proven.

We have an obligation to clean up our environment and restore our abandoned mine lands and waters, and this program helps us do just that.

Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairman and ranking member, and I urge my colleagues to vote “yes” on this amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment that takes more money, again, away from an already starved EPA.

This is a duplicate from the last amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia earlier. It cuts another \$32 million from the EPA’s operating accounts.

Our country right now is dealing with two catastrophes caused by hurricanes. The destruction is going to be felt for years. The EPA right now is one of the primary Federal agencies responsible for protecting human health, monitoring air and water, and managing recovery and cleanup, so it would be simply reckless to adopt another amendment that would further cripple the EPA.

These two amendments would cut the EPA by \$108 million.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentlewoman for those comments.

My point is, though, that this actually takes \$32 million and puts it like a laser on an area where we know that environmental damage is well documented and we have very effective public-private partnership techniques to address.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee.

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

I am certainly prepared to accept this amendment. I understand the importance of the program to the gentleman from Pennsylvania and other Members in the Appalachian region. I look forward to working with him and all of the interested Members.

Mr. Chairman, I encourage adoption of the amendment.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, once again, I understand clearly what the gentleman from Pennsylvania is trying to accomplish.

I wish we could accomplish that goal. But with already a \$240 million cut to the EPA and all of the challenges on the EPA—we just recently agreed on this floor by a voice vote to cut the EPA another \$75 million. This would be another \$33 million.

So I hope that we can reach a place in the funding that the chairman and I have where we can address the serious concerns that you bring to the floor where you had success with programs. But, at the same time, I would be cutting opportunities for cleanup, especially with all of the disasters looming—forest fires, disasters, and cleanup I just had recently in my district that came out of the blue. The EPA wouldn’t have money to respond.

Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose 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 Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 18 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 39, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$1,011,000)”.

Page 64, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$1,011,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, my amendment will restore \$1 million in cuts to the Environmental Justice program within the EPA, with an equivalent cut to leadership and administration within the DOI Office of the Secretary.

In 1992, the program was created and originally called the Environmental Equity Office. It was created after a series of releases of reports that revealed polluter sites were disproportionately located in low-income communities and communities of color.

□ 1815

With minimal support, the program has provided communities with leveraged resources to do things like revitalize neighborhoods, build health centers, expand affordable housing, create green space and recreation areas, and, more importantly, raise the awareness of the disproportionate treatment in both affected communities and decisionmakers.

Despite this success within the EPA for decades, we are not even close to dealing with the issue of environmental justice.

In 2016, the United States Commission on Civil Rights found that racial minorities and low-income communities are still disproportionately affected by the siting of waste disposal facilities, permitted emissions facilities, and that they often lack the political and financial clout to properly bargain with polluters when fighting a decision or seeking redress.

A report by the staff of the House Committee on Natural Resources found that clean water access and sanitation infrastructure on numerous reservations across the Nation more closely resemble developing countries than they do the rest of the Nation. Nearly half of all homes on Tribal land lack access to adequate drinking water, sewage, or solid waste disposal facilities. As a result, Native families often end up drinking unclean water that increases disease risks and impairs Tribal economic development.

Additionally, low-income communities of color have been on the frontline of Houston’s petrochemical industry for decades, and when Harvey struck, they were some of the first to feel the effects as chemical plants caught fire, refineries began flaring toxins, and polluted floodwater went into their neighborhoods.

The EPA Office of Environmental Justice helps integrate concerns of these communities within the general activities of the agencies. This is not a program that can afford to be scaled back, especially as concerns of environmental justice continue to arise around Hurricane Harvey and now in Irma’s path. It is critical that we protect frontline communities and communities of color from disparate impacts caused by environmental pollution. One million dollars is not a lot of

money for this task, but it reaffirms the significance of the office and our sense of equality.

Today I ask my colleagues to join in defense of these communities and show them that Congress cares about their public health, their housing, and their importance as people.

Mr. Chair, I urge a “yes” vote on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, given our allocation, which was \$824 million below the fiscal year 2017 level, we had to find areas to trim. It is also important to note that the bill does not support the elimination of the program, as has been proposed in the President’s budget. It was the committee’s effort to find some middle ground.

While I can certainly appreciate the gentleman’s interest to maintain fiscal year 2017 enacted level, the allocation of the committee doesn’t support those levels. So, therefore, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the gentleman’s amendment.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN), a member of the Natural Resources Committee, and ranking member of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am proud to rise in support of this amendment to restore funding to the Environmental Justice program within the EPA. This program enables the agency to better assist frontline communities that are disproportionately impacted by pollution.

Low-income and minority communities face disproportionate levels of hazardous pollution and environmental contaminants due to where their members live and where they work.

The harms are real. For instance, higher levels of air pollution result in members of minority groups having higher death rates and higher numbers of emergency room visits and hospital stays.

As the cofounder and co-chair of the United for Climate and Environmental Justice Task Force, it is my mission to combat these environmental injustices and ensure frontline communities no longer bear the unequal burden of environmental, economic, and health harms.

That is why, Mr. Chairman, this amendment is so important.

The Environmental Justice program leverages Federal funds to greatly improve health and quality of life in our most vulnerable communities. Since the establishment of the program, communities have been better able to revitalize neighborhoods, build health centers, expand affordable housing, and create new green spaces and recreational areas.

I urge my colleagues to show low-income and minority communities that we care about their health, housing, and overall well-being by supporting the amendment.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I urge a “yes” vote on the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

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

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. 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. 21 OFFERED BY MR. PRICE OF NORTH CAROLINA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 21 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 63, line 6, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$104,235,000) (increased by \$104,235,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would restore the EPA’s Science and Technology account to 2017 levels.

I offer this amendment to underscore the importance of environmental research to the health and safety of the American people, as well as thousands of jobs in my district and across the country.

This amendment is framed in increase-decrease terms for the simple reason that, given the subcommittee’s inadequate allocation, there is simply no place to turn for an offset.

The EPA’s Science and Technology account funds research and development activities within the agency, supporting the work of the world’s leading environmental research enterprise and informing the environmental policies that Congress enacts.

The bill on the floor today would cut this account by \$105 million, a 15 percent reduction. About the only good thing I can say about that is that it isn’t as bad as the Trump budget, but it is still a deep and devastating cut. Mr.

Chairman, we have to restore these funds as this bill moves through the remaining stages of the process.

The EPA’s Office of Research and Development funded by this account not only supports EPA programs in air, water, toxicology, and energy research, but it also facilitates innovative partnerships with some of the premier higher education and research institutions in the country.

EPA research facilities employ more than 2,000 people, supports some 700 affiliated jobs in my district alone. This includes advanced laboratory scientists, administrative personnel, also blue-collar jobs in maintenance, custodial, and security positions.

The EPA research that this agency conducts, world class research, it allows us to remain proactive in protecting the air we breathe, the water we drink, resources, whose safety we must never, ever take for granted.

Now, I know the EPA is continually a scapegoat when it comes to spending cuts. In times of crisis, however, we don’t hesitate to call on them to respond quickly to events that could pose a threat to the environment and public safety.

Just last week in the devastating wake of Hurricane Harvey, sites containing dangerous chemicals and contaminants were severely flooded and damaged. Research from this office, the office being cut in this bill, proved invaluable in putting together a safe and effective response.

In other words, the EPA is part of the first line of defense to respond to events that pose threats to public health and safety. It follows that if we gut the EPA’s research budget, we are putting ultimately the American public at risk.

The EPA research cuts underscore, I think, how fraudulent the claim is that this is a bill that would make America secure and prosperous. Really? In reality, it would cripple investments that Americans count on each and every day to keep them safe and healthy.

Mr. Chairman, I remain hopeful that a bipartisan budget agreement will be reached that will allow us to restore this research funding and do right by the people we represent.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I certainly appreciate my friend’s support for the research conducted at the EPA, and particularly the Research Triangle Park. I am a supporter of the world class research that occurs at RTP with respect to the computational toxicology program. That research has helped to identify alternative high throughput testing methodologies that have reduced the number of animals used in laboratories.

Given the current allocation, however, which is \$824 million below the

fiscal year 2017 level, we had to find areas to trim. We certainly don't have a funding level that can support the fiscal year 2017 enacted levels, but we tried to do the best we could to find common ground.

I certainly look forward to working with the gentleman in the future, if we happily come to some kind of budget agreement, where we can reallocate funds to something as important as this. But, again, because of our allocation, I must oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I have to acknowledge that the chairman did a pretty good job of describing some of the research that we have underway in North Carolina and around the country, and I know he understands that and wants to support it.

I also know that we have got to do better than the allocations represented in this eight-bill omnibus effort. So I pledge to work with him and other colleagues to achieve that kind of agreement, and then also to revisit this account and other accounts that we know need attention if we are to do our duty as representatives of our communities and also maintain the investments a great country must maintain.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, as the designee of Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN, I move to strike the last word.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LANCE) for the purpose of entering into a colloquy.

Mr. LANCE. Mr. Chairman, I thank both Chairman CALVERT and Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for their work on this legislation. I greatly appreciate the committee's efforts to fund the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

I stress the importance of Federal investments in the arts and humanities. The numbers speak for themselves. The NEA and the NEH each consist of only .003 percent of a nearly \$4 trillion Federal budget, yet for every dollar the United States spends on Federal arts initiatives, nine nonFederal dollars are leveraged, generating roughly \$600 million in matching support.

Federal arts and humanities funding is a catalyst for the economic development and job creation that we all need, having a powerful multiplier effect not only in New Jersey, the State I rep-

resent, but throughout the entire Nation.

The arts and humanities also engage nearly every community. In April, I visited the Paper Mill Playhouse in Millburn, New Jersey, in the district I serve, to see its "Theater for Everyone" project in action, an autism-friendly program supported by the NEA. It provides a creative outlet for children with developmental disabilities and for their families. Seeing these performances reinforced the importance of our continued investments in the NEA and in the NEH.

Mr. Chair, I also thank both Chairman CALVERT and Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for including funding for the Delaware River Basin Restoration project authorized just last year to coordinate private investments, regional partnerships, and local knowledge, and develop strategies to protect and restore the watershed's ecological and recreational assets and historical significance.

□ 1830

Throughout the four States that are involved—New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, and Delaware—the Delaware River Basin supplies 15 million people with clean water and supports approximately \$25 billion in economic activity each year. It is imperative that we preserve these resources for future generations, and I look forward to working with the committee on this initiative.

Let me repeat my deep thanks to Chairman CALVERT and to Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. SLAUGHTER).

Ms. SLAUGHTER. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman CALVERT and Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for their commitment to the arts. I greatly appreciate the subcommittee's efforts to fund the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities.

The NEA's mission is to strengthen the creative capacity of our communities by providing all Americans with diverse opportunities for arts participation. Of critical importance, the NEA has expanded their reach to help servicemembers who have been diagnosed with TBI, traumatic brain injury, and other psychological conditions. This new partnership is critically important.

The NEA Creative Forces Military Healing Arts Network is a collaboration with the Department of Defense which supports music, writing, and visual art therapy at military care facilities. They are finding that the best treatment for PTSD is yoga, which doesn't cost us anything.

The Creative Forces program places the creative arts therapies at the core of patient-centered care in military medical facilities and invests in research on the impacts and benefits of these innovative treatment methods.

The cost-effective, noninvasive arts therapy of those programs rank consistently in the top five "helpful" and "wish to continue" programs on patient satisfaction surveys of the men and women who have gone through the programs, and over 85 percent of military patients said art therapy was helpful to their healing.

We may even be learning here that this might be the best thing, as Mr. LANCE was pointing out, for autistic children.

But throughout the art therapy programs and the work that they are doing, our servicemembers and -women are being able to transition away from the basketful of prescription drugs that they carry around with them and lived on and are rejoining their families and life. So when they wheel out of that healing, that psychological skill-building, self-expression, and self-esteem that comes from these programs, that obviously is certainly something that we need to continue.

As part of the NEA's mission to increase access to the arts for all Americans, Creative Forces enables more servicemembers, veterans, and military families to benefit from creative art therapies and community arts activities.

NEA is so cheap it is surprising. For the small amount of money we put into it, we would get about \$9 billion back and many people who have been employed. We don't do anything with a better return than the money we spend for the arts.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, as the designee of Ranking Member LOWEY, I move to strike the last word.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE).

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding. I thank Chairman CALVERT for engaging in this colloquy with Mr. LANCE and Ms. SLAUGHTER and me.

We are highlighting the importance of the National Endowment for the Arts and the National Endowment for the Humanities and the importance of robust funding for the work of those agencies. There is no more efficient dollar spent in the entire Federal budget. I will say in a minute what I mean by that.

I am very happy to be co-chairman, with Mr. LANCE, of the Congressional Humanities Caucus, to be a member of the Congressional Arts Caucus, which Ms. SLAUGHTER and others have led, and proud to support the missions of these two agencies.

Federal support for the arts and the humanities affirms America's rich and diverse cultural and artistic heritage. It really is an investment in the quality of life of our people. I think we should see it that way, and we need to

be steadfast in our support and our investment. It is one of the most efficient we make, as I said. It leverages private, nonprofit, and corporate dollars.

In 2015 alone, for example, Federal NEH museum grants leveraged \$104 million in outside funding from only \$33 million in Federal funds. That is a pretty good return for the taxpayer.

They support millions of jobs, these endowments do, and the projects they fund, hundreds of millions of dollars in direct economic activity, and the American public loves them. Participation all over this country, in communities large and small, rural and urban, is widespread and enthusiastic.

So again, I thank the chairman for his attention to these important lines in the budget. I hope we can bolster our commitment to the arts and humanities and do even better as the appropriations process moves forward.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I want to also commend the chairman and working with the whole committee to make sure that the arts and humanities receive the funding that they did.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. I want to quickly thank the gentlewoman from the great State of Minnesota, thank the gentleman from California, and just very quickly say that I come with my amendments, but I also come just to acknowledge the pending storm in Florida and Hurricane Harvey because our arts communities were underwater, and they are still underwater.

I offered amendments that deal with preservation of heritage areas, urban reforestation, and the Smithsonian outreach. I thank my colleagues for putting it in the en bloc.

But as I do so, I want to take note of, again, all of the debris and be able to say that, in the course of hurricanes, historic entities are impacted.

We are looking to establish an emancipation trail, and one of my most important amendments is to ensure that there is national policy to preserve, for public use, historic sites, buildings, and objects of national significance for the inspiration and benefit of people of the United States.

My community is looking for that emancipation trail, but it starts from Galveston. We have not yet been able to assess whether any of those historic markers and places were destroyed by Hurricane Harvey. So the funding for the Interior Department and the aspects that come under the Interior Department, the jurisdictional issue is very important to us because we will have to look to see if our historic entities have been preserved.

In the midst of debris and danger that our constituents face, this is equally important, and it is equally important to restore the symphony, to restore the ballet and our theater, all of them underwater in my congressional district.

I hope, as we move forward, H.R. 3686, Hurricane Harvey supplemental appro-

priation that we have filed that will embrace all of these issues, will be considered.

I thank my colleagues for those amendments. And, again, in the course of a storm, the history of people is jeopardized, and my amendments deal with preserving the history of our people. Maybe, as we come out of this, we will create the emancipation trail that is part of my amendment.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 27 OFFERED BY MR. LANGEVIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 27 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 64, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 64, line 12, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$1,000,000)".

Page 67, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

Page 73, line 23, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$1,000,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, before I actually get to my amendment, I just want to say in reference to the previous discussion about properly funding the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities, I commend the discussion on both sides and the commitment to properly fund those programs.

The National Endowment for the Arts and National Endowment for the Humanities holds a special place in Rhode Island in that both of those programs were championed by and helped to have been created by our late senior Senator Claiborne Pell. We understand the importance of the arts and humanities in Rhode Island, the jobs they create, the quality of life they enhance, and I wholeheartedly support properly funding both of those programs.

I had led a Special Order when the President's budget came out and those programs had been zeroed out in funding. Several of my colleagues and I got together and talked about the impact the arts and humanities have on our States, on our districts, and on the country as a whole. I just want to reiterate my support for the National Endowment for the Arts and Humanities and all they do for the country.

Mr. Chairman, my amendment that we have before us would restore some funding to the southern New England estuaries program, which is currently zeroed out in the underlying bill.

This program, part of the EPA's geographic programs, has been a thriving success, and anyone who has been to

New England knows the beauty of where the ocean meets the land. Our estuaries are in South County, Rhode Island, and all along the Narragansett Bay; along Mount Hope Bay and Buzzards Bay and throughout Cape Cod.

These areas are the lungs of our coastal areas and sustain the diversity of plant and animal life. These funds are vital to conserving this wetland habitat which is frequently under attack by human and natural damage. So I implore the majority to support this program, as they have supported similar programs for Puget Sound, the Chesapeake Bay, and other areas.

I am proud to be joined by Representatives CICILLINE, KEATING, and KENNEDY as cosponsors of this amendment.

Mr. Chairman, finally, I just want to say that I intend to offer and withdraw this amendment provided that my colleague, Chairman CALVERT, is open to continuing the discussion on the importance of this program.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. While the amendment itself is drafted in order as a general increase to EPA geographic programs, the gentleman proposes to fund a program that was not requested in the budget and is not authorized.

Further, he proposes to reduce grants from DERA, the DERA program, which is a key program for improving air quality in areas like mine that are in a nonattainment area with existing standards.

For those reasons, I oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Chairman, as I said, I have offered to withdraw the amendment as long as the chairman would continue discussion with me.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I am sorry. I didn't hear the gentleman, and I happily accept his offer to withdraw the amendment. I will happily work with him to see if we can't work some time in the future to find room for this program that the gentleman is obviously supportive of.

Mr. LANGEVIN. I thank the chairman, and I am grateful for his consideration, and I look forward to working with him.

I yield back the balance of my time and withdraw my amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The amendment is withdrawn.

The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mr. KATKO) assumed the chair.

#### FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate by Ms. Curtis, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has agreed to



without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 69. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for the District of Columbia Special Olympics Law Enforcement Torch Run.

The message also announced that the Senate has passed bills of the following titles in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 597. An act to increase Federal Pell Grants for the children of fallen public safety officers, and for other purposes.

S. 1165. An act to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Huntington, West Virginia, as the Hershel "Woody" Williams VA Medical Center.

The message also announced that the Senate has agreed to a concurrent resolution of the following title in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution providing for a correction in the enrollment of H.R. 601.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

□ 1845

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS  
ACT, 2018

The Committee resumed its sitting.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. TIPTON). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 29 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 64, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert "(reduced by \$10,234,000)".

Page 141, line 4, after the dollar amount, insert "(increased by \$10,234,000)".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. Chairman, earlier this year President Donald Trump submitted his budget request for fiscal year 2018 to Congress. The budget request included a 20 percent reduction in funding for the Environmental Protection Agency's Office of Enforcement and Compliance Assurance to \$419 million, \$129 million below the fiscal year 2017 level.

The underlying bill cuts roughly 15 percent of the EPA's enforcement budget, and my amendment would get us closer to meeting the President's request by cutting an additional \$10,234,000 from the EPA's programs and management account enforcement line item.

Reducing the EPA's enforcement budget will help rein in inappropriate

bureaucratic actions. It is necessary to revive the American economy and restore regulatory sanity to environmental regulations.

Make no mistake, Mr. Chairman, the American people cannot afford to continue to be burdened by an out-of-control EPA that overregulates and promulgates rules and then punishes the American by adjudicating unconstitutional penalties.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I can't support an amendment taking money from an underfunded agency, reducing our bottom line, when it is already \$824 million below the FY17 enacted level. Let me give you two examples of why I think the gentleman's amendment should not be supported.

One is I have been talking to EPA officials because we have a surprise toxic dump site that is as close to a residential area as I am from the Chairman. Barrels. The owner just walked away. Too much for the city of St. Paul to handle. Too toxic. Too dangerous.

The State of Minnesota, the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, had to call in the EPA for help. It is costing us as taxpayers millions of dollars to clean that up because the businessowner just walked away. Nothing that the EPA can do but clean it up, and clean it up they are, and the neighbors are ecstatic that the Federal Government is there to help them.

The EPA, by taking more money away from it and putting it in the spending reduction account at a time when I know that the EPA regions all across this country are sending men and women down to help cities and counties and communities out with the disaster that Harvey has created, this is all money that is being spent right now in an agency that is \$824 million below 2017.

I think it is important that we protect the air that we breathe and the water that we drink, and the consequences of further cuts to the EPA, I believe, will be felt in communities like mine, like Houston, like maybe what we will be hearing in Florida—we haven't had the assessment yet in the Virgin Islands—all across this Nation. That, to me, is just irresponsible.

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I won't take the 2 minutes. I just want to let the gentleman know I am prepared to accept the amendment, and I encourage adoption of the amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 3¾ minutes remaining.

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

The EPA has no statutory duty to pursue or enforce regulation. My home State of Arizona, along with the States west of the Mississippi, are those who are most affected by the heavy hand of the enforcement arm of the EPA.

In my community, dust is the number one particulate. The EPA's response is to come to us in a desert and say: "Water it down. Water it down." Then they come after us because of misuse of water.

This is the inconsistency that we see in the EPA that is weighing down the economy of many of the areas within the West.

The more I meet with local and national natural resource leaders, their number one concern mostly deals with the EPA's burdensome regulations and its enforcement proceedings. Further reducing the EPA's enforcement budget will limit its ability to stifle the economy and enforce unconstitutional rules.

I also want to emphasize the need to restore fiscal sanity in our country. With the ever-growing national debt, my amendment will return \$10 million back to the United States Treasury.

I thank the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. SMITH) for partnering with me on this effort, and to all Members who support our effort to restore fiscal and regulatory sanity in our country.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, as I said earlier, this account has already been cut by \$240 million below the 2017 enacted level, another \$108 million tonight on the floor, but at least those dollars were going back into something, in my opinion, meaningful. This is just taking money away from the EPA, which is underfunded, which is undersourced, and being asked to do more for less at a time when, as I pointed out, we don't even know until there is an opportunity for the waters to subside what we are going to find at the Superfund sites from Harvey.

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 Arizona (Mr. BIGGS).

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 30 OFFERED BY MR. KATKO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 30 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 64, line 1, after the dollar amount, insert “(reduced by \$250,000,000)”.

Page 67, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$250,000,000)”.

Page 67, line 22, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$250,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment, which restores critical water infrastructure funding to the Clean Water State Revolving Fund.

Across our country, communities are faced with aging water infrastructure, which poses a growing threat to existing levels of service, public health, and our environment.

The State Revolving Funds are a proven critical tool for States and local communities to make high priority water infrastructure investments that otherwise may not be feasible.

Earlier this year, Onondaga County in my district leveraged over \$20 million in funding through the State Revolving Funds to upgrade the Syracuse-Metro sewage treatment plant to continue to improve the water quality of Onondaga Lake, which has made a remarkable recovery.

While I commend the Chairman for his work on this legislation, with the EPA estimating our national 20-year capital improvement need to be over \$650 billion for drinking water and waste infrastructure combined, now is not the time to roll back this Federal funding.

The \$250 million cut to this fund included in the bill would prove harmful to communities in my district and throughout our entire Nation.

I was heartened to see that the President's statement yesterday opposed this \$250 million cut and reaffirmed the administration's support of pivotal water infrastructure funding.

This is a bipartisan issue that impacts nearly every congressional district. I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this amendment to ensure our communities can continue to invest in critical water infrastructure projects that support their economies and a safe and healthy environment.

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

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. HULTGREN). The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, while there is nothing more I would like to do, I think any of us would all like to do, than to provide more resources for the clean water SRF, it can't be done

by reducing the EPA's environmental programs in management.

This administration has clearly shown that they do not regard the EPA's work as a priority, which means that they have a blatant disregard for public health and the health of our environment.

The EPM account includes funding for programs like brownfields enforcement, environmental justice, geographic programs, and lot of other critical programs, some of which I gave examples of this evening, which would suffer with a \$250 million reduction.

This amendment illustrates, because I agree with the gentleman, I wish we had more money to put in that account, what happens when we don't have adequate 302(b) allocations. To overuse a common phrase, we are robbing Peter to pay Paul, and it is not making us whole. So it is with great reluctance that I oppose this amendment, but oppose it I must because the cuts that have already been made this evening to the brownfields enforcement, the environmental justice programs, and a myriad of other programs which are critical to the health and well-being of our communities, and they are out there working every day on it, is something I can just not support.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I support the gentleman's amendment because water infrastructure remains a top priority of this committee. I urge adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Chair, in response to my colleagues from the Democratic side of the aisle, it is clear, as I stated previously, that the President has signaled not only that he supports the plussing up of the money as I propose in this amendment, that he supports plus-ing up a much larger amount the Clean Water State Revolving Funds as part of an overall infrastructure plan. To say otherwise is simply untrue. This President wants everyone in the United States to have clean drinking water. He supports this program, and for someone to say otherwise, it is just not true.

She also stated that robbing Peter to pay Paul is something that may be going on here. We are talking about clean drinking water, \$250 million of clean drinking water, that would come out of the general fund. I would much rather see a little discomfort from bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., than to see people not have clean drinking water nationwide.

I want to reiterate the importance of supporting the effective State Revolving Fund program. It has done a great job nationwide, and we need in these tough fiscal times to find ways to make these things work. This is a way to do it. Take away from the general fund, take away from instances in

which bureaucrats may not be able to rent the car of their choice or have the pencils that they choose or an upgraded computer. I would much rather have that than to have dirty drinking water for our constituents nationwide.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, the very employees that the gentleman was talking about that get in a car, they drive to check out the sewer waste plants to make sure that they are operating. They are making sure that the water is clean. They are doing their job.

Tonight we have cut this account already by 16 percent. That means we are cutting programs. We have cut brownfields enforcement, environmental justice, geographic programs, programs that support the very account you and I would like to see more money go into. I just urge my colleagues not to 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 New York (Mr. KATKO).

The amendment was agreed to.

□ 1900

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY  
LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 31 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 67, line 20, after the dollar amount, insert “(increased by \$6,000,000) (reduced by \$6,000,000)”.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, a little more than 2 years ago, an Environmental Protection Agency team was investigating a contamination at the Gold King Mine that caused a spill of 3 million gallons of wastewater, impacting New Mexico, Colorado, Utah, Arizona, the Southern Ute Reservation, and the Navajo Nation.

I was in Farmington, New Mexico, in the Four Corners area when the toxic plume turned the Animas River yellow. I met with the community and heard their concerns about the toll that the spill was taking on businesses, farmers, families, and individuals. I attended different community meetings, not only in southern Colorado, but in that northwestern part of New Mexico.

Despite repeated promises by the EPA that it would fully address this

environmental disaster, progress has too often been needlessly slow. For example, in January of this year, the EPA and the Department of Justice announced a deeply disappointing decision that the EPA was not liable under the Federal Tort Claims Act for damages caused by the Gold King Mine spill.

And while I appreciate Administrator Pruitt's recent announcement that the EPA was reconsidering this misguided position, I believe that the EPA and the Congress should act to ensure that every impacted individual and community—especially New Mexicans and the Navajo Nation—receive the compensation they deserve.

The State of New Mexico and the Navajo Nation should not have to sue the Federal Government to ensure that the government meets its moral obligation to the farmers, small business owners, and others injured by this spill.

This amendment, however, is about the long-term impact the spill will have on the river and all that it sustains, from drinking water to providing water for farming and livestock. Robust long-term water quality monitoring is essential to ensuring that communities along the Animas River have the data they need to protect the health of all of those who rely on this water, and the State of New Mexico has developed a robust and independent monitoring plan that deserves the EPA's support.

That is why I am again offering an amendment to provide \$6 million to direct the EPA to work with the affected States and Indian Tribes to support long-term monitoring programs for water quality on the Animas and San Juan Rivers in response to the Gold King Mine spill.

The same amendment was accepted by the House last year on a bipartisan basis. I thank both the chairman and the ranking member for their work on this issue, and because monitoring now and well into the future is necessary to protect the health of all those who rely on this water, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment, reluctantly.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I think it is important that EPA right the wrong that was caused by the Gold King Mine spill and ensure that the affected States, and the Tribal areas, have the resources they need following the spill.

The FY17 bill included \$4 million to work with the States and Tribes on an independent water monitoring plan as authorized by the WIIN Act. Therefore, the proposed level in this amendment would exceed the authorized level. And for that reason, I must oppose the gentleman's amendment.

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

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairman very much for his comments and look forward to working with him on this issue.

We arrived at \$6 million for water monitoring after consulting with the State of New Mexico, and, in fact, it is my understanding that New Mexico has about \$15 million in priority needs related to the Gold King Mine spill, including \$6 million specifically for monitoring.

And so we checked with the State before we came down this evening to debate this amendment, and what the State of New Mexico shared with me, they report that they have only received \$577,193 in Federal funding to support monitoring, which is less than 10 percent of what my home State believes is needed.

In addition, the Navajo Nation and other impacted communities still need support from the Federal Government to help recover from this disaster. So, again, I look forward to working with both the chairman and with the ranking member to ensure that all of the communities impacted by this spill are made whole, and that we provide appropriate support to vital water and monitoring efforts in New Mexico, Colorado, Arizona, Utah, the Southern Ute Tribe, and the Navajo Nation.

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

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

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

Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico. 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 New Mexico will be postponed.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 32 printed in House Report 115-297.

AMENDMENT NO. 36 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 36 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 134, strike lines 17 through 25.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment seeks to preserve our current Clean Water Act protections for

our rivers, streams, and wetlands. Our Nation's river systems and wetlands provide values that no other ecosystem can. These include: natural water quality improvement, flood protection, shoreline erosion control, recreation, general aesthetic appreciation, and natural products for our use at no cost.

Yet section 430 of this bill seeks to undermine the critical balance between protecting these waters and the day-to-day operations of our Nation's farmers, ranchers, and foresters. Under current law, farmers, ranchers, and foresters can carry out their normal operations in any waterbody without securing a Clean Water Act permit.

So what this means is farmers can continue to plow their fields, including potential wet areas that have been farmed for decades, plant their seeds, harvest their crops, without ever having to obtain approval under the Clean Water Act.

Any normal farming, ranching, and forestry exemption is going to include minor limitations. For example, a farmer cannot use the current exemption to convert his farmland to a residential development without obtaining a permit. And a rancher can't use the exemption to plow under a wetland to expand his reach of grazing lands. And forestry operations cannot use this exemption to change the course of a local stream to improve drainage on their growing lands.

In short, the way the Clean Water Act currently operates is to allow normal ranching, farming, forestry operations to continue without a permit, unless the activities either change or convert the use of the waterbody to a new purpose, or impair the historic flow or reach of a stream or wetland.

So if the planned activity triggers any of these limitations, the current law requires the activity to obtain a permit. That is perfectly reasonable. But section 430 of this bill would, in essence, provide an absolute clean water exemption for impacts to any streams or wetlands that happen to be on agriculture, ranching, or forestry lands, regardless if they have any relation to these activities.

Mr. Chairman, this is a fundamental change to the Clean Water Act, and one where the impacts have never been explored. When the EPA was asked what the impact of this amendment would be, here was their response:

This amendment would be a significant departure from almost 40 years of implementation of the Clean Water Act by eliminating the existing provision requiring that the exemptions apply only to normal, as in established or ongoing, farming practices.

This change could result in the loss or impairment of thousands of acres of valuable wetlands and other waters where land is converted to agriculture.

Mr. Chairman, we should not be using an appropriations bill to change Federal policy related to the protection of our Nation's rivers and streams. To the best of my knowledge, no hearings or investigations on the impacts of this provision have been held.

If this Congress is interested in overturning almost 40 years of Clean Water Act precedent, regular order would require hearings before the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, which has sole jurisdiction over the Clean Water Act, and approval by that committee before consideration on the floor.

This rider is bad policy for the protection of our environment, for the protection of human health, and bad policy for the protection of our public safety.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. In 1977, Congress made a deliberate policy choice to exempt ordinary farming, silviculture, ranching, mining, related activities, from the requirements to obtain Clean Water Act permits when undertaken as normal activities: prepare and maintain land, roads, ponds, and ditches.

Unfortunately, we heard concern for several years that, under the Obama administration, the EPA and the Corps of Engineers changed implementation of these provisions to significantly reduce the application of the statutory exemptions.

Section 430 of the bill makes clear that Congress has always intended that statutory exemptions are to have meaning, that the agencies cannot simply ignore the will of Congress as set out by law.

For these reasons and a number of others, I oppose the amendment and urge a “no” vote.

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

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the perspective of the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on this. I think our clear understanding is that the exemptions, as currently written, allow for all normal farming, ranching, forestry activities, and that the permit would only be required when there is a substantial difference from the activity as it has gone on before, and that this is the way the law has been interpreted and enforced for the last 40 years.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I urge a strong “no,” and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 37 OFFERED BY MR. BEYER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 37 printed in House Report 115–297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 135, strike lines 1 through 23.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, my amendment would strike section 431.

Section 431 does two things. First, it withdraws the Clean Water Rule. Second, and more importantly, it breaks procedure and creates a loophole so that the removal of the Clean Water Rule does not have to abide by the Administrative Procedure Act.

In essence, we are creating a loophole to eliminate a rule, a rule requested by the Supreme Court and one that took several years to put together. This elimination without allowing tweaks, thoughtful removal, or comment is a radical and dangerous precedent.

In fact, 80 Members of Congress and I actually asked for an extension of the 30-day comment period to eliminate the Clean Water Rule to allow the American people to have a say. The Trump administration agreed with us and extended the comment period an additional 30 days. I don’t get to say that too often.

So clearly, there is a desire for a comment period, as evidenced by our letter and the administration’s decision to appropriately extend the comment period, but the language in this bill would eliminate that process completely.

I include in the RECORD the request for extension.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,

Washington, DC, June 29, 2017.

Re Request for Extension of Comment Period on EPA and Corps Proposed Rule Defining Waters of the United States under the Clean Water Act.

Administrator SCOTT PRUITT,  
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA),  
Washington, DC.

Attention: Docket ID No. EPA-HQ-OW-2017-0203

DEAR ADMINISTRATOR PRUITT: We request a minimum 90 day extension to the proposed 30-day comment period to rescind the 2015 Clean Water Rule, 80 Fed. Reg. 37054 (Jun. 29, 2015).

The Environmental Protection Agency and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) finalized the Clean Water Rule to clarify the scope of waters protected under the Clean Water Act. The EPA and the Corps solicited comments on the Rule for over 200 days. In accordance with Administrative Procedure Act, the agencies first established a public comment period for 90 days and extended the comment period twice in response to extension requests. The final rule reflected over 1 million public comments on the proposal, the substantial majority of which supported the Clean Water Rule.

The agencies also initiated an extensive public outreach effort, including over 400 meetings across the nation with various stakeholders, including but not limited to: states, small businesses, farmers, academics, miners, energy companies, counties, municipalities, environmental organizations, and

other federal agencies. The agencies incorporated these comments into the final Clean Water Rule.

President Trump’s Executive Order 13778 directs EPA and the Corps to evaluate whether to revise or rescind the Clean Water Rule, “as appropriate and consistent with law.” We ask that as you examine the Clean Water Rule, like the prior administration, you engage in a thoughtful and comprehensive process bound in scientific fact.

Americans depend on clean water for their health and livelihood. More than 117 million Americans rely upon drinking water from public water systems that draw supply from headwater, seasonal, or rain-dependent streams that were vulnerable to pollution before the Clean Water Rule. As such, the decision to roll back the Clean Water Rule cannot be made in haste.

We are concerned that the EPA has provided limited time and opportunity for stakeholder involvement and official public comment. Any proposed rulemaking must include sufficient time and participation to gather input from concerned and affected parties, including those whose legal rights and responsibilities will be affected by this effort. For example, the 2015 Clean Water Rule provided legal certainty that regulatory-defined water features, such as stormwater control features, wastewater recycling structures, and puddles, are not covered by the Clean Water Act. However, that certainty would be eliminated if the 2015 Clean Water Rule were rescinded.

Given the history of engagement on this issue and the fact that parties may be subject to greater regulatory uncertainty by this effort, a comment period of 30 days does not allow for meaningful engagement from the public and stakeholders.

The Clean Water Rule is robust and ensures that water sources are protected by taking into account the connected systems of water, from wetlands and seasonal bodies of water to large rivers and lakes. The requirements of the Rule were meticulously developed and addressed longstanding uncertainty, improving our national commitment to protect not only America’s water, but the American people. If the Clean Water Rule is revised or rescinded, the process must be comprehensive and deliberative.

We ask that you take into consideration the opinions of the American public by extending the comment period, allowing for respectful debate. We look forward to hearing from you.

Sincerely,

Donald S. Beyer Jr., Brenda L. Lawrence, Gerald E. Connoll, Grace F. Napolitano, Matthew A. Cartwright, Barbara Lee, Keith Ellison, Jared Polis, Paul D. Tonko, Niki Tsongas, Jackie Speier, Carol Shea-Porter, Debbie Dingell, Gwen Moore, Katherine Clark, Mike Quigley, Raúl M. Grijalva, Earl Blumenauer, Zoe Lofgren, Donald M. Payne, Jr., Anthony G. Brown, James P. McGovern, David E. Price, Alan Lowenthal, Madeleine Z. Bordallo, Daniel W. Lipinski, Cedric L. Richmond, Louise M. Slaughter, Colleen Hanabusa, Bonnie Watson Coleman, Carolyn B. Maloney, Jared Huffman, Jerry McNerney, Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan, Naette Diaz Barragan, Bill Foster, Jamie Raskin, Betty McCollum, John Sabanes.

Jerrold Nalder, Suzanne Bonamici, Steve Cohen, Marcia L. Fudge, Beto O’Rourke, Grace Meng, Mark Pocan, Anna G. Eshoo, Ted W. Lieu, John Yarmuth, Alma Adams, Alcee L. Hastings, Adam Smith, A. Donald McEachin, Tony Cardenas, Dwight Evans, Brendan F. Boyle, James R. Langevin, Salud O. Carbajal, Joseph P. Kennedy, III, Judy Chu, Elliot L. Engel, Jan Schakowsky, Richard E. Neal, Pramila Jayapal, Lisa Blunt Rochester, Yvette D. Clarke, José E.

Serrano, Daniel T. Kildee, Robert C. "Bobby" Scott, Debbie Wasserman Schultz, William R. Keating, Stephen F. Lynch, Doris Matsui, Richard M. Nolan, Elizabeth H. Esty, Pete Aguilar, Adam B. Schiff, Marcy Kaptur, J. Luis Correa, Scott Peters.

Mr. BEYER. So is this our new status quo, that once an industry decides it doesn't like how a regulation turns out, we eliminate that regulation without comment or consideration for the various stakeholders or its value.

We are eliminating the process here that we, Congress, put in place to ensure that those regulations were being considered, adjusted, or even removed, that they were done thoughtfully and while keeping stakeholders, like the American people, in mind.

It could be any rule, but the rule at stake this time is the Clean Water Rule. Over 100 Members of Congress joined me to reinforce the value of the Clean Water Rule, because without it, the streams that help supply public drinking water serving one in three Americans will be at risk.

Rolling back the Clean Water Rule cannot be made in haste and without stakeholder input. Clarity was needed in light of the Supreme Court rulings in 2001 and 2006 about uncertainty of the scope of the waters protected under the act.

The EPA and the Corps held a lengthy and inclusive public rule-making process, 200 days of public comment, 400 meetings across the Nation, and the rule reflected over 1 million public comments on the proposal, the substantial majority of which supported the Clean Water Rule.

So we are overruling, essentially, 1 million comments and 400 meetings to do this without the appropriate administrative process.

So if it is withdrawn, I simply ask that the process be comprehensive and deliberative, and the bill does not allow for that.

With this rule at stake, this time it is the Clean Water Rule, but it could be any rule going forward.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD a letter from Members of Congress to Administrator Scott Pruitt opposing the proposed rule to rescind the Clean Water Rule.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
Washington, DC, August 18, 2017.

Hon. SCOTT PRUITT,  
Administrator, Environmental Protection Agency, Washington, DC.

DEAR ADMINISTRATOR PRUITT: We write in opposition to the proposed rule rescinding the Clean Water Rule (Docket No. EPA-HQ-OW-2017-0203), also called the Waters of the United States (WOTUS) rule. Americans need an Environmental Protection Agency that will use the best possible science to protect our health and this nation's natural heritage. This rule to rescind WOTUS and reports of plans to reduce protections under the Clean Water Act are deeply concerning. Rather than protecting Americans, these actions ignore science and undermine our clean drinking water, our public health and our outdoor recreation economy.

The Clean Water Rule finalized by the Obama Administration protects the drinking water of roughly one-third of Americans. 117

million people rely on drinking water sources fed by headwater, intermittent or ephemeral streams—waterways protected under the Clean Water Rule. Rescinding this rule puts Americans' health at risk by endangering their drinking water.

Eliminating this rule also threatens our safe access to the great outdoors and the outdoor recreation economy, which generates \$887 billion in consumer spending annually and supports 7.6 million American jobs. Pollution in unprotected streams and wetlands can threaten the health of the lakes and rivers that our constituents use for swimming, boating and other recreation. Wetlands protected under the Clean Water Rule provide some of the country's best habitat for hunters and anglers. As EPA Administrator, it is imperative to protect the water bodies that our constituents use for recreation, both to protect public health and the millions of jobs these places have helped create.

Rescinding this clean water safeguard ignores science. Years of research and peer-reviewed science have told us that intermittent and ephemeral streams and wetlands provide critical services, from filtering our drinking water to protecting communities from flood and drought. They also connect directly to major waterways, which means they can pose a danger to drinking water and recreation if polluted or degraded. The science is clear—what we do to these water bodies impacts large, continuous water sources.

Americans agree that we should protect these waterways. The previous Administration crafted the Clean Water Rule using the comments of over one million Americans, the vast majority of which were in support of the rule. Some opponents have used scare tactics to confuse the public by stating that there are new requirements for agriculture and that the rule covers new types of waters. This is not the case. In reality, the rule provides certainty over streams and wetlands that have historically been covered by the Clean Water Act while preserving agricultural and other common sense exemptions, including for things like drainage ditches and stock watering ponds on dry land.

The Clean Water Rule is a science-based rule that keeps our communities safe and our natural resources protected—exactly what Congress intended the Clean Water Act to do. We would be willing to work with an Administration that wants to develop thoughtful changes that maintain protections for this life-sustaining resource, but this repeal is reckless. In rescinding this rule, the Agency is risking the health and safety of the American people and our natural resources. We urge you to reconsider this rescission and instead focus on fairly and fully enforcing the Clean Water Act.

Sincerely,

Donald S. Beyer, Jr.; Doris Matsui; Gerald E. Connolly; Jared Polis; Marcy Kaptur; Paul Tonko; Alan Lowenthal; Matt Cartwright; Mike Quigley; Grace F. Napolitano.

Jared Huffman; Barbara Lee; Eleanor Holmes Norton; André Carson; Jerrold Nadler; Dwight Evans; Donald M. Payne, Jr.; Nike Tsongas; Peter A. DeFazio; Debbie Dingell; Brenda L. Lawrence; Adam Smith; Gregorio Kilili Camacho Sablan; Keith Ellison; Stephen F. Lynch; Sander M. Levin.

Seth Moulton; Nanette Diaz Barragán; Anthony Brown; A. Donald McEachin; William R. Keating; Sheila Jackson Lee; Elijah E. Cummings; Gwen Moore; Bill Foster; Jamie Raskin; Madeleine Z. Bordallo; Earl Blumenauer; James P. McGovern; Janice D. Schakowsky; John Conyers, Jr.; Debbie Wasserman Schultz.

Louise M. Slaughter; Raúl M. Grijalva; Carol Shea-Porter; David N. Cicilline; Mike Doyle; Bonnie Watson Coleman; Nydia M. Velázquez; Mark DeSaulnier; Hakeem Jeffries; Mark Pocan; Michael E. Capuano; John K. Delaney; Katherine Clark; Joseph P. Kennedy, III; Anna G. Eshoo; Frank Pallone, Jr.

John Yarmuch; Donald Norcross; Betty McCollum; Chellie Pingree; Ruben J. Kihuen; Grace Meng; Diana DeGette; Henry C. "Hank" Johnson, Jr.; Alma S. Adams, Ph.D.; Mike Thompson; Zoe Lofgren; Lucille Roybal-Allard; Jackie Speier; Robert C. "Bobby" Scott; Daniel T. Kildee; Luis V. Gutierrez.

Rick Nolan; John Sarbanes; Suzanne Bonamici; Daniel W. Lipinski; Elizabeth H. Esty; Marcia L. Fudge; Albio Sires; Jimmy Gomez; Steve Cohen; David E. Price; Judy Chu; Jim Langevin; Linda Sanchez; Robert A. Brady; José E. Serrano; Salud O. Carbajal.

Brendan F. Boyle; Bill Pascrell, Jr.; Darren Soto; Pramila Jayapal; Brad Sherman; Josh Gottheimer; Tony Cardenas; Richard E. Neal; Jerry McNerney; Adam B. Schiff; Stephanie Murphy; Ted W. Lieu.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Since day one, everything about EPA's waters of the U.S. rule has been flawed. The Obama administration claimed that it was not expanding the waters under their jurisdiction, but we know that more permits will be required.

□ 1915

The Obama administration claimed that the rule was based on sound science but only released to science after publishing the rule. The previous administration changed the name to call this the clean water rule and took to social media to lobby the public, which led to questions about whether the EPA violated law, which the GAO later confirmed.

It was clear the previous administration had an agenda to implement a rule, and they weren't going to be told otherwise. Thankfully, the Sixth Circuit Court put a stay on that rule.

The language of the FY18 bill authorizes the withdrawal of the Waters of the U.S. rule and seeks to bring resolution to the issue. The language in this bill is consistent with the steps the new administration has already taken.

For that and many other reasons, I urge a "no" vote on the amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise to support this amendment. The rider that we are talking about here gives an unprecedented amount of power to the EPA. It puts the agency above the law, letting it get away with no public comment on its proposals, no

economic analysis on the cost and benefit of repeal, no justification for repeal, and not having to defend repeal against court challenges.

As the Congressman pointed out, for some, this rider might serve a purpose this time. But what about in the future? What do we really want to say? That it is okay for the executive branch to circumvent laws we create and that there is no accountability in our courts?

This rider removes the checks and balances that are essential to a functioning democracy, so I support the gentleman's amendment.

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

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 38 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 136, strike line 1 and all that follows through page 137, line 7.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, all Americans deserve access to clean air. We have a great deal of progress that we have made in making the air cleaner and reducing pollution, but we should continue to learn from the most recent science to continue to improve air quality. Instead, this bill delays needed public health protections like the ozone standard.

My amendment would strike language that delays the implementation of the new ozone standards until the year 2026. We don't have until 2026 to protect our children's lungs. We don't have until that time to protect our seniors who are most subject and vulnerable to respiratory harm.

The consequences of this pollution are real and significant, especially for ozone pollutants. Chronic exposure to ozone at the ground level is dangerous. It increases the risk of hospital admissions. In my district in Minnesota, we have a real epidemic of respiratory injuries known as asthma. North Minneapolis is mostly a low-income community of color and has the highest rates of poverty, unemployment, and asthma.

Our children deserve better. Allowing the implementation of these ozone standards will protect them.

I just want to say, Mr. Chairman, much is said on this House floor about

job-killing regulations. As a person who believes in the right of a business to open up and make a profit, I also believe that business must absorb the cost that they impose on society as well.

This rule says you can take all the money you can possibly make as you expand and increase ground level ozone, but you don't ever have to pay the costs of the externalities and the health costs you impose on everybody else.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, where I come from, Midland Empire, which is where I have lived my whole life, is part of the South Coast Air Quality Basin, which has been a nonattainment ozone area for about as long as the Federal standard for ozone has existed. But it is not for a lack of trying, as the south coast has a long history—actually the longest history—of implementing some of the most stringent Air Pollution Control measures in the entire United States.

We have done about all we can to reduce emissions from stationary sources. Our issue is the amount of cars and trucks traveling through the region. So you will find no stronger advocate for clean air than myself, which is why this bill funds targeted Air Shed Grant Programs and DERA grants. States and communities need resources to help meet the overlapping 2008 and 2015 air quality standards.

To be clear, the language in the bill does not change ozone standards. It gives communities some administrative relief to allocate more resources to meeting the 2015 standard of 70 parts per billion.

Similar language, by the way, passed the House in July. Therefore, I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment to strike, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, administrative relief sounds like a euphemism for "you guys got to keep breathing this bad stuff."

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI).

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Chairman, I first thank the gentleman for yielding and for his amendment.

We all know that ozone is a hazardous air pollutant that contributes to health problems such as asthma attacks, heart disease, and birth defects—problems being made worse by climate change.

More than 40 percent of Americans, almost 130 million people, live in counties that receive an F grade for air quality from the American Lung Association. This includes my district that I represent in Illinois, as well as Washington, D.C.

This amendment would remove a needless delay in the implementation of an ozone rule designed to protect public health. The rule in question involves a modest lowering of the ozone limit from 75 to 70 parts per billion, a small change that would yield large health benefits, including preventing 230,000 asthma attacks in children and 188,000 missed school and workdays each year. This decision to lower the ozone limit was the result of a rigorous multiyear process carried out by expert scientists.

So I want to urge my colleagues to stand up for the health of our constituents and support this amendment.

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

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, how much time do I have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Minnesota has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to share with everybody that over the past several weeks, Americans have seen this body try to strip healthcare away from them. If there was a full repeal with no replace, 32 million people would have been without any healthcare that they had before, and many more would have been unprotected from preexisting conditions. That, fortunately, was held off. But now here we are again today with more attacks and assaults on people's health.

When will the Congress take people's health seriously? When will we hold businesses accountable who emit toxins that cause the ozone layer at the ground to increase and cause respiratory illnesses?

It is time for Congress to act responsibly in the public interest to make sure that the health of all Americans is protected. The people have the right to breathe. Let's go forward and eliminate and strip out this language that delays the implementation of the new zone standards until many years from now. Let's do it now.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Again, Mr. Chairman, I would reiterate that California has done more to clean air than virtually any other State in the Union based upon its regulatory structure that we created and I continue to support.

But technologies do not exist to meet standards that have been set out by the Obama administration. So this gives us time to do what we need to do, and that is to clean up ozone, and that is exactly what we are going to do. But this is not the amendment that is going to do that.

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

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

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



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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR. LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 39 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

In division A, strike section 435 (page 138, beginning on line 3).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from California (Mr. LOWENTHAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, my amendment preserves the National Ocean Policy.

The National Ocean Policy is a commonsense way to facilitate multistakeholder collaboration on complex ocean issues, and it promotes economic opportunity, national security, and environmental protection.

Mr. Chairman, I represent a coastal district in southern California, and I know firsthand that we can have a thriving ocean economy and, at the same time, protect and conserve our precious ocean resources.

Off the coast of my district, there are marine protected areas, State waters, Federal waters, and Department of Defense installations. We are a marine life hot spot—some of the best blue whale watching happens a few miles from our shore. We have a booming recreational fishing sector. We have a large shellfish aquaculture ranch that is now operating. We have beautiful beaches. We also have oil and gas activity with some rigs right near our shores. My district is also home to the Port of Long Beach, which is the second busiest port in the United States.

With so much activity happening, it simply makes sense to have the Navy at the table when NOAA is working on siting for a new aquaculture installation. It makes sense to have the fishery management council weigh in when oil rigs are being decommissioned, and it is a no-brainer that NOAA, the Coast Guard, and the ports all work together to get those massive ships in and out of port safely.

We want these collaborations to happen because we want to have a sustainable ocean economy, and by developing regional plans and having a framework for multistakeholder involvement, we can streamline this process and promote a robust ocean economy that also conserves our precious ocean resources.

Mr. Chairman, as we look to the future, the need for an overarching pol-

icy only grows. Issues like sea level rise and ocean acidification are too big and too serious for any one community or agency to tackle alone. Increased aquaculture development and new technologies for clean, local energy are creating economic opportunities but must be thoughtfully implemented.

Prohibiting the allocation of funds to this important program would stifle collaboration among all the stakeholders on these complex issues, as I pointed out before, relating to environmental protection, national security, economic opportunity, and ocean policy.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I understand the importance of agencies working together to protect our coastal resources for future generations. We must also ensure that such coordination is done carefully with congressional input to ensure that it does not lead to Federal overreach.

□ 1930

When the previous administration created the National Ocean Policy through executive order, the impacts were so broad, so sweeping, that it would have allowed the Federal Government to evaluate everything from agricultural practices, mining, energy production, fishing, and anything else with activities impacting our oceans.

This subcommittee asked the CEQ, DOI, and EPA on a number of occasions to provide estimates of the impact of the policy on their budgets, but the administration failed to work with Congress and provide such information.

How can Congress adequately budget for something without knowing the expected expenditures and implication of the policy?

The bottom line is, if the administration wants to fund the National Ocean Policy with such sweeping implications, it must work with Congress to provide relevant information and allow Congress to provide the necessary oversight to prevent that Federal overreach.

I support the language of the underlying bill, and I encourage my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Chairman, we just heard a very interesting argument that said that we should not support or fund the National Ocean Policy because, instead of by executive action, it should have been done through congressional legislation.

But I would remind everyone watching this that, prior to the beginning of the National Ocean Policy by the previous administration, over the 4 years before that, four bills were introduced.

Each one—two by a Republican leader, two by Democratic leaders—did what was just asked of us: to introduce it by the Congress. It was never taken up by the Congress in the administration prior to President Obama.

What was called the Oceans Conservation, Education, and National Strategy for the 21st Century Act was never heard. That is why it was done through executive action. That is why we need to continue this. Without having coordinated ocean policy, we will have tremendous problems as we move forward, as I pointed out, both in terms of economic opportunity, national security, and also environmental protection.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, just because legislation isn't passed in the House and the Senate and made into law doesn't mean that the President can then go out and create an executive order. We have a Constitution, and we have a process we must abide by. For that and other reasons, I strongly oppose this amendment, and I urge a "no" vote.

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

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

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

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 40 OFFERED BY MR. LONG

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 40 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to enforce notification requirements respecting released substances under subsections (a) through (d) of section 103 of the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980 (42 U.S.C. 9603) or subsections (a) through (c) of section 304 of the Emergency Planning and Community Right-To-Know Act of 1986 (42 U.S.C. 11004) with respect to releases of hazardous substances from animal waste at farms.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. LONG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, my amendment is very straightforward. It would

make clear that two laws enacted several decades ago to manage the aftereffects of industrial toxic waste spills would not apply to everyday emissions that are simply a way of life on family farms.

A court decision earlier this year overturned the EPA exemption for agriculture from reporting requirements under the Superfund and emergency planning and community right-to-know laws. This court decision means that over 100,000 farmers and ranchers will be forced to report odor emissions from livestock and poultry manure.

If farmers and ranchers don't submit these reports, they face potential lawsuits from the government and any citizen who wishes to sue them, subjecting them to penalties as high as \$53,907 per day for not filing paperwork. Farmers will lose time and money that would otherwise be spent growing our Nation's food supply.

Mr. Chairman, I think that it is important that I note that the Obama administration as well as the Bush administration defended this exemption. This is not a partisan issue. This is simply a case of reaffirming congressional intent under the law, as the EPA already tried to do several years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all Members to vote in favor of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment would prohibit the EPA from requiring agricultural sources to report air emissions under the Comprehensive Environmental Response Liability Act.

The purpose of this amendment is to circumvent a 2017 court decision that invalidated an EPA rule which exempted agricultural sources from such reporting.

Policy riders like this do not belong in the appropriations bills. The EPA should either accept the court's decision or they should appeal the decision. At a minimum, something that is this impactful with court policy does not belong as a rider on an appropriations bill. For that reason, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support this amendment.

The recent court decision earlier this year overturned, really, a longstanding EPA exemption for reporting from farms. These family farms and ranchers across the Nation shouldn't be burdened with just more and more paperwork to do an activity they have been doing for many, many years in this country. It is not what Congress intended. Congress, last I looked, still makes the laws around here.

I would support the gentleman's amendment and urge its adoption.

Mr. LONG. Mr. Chairman, I say this is a nonpartisan issue, and I would like to point out that the organization, National Association of SARA Title III Program Officials, back in 2012, in an earlier version of a similar amendment, had opposed this. Back on May 28 of this year, they announced that they are no longer in opposition. So I don't really think it is controversial at all.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I just want to point out that, as a State representative and, even now, as a Member of Congress, I will encounter people—and I was just at our State fair—over the years, people who have built homes in rural areas and are contributing to the schools and maybe have a soybean farm or a community that is built up over the years around farms. All of a sudden, a hog farm comes in and people are sick, they are unable to go to work, their children develop lung issues and all kinds of problems. They come to the State or they come to us as Members of Congress and say: What is going on here? The air is so polluted, it is making me and my family sick. I am losing my home. I am losing my investment.

So I think that there is a role to have these discussions about what do we do, as a community, to make sure about people who live in some of these rural areas who all of a sudden find themselves, after decades of living in the same area, unable to open up their windows on a summer day.

As I said, that is why I don't think this policy rider belongs in this bill. I think we need to have a thoughtful discussion on it and really hear out both sides on many of these agriculture issues, especially in rural communities.

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. LONG).

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 41 OFFERED BY MR. BUCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 41 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available under this Act may be used to enter into a cooperative agreement with or make any grant or loan to an entity to establish in any of Baca, Bent, Crowley, Huerfano, Kiowa, Las Animas, Otero, Prowers, and Pueblo counties, Colorado, a national heritage area, national heritage corridor, national heritage canal way, national heritage tour route, national historic district, cultural heritage corridor, or other heritage partnership program.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. BUCK) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of my amendment to protect private property rights in Colorado.

This amendment would prevent the creation and expansion of a National Heritage Area in southeast Colorado. Heritage Areas open the door to new land use restrictions on privately held land that are strongly opposed in this part of my district.

I recently held multiple townhalls in southeast Colorado to hear the unique concerns of these rural communities. At the top of their list was a need to cut burdensome government red tape that hurts their businesses and threatens their way of life.

These small family farms and ranches should not be forced to follow new regulations that give control of their private lands to Washington, D.C. That is why this amendment is so important. It allows Coloradans to keep control of their land.

My amendment would only affect nine counties in Colorado and protect them from new, unwanted land use restrictions. This amendment passed last year by voice vote, and I urge my colleagues to again support the private property rights of these farmers and ranchers.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this amendment stops the Department of the Interior from entering into cooperative agreements and providing financial assistance for the purpose of protecting natural, cultural, and historic resources in several counties in southeast Colorado.

This amendment restricts the expansion of Natural Heritage Areas, Natural Heritage Corridors, Natural Heritage canalways, national heritage tour routes, and national historic districts and cultural heritage corridors.

All of these preservation partnerships are important tools that enable the Federal Government to work with private partners to preserve and protect our Nation's shared heritage. Unfortunately, this amendment takes those options off the table for the people in southeastern Colorado.

It is my understanding that the sponsor aims to preemptively prevent expansion of a Federal footprint in his district, but I would like, Mr. Chairman, to remind us that the sponsor of the Preserve America Executive Order was issued by President George W. Bush, a Republican, and it emphasizes public-private partnerships that limit, not expand, Federal ownership.

I have worked on some of these corridors. We always make sure that it is a partnership and it is not the Federal Government coming in and taking over land. It is a partnership that the community comes to the Federal Government and asks for.

So, if there are specific concerns that you have about the Federal management in this region, I believe the sponsor should work with the authorizing committee to make sure that they are addressed and not use the appropriations process to wall off a section of the country from partnering with the Federal Government to preserve its historical and cultural natural resources.

These discussions that take place at a local level with sometimes the business community, sometimes it is schools, sometimes it is churches, that come together to talk about what can we do to preserve our cultural history or what can we do to preserve something is driven by local control.

I have never attended a meeting, once, where it was driven by Federal control. The Federal Government has asked to come in to be a partner.

I oppose this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the subcommittee chair.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I was happy to accept the amendment in the last year and will be happy to support it again this year.

With that, I urge its passage.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, once again, I really think that we need to better utilize, in this Congress, in this institution, our policy committees. They should be the first call for help if there are questions, if there are concerns, if there are adjustments that need to be made, not the appropriations committee, where there has been no hearing on this.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Chairman, this amendment will protect private property rights in southeast Colorado. These families have worked for generations to maintain their land. They should not lose their livelihoods because of land use restrictions from Washington, D.C.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 42 printed in House Report 115-297.

□ 1945

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 43 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the desk. The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Secretary of Interior to implement the final rule entitled "Alaska; Hunting and Trapping in National Preserves" (80 Fed. Reg. 64325 (October 23, 2015)), or to develop, issue, or implement any other rule of the same substance.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment that was successfully included in the House fiscal year 2017, which prohibits funds in this act being used to implement the Obama administration National Park Service rule that interferes with the State's wildlife management authority on national preserved lands of Alaska.

Mr. Chairman, when we became a State, we were guaranteed to have management of all Federal lands and State lands on fish and wildlife management. Under the Obama administration, they tried to do differently on the wildlife lands, and now they are trying to do it on the BLM lands and the park preserves, not the parks themselves.

I suggest, respectfully, if you want to follow the law, you adopt this amendment, as it should be, as is proposed, and we will be able to manage lands we were guaranteed by this Congress to the State of Alaska.

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

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

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment, which undercuts an important rule meant to protect our public lands and the species that inhabit them.

The National Park Service has an important mission, which is "to conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects in the wildlife by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

As a result of this mission, the National Park Service has implemented an important rule that protects a variety of species critical to the ecosystem in our national preserves in Alaska.

In 1994, Alaska did pass a law that undercut those efforts by allowing for extreme predator control, which led to fringe practices that could hardly be called traditional hunting.

Now, the other side may argue that this amendment is a States' rights

issue, but that simply isn't true. These are Federal lands and are, therefore, subject to Federal regulation.

These national lands are intended to be enjoyed by all Americans, including those who visit and hope to have the rare opportunity to see bears and wolves in their natural habitat.

Now, to be clear, Mr. Chairman, the rule that this amendment aims to reverse is not intended to ban hunting in its entirety. The rule simply regulates that there be no use of bait, which has been as extreme as grease-soaked doughnuts and bacon, allowing for point blank shots, no use of artificial light to spotlight black bear dens, no killing sows or bear cubs, no killing pups or wolves and coyotes during the denning season, no hunting of big game that is swimming, no use of dogs to hunt big game, and no predator control simply for the purpose of increasing stocks for human consumption.

Now, these are reasonable regulations that prevent cruel hunting practices. Let us be very clear, Mr. Chairman, that reversing this rule would actually be thumbing our noses at the voices of tens of thousands of citizens who took part in a public comment period process that was extensive.

Before the rule's adoption, the National Park Service held two separate comment periods which resulted in 26 public hearings, two teleconferences, and three tribal meetings. More than 70,000 public comments were received, and the majority of those supported the existing rule. Ignoring this process and the thoughtful public input would be a major slight to the democratic process and to everyone who participated.

These processes are in place to ensure that the voice of the people is heard, and circumventing this is unacceptable.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), my good chairman from the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I understand the specific rule is now being reconsidered by the Department of Interior, which is a good thing, and I encourage my colleagues to support the Young amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. You know, I rarely do this, but I'm deeply disappointed in my good lady from Washington. \* \* \*

This was a preserve, and we were guaranteed this in the Alaska National Lands Act. No more. No more. And the State, under the Constitution, has the right to manage fish and game.

Now, I know your side doesn't believe in State's rights. You don't; I do. My job is to protect my State, not your State—my State.

And what you said a while ago was really nonsense. It was written by an interest group, not yourself. Maybe

your staff is affiliated with the Humane Society or some other group, and I'm disappointed.

My Native people support this amendment. You talk about natives. Alaskans, our first Americans, support this amendment. And I really am disturbed. \* \* \*

I am still talking.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I ask to have the gentleman's words taken down. The gentleman has already impugned my motives by saying that I don't know a damn thing about what I'm talking about.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. I didn't say "damn." You said it.

Ms. JAYAPAL. He's now called me "young lady," and Mr. Chairman, I demand that the words be taken down.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman will take his seat.

The Clerk will report the words.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my offending words.

And to the gentlewoman, I do apologize. I get very defensive about my State. We have gone through these battles for the last, actually, 45 years, and we are a State. I have my people to represent, as you do yours. I do apologize for my statement. I recognize it was out of order, so I hope you accept my apology.

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Reserving the right to object, I thank the gentleman from Alaska. I do accept your apology. I thank you for it. We have, obviously, some work to get to know each other. But I can tell you that I care about my State, as deeply as you do, and I look forward to getting to know you.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. And I thank the gentlewoman.

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, the words are stricken from the RECORD.

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, let me continue by saying that the reason I do feel strongly about this is I also believe that this amendment would be bad for the economy and for the people who depend on it.

Every year, wildlife watchers contribute more than \$2 billion toward the economy. According to the National Park Service, in 2016, 2.8 million park visitors spent an estimated \$2.8 billion in local gateway regions while visiting National Park Service lands in Alaska. These expenditures supported a total of 18,900 jobs, \$644.7 million in labor income, \$1.1 billion in value added, and \$1.9 billion in economic output in the Alaska economy.

I do believe—and the reason I am speaking up so strongly about this, we all have very strong perspectives on all

sides. I do believe that we must do everything we can to preserve our natural lands and their inhabitants, particularly as climate change takes its toll all over the country and the world. In my home State of Washington, which I care deeply about, wildfires are destroying thousands of acres of land and threatening homes, while across the country residences of Houston are reeling from Hurricane Harvey and Floridians brace for Hurricane Irma.

We need to invest in our public lands for all Americans so that generations in the future can continue to enjoy the beauty that our country has to offer.

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

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

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

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

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

□ 2000

AMENDMENT NO. 44 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF ALASKA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 44 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alaska.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, my amendment, which was successfully included in the House fiscal year 2007 Interior appropriations bill, prohibits the funds to be used by the Bureau of Land Management to change their existing placer mining plans of operations with regard to environmental mitigation in Alaska.

Alaska is one of the very few places left in the United States where placer mining is being still conducted. Unfortunately, unelected bureaucrats have targeted these small mom-and-pop, usually retired people, family miners from attaining unattainable regulations under the falsehood of protecting the environment.

Mr. Chairman, this is a sound piece of legislation that should be accepted by this committee and this body to make sure those people elected participate in mining on lands that are old. This is a mining area that has been mining for the last 100 years, yet the BLM has decided they are going to take these little miners and put them out of business.

Mr. Chairman, I urge passage of my amendment. It is very simple. It protects the smaller people of America. Let them do what they wish to do. Letting them have an activity after they retire I think is actually important. As I said before, it was adopted before.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I listened very carefully to what the gentleman from Alaska had to say, and the bulk of my objection, Mr. Chairman, is that this is better addressed in the Policy Committee than on the Appropriations Committee as a rider.

BLM does many outreach activities, including public meetings and interactions with individual miners, and is working with industry to incorporate best management practices in new science-based reclamation techniques.

In the course of the reclamation activities, it has been necessary to increase the annual cost to miners to recover these streams and restore ecostream function.

This amendment would prohibit the cost of reclaiming these areas to placer miners who are profiting from mineral extractions on BLM managed land.

I do hear the gentleman talking about not all business is the same shape or size, so I really think that we should work through the Policy Committee. For that reason, I object to this amendment, and I would encourage the gentleman from Alaska to work through the Policy Committee.

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

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON).

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

I appreciate the gentleman's amendment and his dedication to the sound management of natural resources on behalf of the constituents in his State.

Placer mining is unique to Alaska and has a unique history in place in Alaska's economy. As such, the BLM proposal for unique reclamation and bonding requirements need to receive additional review.

Mr. Chairman, I urge adoption of the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chairman, I, again, urge passage of the amendment, and I thank the chairman and the ranking member for their work.

This is a mom-and-pop operation. If I thought it was going to do anything wrong—it has been mined for 100 years. They came in, they had a guy in a wheelchair, and they made him walk to his mine because you couldn't use a mechanized vehicle. Now, that is not good personnel.

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

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 45 OFFERED BY MR. WESTERMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 45 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to enforce the final rule entitled "Onshore Oil and Gas Operations; Federal and Indian Oil and Gas Leases; Measurement of Oil" and published by the Bureau of Land Management on November 17, 2016 (81 Fed. Reg. 81462).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairman CALVERT and Chairman FRELINGHUYSEN for their hard work on this bill.

On November 17, 2016, the Bureau of Land Management released a final rule titled: "Onshore Oil and Gas Operations; Federal and Indian Oil and Gas Leases; Measurement of Oil."

Though the BLM claims that this rule would incorporate proven industry standards developed by oil measurement experts from industry and the BLM, it seems like the BLM ignored industry expert standards and set their standards, regardless of industry input.

In comments filed on December 14, 2015, the Independent Petroleum Association of America, the American Petroleum Institution, the Western Energy Alliance, and many citizens involved in oil production detailed serious concerns. Many of the comments centered on BLM's reluctance to recognize its obligation to adopt properly established industry standards.

Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is vital that agencies such as the BLM listen to and take into account industry concerns and input when promulgating these new rules.

My amendment would restrict funding for this rule in its current form, and I ask my colleagues to support this amendment.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, this new rule updates outdated regulations and establishes minimum standards for the measurement of oil production from Federal and Indian leases to ensure that productivity is accurately measured and properly accounted for.

The administration has aggressively sought to abolish rules that were developed over many years, and adhere to the process outlined in the Administrative Procedure Act, which includes consideration of Tribal and public comments.

Updating this regulation avoids regulatory uncertainty and reflects the considerable changes in technology and industry practices that have occurred over 25 years since the previous oil and gas order No. 4—25 years since the previous onshore oil and gas order No. 1. Changes in technology. We should be embracing changes in technology and industry practices. We should not be using technology and practices formed 25 years ago.

The new rule also responds to comments made by the GAO, the Department of Interior's IG, and the Royal Policy Committee regarding BLM's production and verification efforts.

The objective of this rule is to ensure that the oil volume reported by the industry is sufficiently accurate to ensure that the royalties due are paid correctly, the royalties due to the U.S. taxpayer. The rulemaking process has been comprehensive and it has been transparent. If there are to be changes to those rules, those changes need to be done in accordance with the procedures outlined in the Administrative Procedure Act. There is a way to do that. So, once again, there would be an opportunity for Tribal and public comment.

This amendment does not provide for an open and transparent process.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to defeat this amendment and to protect the American taxpayer to make sure that the royalties are accurately recorded.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I won't take nearly 1½ minutes. I just want to support the amendment.

I understand there are portions of the order that are widely accepted and some parts that need to be reworked. I hope the Bureau gets the message and works with all of the interested parties to improve onshore order No. 3.

Mr. Chairman, I am happy to support the amendment.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, another way the BLM has ignored their

obligations under the rulemaking process is by discounting the practical difficulties for both industry and the agency associated compliance.

Mr. Chairman, the BLM ignored their rulemaking responsibilities by both disregarding industry input and snubbing practical timelines for compliance.

I believe the BLM should go back, re-examine this rule, and this time listen and get it right.

Mr. Chairman, I ask support for my amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition for two reasons.

One, this, once again, is a substantial piece of policy work being done on an appropriations bill on the floor of the House. We have committees which can take things up, government oversight, and we have the Natural Resources Committee. There are many venues in which the gentleman could ask for a hearing and bring people to testify, if there are things that need to be done. Or just work through the Administrative Procedure Act, which has opportunities before it, if people feel that they are not being treated justly.

But the other reason why I rise against this is, 25 years since the previous update has happened, technology has changed since then and industry practices have changed. Part of our responsibility—and I truly believe this in my heart—is to make sure that when we do leases, when we are to receive royalty payments, we need to be looking out for the U.S. taxpayer to make sure that they are fairly compensated for these leases.

Mr. Chairman, I object to 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 Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 46 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 50 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) and a



Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

My amendment simply prohibits the EPA from using its Chesapeake Bay total maximum daily load and the so-called watershed implementation plans to hijack States water quality strategies.

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

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the bay is a national treasure, and I want to see it restored. But we know that in order to achieve this goal, the States and the EPA must work together. The EPA cannot be allowed to railroad the States and micro-manage the process.

With this amendment, we are simply telling the EPA to respect the important role States play in implementing the Clean Water Act and preventing another Federal power grab.

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

□ 2015

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, this amendment would prohibit the EPA from spending any funds to ensure that States fulfill their obligations under the Clean Water Act to help clean up the Chesapeake Bay. If passed into law, this amendment would endanger the progress we have made in restoring the Chesapeake Bay watershed and would put in jeopardy not only the Chesapeake Bay itself, but also critical economic contributions that the bay provides.

Since the Chesapeake Bay agreement was signed in 1983, the most recent agreement signed in 2014, bay States and the Federal Government have invested significant resources in cleanup and restoration efforts. Cooperation is critical in these efforts, and only under the cooperative agreement agreed upon in the Chesapeake Clean Water Blueprint are we seeing a lot of progress being made. But the Chesapeake Bay cleanup efforts are part of backstops that make sure that each State does what it has actually promised to do. With these safeguards in place, States have to certify that their investments are not made in vain and that other States will also make good on their investments.

This amendment would undermine this historic collaboration, endanger historic progress we have made, and give States a loophole to avoid meeting their responsibilities under the Clean Water Act.

I believe that, instead of offering amendments that undermine Chesapeake Bay restorations, we should be investing even more resources to ensure that they are successful.

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I won't take 1 minute. I just want to support the gentleman's amendment.

It is my hope that the gentlemen from Virginia and Pennsylvania may be able to work with the new administration, find common ground on approaches that will improve water quality in a flexible manner which works for everybody.

Mr. Chair, I support the amendment and urge an "aye" vote.

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

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, how much time is remaining on each side?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) has 2 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. GOODLATTE. Mr. Chair, I understand that the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) has the right to close.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE) has the right to close.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject the amendment.

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

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

Mr. Chair, I want to thank the gentlemen from Pennsylvania, Chairman SHUSTER along with Mr. THOMPSON, for being cosponsors of this amendment. I urge my colleagues to support it.

It is simply not true that this amendment would interfere with the cleanup of the Chesapeake Bay, and I am going to repeat what I said earlier. My amendment does not remove the TMDL or the watershed implementation plans. It only removes the retaliatory actions threatened by the EPA.

The current plans and processes the States are using to clean up the bay are working. That is absolutely right. They are working, and they started long before this imposition by the EPA that occurred at the beginning of the Obama administration.

States have made great strides in cleaning up the bay, so why continue to threaten them with an EPA takeover of their water quality plans.

The other argument that is made is the Federal Government needs to be involved in this cleanup process. Well, I believe the Federal Government should be a partner in this effort. As the chairman has noted, they can play an important function. However, the current process has the EPA dictating to States, local communities, and businesses instead of a cooperative approach. That is not playing a part; that is controlling the process.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this important 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 Virginia (Mr. GOODLATTE).

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 51 OFFERED BY MR. SANFORD

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 51 printed in House Report 115-297.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chair, as the designee of the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. LOBIONDO), I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to authorize, permit, or conduct geological or geophysical activities (as those terms are used in the final



programmatic environmental impact statement of the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management entitled "Atlantic OCS Proposed Geological and Geophysical Activities, Mid-Atlantic and South Atlantic Planning Areas" and completed February 2014) in support of oil, gas, or methane hydrate exploration and development in any area located in the North Atlantic, Mid-Atlantic, South Atlantic, or Straits of Florida Outer Continental Shelf Planning Area.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chair, I want to make clear I am offering this amendment on behalf of the gentleman from New Jersey, FRANK LOBIONDO, who I know has worked with my colleague, the gentleman from Virginia, DON BEYER, on this bipartisan measure. I think it is one that makes sense. It would, quite simply, restrict money with regard to seismic testing on the Atlantic waters and the waters of the Florida Straits.

Now, why do I think that that is important? I think it is important because you don't build a foundation if you don't intend to build a house. And yet, fundamentally, what we are trying to do is move forward on something that I think begs this most Republican of questions, which is: Do we believe in home rule?

At home, every municipality of every town and hamlet along the coast of South Carolina has come out unanimously against the idea of offshore drilling and seismic testing, not because they are against fossil fuel, but simply because they believe that they want to determine themselves how the coast of South Carolina develops. That is obviously the case with many colleagues from Florida, who have now headed home to deal with the hurricane, and a whole host of other places up and down the Atlantic and, again, the Straits of Florida.

So I think that this amendment fundamentally is about this notion of, if you believe that the government that is most local governs best—not always, but generally—then might you not give this amendment a try, because fundamentally what it says is places like Port Fourchon are nice, but what the people of South Carolina have determined is that we don't want our coast to develop that way because of the amount of onshore that is necessary to support offshore operations.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), my colleague.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) for yielding time.

Mr. Chair, moving forward with permits for seismic airgun surveys for subsidy oil and gas deposits puts our vibrant Atlantic coast at risk.

I am a Virginia businessman, and I look at what seismic testing does. Con-

gressman RUTHERFORD and I led a bipartisan letter to the administration signed by over 100 of our colleagues expressing our concerns about seismic airgun blasting.

Our coastal economy relies on healthy ocean ecosystems, which generate \$95 billion in gross domestic product, support nearly 1.4 million jobs each year. We have heard from countless businessowners, as Congressman SANFORD has said, elected officials, residents all along our coasts who recognize and reject the risks.

NASA, the Department of Defense, the Florida Defense Support Task Force have all expressed concern that offshore oil and gas development will threaten their ability to perform critical activities.

The North, South, Mid-Atlantic Fishery Management Councils, which are responsible for the management of fish stocks and habitats in Federal waters from Maine to Florida, also have significant concerns about the risks associated with offshore drilling and seismic airgun blasting.

So you have numerous fishing and tourism interests, including all the local chambers of commerce, tourism, restaurant associations, an alliance representing over 41,000 businesses, and 500,000 fishing families from Florida to Maine oppose offshore oil drilling activities as well.

Opening up the Atlantic to seismic testing and drilling jeopardizes our economy and these coastal economies in the most immediate terms.

I strongly support the LoBiondo-Sanford amendment and urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to support this critical amendment.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

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

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chair, this amendment sets a dangerous precedent not only for the energy future of the Atlantic and the Florida coasts, but for the Nation as a whole.

Although this is framed as an Atlantic amendment, I would make clear that the residents from South Carolina, Virginia, North Carolina, and Georgia support offshore seismic survey activities pursuant to the all-of-the-above energy approach that America needs.

Seismic surveys are routinely conducted off American coasts and around the world for oil and gas. We have been conducting seismic surveys around the globe in the oceans of the world for 50 years with not a single verifiable instance of a marine mammal being harmed or killed. In fact, the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management has confirmed this. President Obama's own BOEM Director, Abigail Hopper, confirmed this to me in a public hearing when I asked her last Congress.

Seismic surveys have not been conducted in the Atlantic region for over

30 years. Today's advancement in technologies allows for 3-D and 4-D seismic work to actually look into the Earth and see what may be there.

I would argue that the folks who are against seismic work really aren't against seismic for the purpose of trying to save marine mammals; they just don't like fossil fuel development. But we need to see what is out there.

If Members are genuinely concerned about Russia, then voting in favor of oil and gas exploration should be a no-brainer. Why would Members vote to cut off the most significant tool in America's arsenal, that is, our energy independence?

For these reasons, it is critical that we continue to permit safe G&G geological studies in all areas off America's coasts, that includes the mid-Atlantic, the south Atlantic, and all Florida.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

Mr. CALVERT. Will the gentleman from South Carolina yield?

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I just want to let the gentleman know that I oppose this amendment. I don't think we should stand in the way of exploration research that could inform potential future decisions, whether it is for or against drilling, but we need to know information so once we know the potential, we can allow the agencies to weigh those pros and cons.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chair, we do have hurricanes coming. The Gulf of Mexico has prepared for hurricanes and dealt with it in the oil and gas industry. That is not the issue.

We are talking about seismic surveys so that we as American policymakers can see what may or may not be in the Earth for future development. I would be willing to bet that, if it was natural gas that was found off the coast of my home State of South Carolina, we would be having a completely different conversation than if oil was found.

Let's at least have the guts to go out there and look and do G&G work off the coast of the mid-Atlantic, the south Atlantic, and Florida and find out what resources may or may not be there and whether they are even recoverable or not.

Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

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

Mr. Chair, I very much respect the viewpoint of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), and I want to be clear: I believe in fossil fuel.

I think that the real conundrum in this debate is who is best able to determine whether or not areas off of where they happen to live should or shouldn't be developed: Should it be decided from Washington, D.C., or should it be decided by local folks?

So I would frame this, fundamentally, as an issue of home rule, that all

the points that you are making are very, very valid, but shouldn't that determination be made by folks that are most close and would be most affected by what might or might not happen in the offshore waters off of the coast of South Carolina or Florida or Georgia or elsewhere?

So I just go back to, if we found the mother of all lodes, there has been testing out there, they say 132 days' worth of supply might be off the coast of South Carolina, and what people have said is we have a vibrant tourism industry on the coast of South Carolina and we don't think the risks are worth the rewards based on what might or might not be out there.

So I very much respect the viewpoint of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. DUNCAN), but again, what folks are telling me at home on the coast of South Carolina is, even if stuff is out there, we are concerned about the tourism risk and we are concerned about the infrastructure that would be required to support it.

Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina. Mr. Chair, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the point of the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD).

We need to find out what is out there. G&G activity would allow us to determine whether there is oil or natural gas. If we find oil, I am willing to have a conversation with the folks in Charleston County, Horry County of South Carolina. If we find natural gas, I believe the conversation will be completely different.

Mr. Chair, what we need to do is G&G work, which is safe to marine mammals, to find out what might be there and might be recoverable.

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

The gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) has 1½ minutes remaining.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chair, I will split my time, in the spirit of bipartisanship, with my colleague from Virginia, and I would simply say this: I want to go back to the most basic of all conservative themes, which is we believe that the individual is paramount in the way that decisions get made and that not all decisions should be made in Washington, D.C. And if folks have spoken out as clearly and as loudly as they have with regard to home rule on what should or shouldn't happen off their coast, that voice ought to be respected in Washington, D.C.

Mr. Chair, I yield the balance of my time to my colleague from Virginia (Mr. BEYER).

□ 2030

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, to respond to both my friends from South Carolina, one of the dilemmas with the additional exploration is that, by law, the data obtained from the seismic surveys are proprietary. They will belong to the many different companies that will be doing this, and they won't be available to the American public; they

won't be available to local government officials; they won't even be available to Members of Congress.

So this inability to access information will leave coastal communities without the opportunity to provide these substantive cost-benefit analyses that Congressman SANFORD referred to.

Our constituents would take on significant risks without being involved in the future development decisions. So, for that reason, I encourage us to vote for the Sanford amendment.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, 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. SANFORD).

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WALKER) having assumed the chair, Mr. HULTGREN, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR,  
ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED  
AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS  
ACT, 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 500 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3354.

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

□ 2032

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. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, with Mr. HULTGREN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, amendment No. 113 printed in part B of House Report 115-295, offered by the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ) had been disposed of.

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON  
AMENDMENT NO. 97 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 97 printed in part B of House Report 115-295 to the end that the Chair put the question de novo.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

The amendment was rejected.

VACATING DEMAND FOR RECORDED VOTE ON  
AMENDMENT NO. 98 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Chair, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 98 printed in part B of House Report 115-295 to the end that the Chair put the question de novo.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

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

There was no objection.

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

The amendment was rejected.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 115-295 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 91 by Mr. ROTHFUS of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 92 by Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.

Amendment No. 99 by Mr. GROTHMAN of Wisconsin.

Amendment No. 110 by Mr. YOHO of Florida.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 91 OFFERED BY MR. ROTHFUS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS) 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 163, noes 248, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 467]

AYES—163

Abraham	Barletta	Blackburn
Aderholt	Barr	Blum
Allen	Barton	Bost
Arrington	Biggs	Brat
Babin	Bishop (UT)	Brooks (AL)
Banks (IN)	Black	Brooks (IN)

Buck Holding  
 Bucshon Hollingsworth  
 Budd Hudson  
 Burgess Huizenga  
 Byrne Hultgren  
 Carter (GA) Hunter  
 Chabot Issa  
 Cheney Jenkins (WV)  
 Collins (GA) Johnson (LA)  
 Collins (NY) Johnson (OH)  
 Comer Johnson, Sam  
 Conaway Jordan  
 Cook Katko  
 Cramer Kelly (PA)  
 Crawford King (IA)  
 Davidson Kinzinger  
 DesJarlais Kustoff (TN)  
 Duffy Labrador  
 Duncan (SC) LaMalfa  
 Duncan (TN) Lamborn  
 Dunn Lance  
 Emmer Latta  
 Estes (KS) Lewis (MN)  
 Farenthold Loudermilk  
 Faso Love  
 Ferguson Luetkemeyer  
 Fleischmann Marchant  
 Foxx Marshall  
 Franks (AZ) McCarthy  
 Gaetz McCaul  
 Gallagher McClintock  
 Gianforte McHenry  
 Gibbs McKinley  
 Gohmert McMorris  
 Goodlatte Rodgers  
 Gosar McSally  
 Gowdy Meadows  
 Granger Messer  
 Graves (GA) Mitchell  
 Graves (LA) Mooney (WV)  
 Graves (MO) Mullin  
 Griffith Murphy (PA)  
 Grothman Newhouse  
 Guthrie Noem  
 Handel Norman  
 Harris Olson  
 Hartzler Palazzo  
 Hensarling Perry  
 Higgins (LA) Pittenger

NOES—248

Adams Costello (PA)  
 Aguilar Courtney  
 Amash Higgins (NY)  
 Amodei Cuellar  
 Bacon Culberson  
 Barragán Davis (CA)  
 Bass Davis, Danny  
 Beatty Davis, Rodney  
 Bera DeFazio  
 Bergman Delaney  
 Beyer DeLauro  
 Bishop (GA) DelBene  
 Bishop (MI) Demings  
 Blumenauer Denham  
 Blunt Rochester Dent  
 Bonamici DeSaulnier  
 Boyle, Brendan Dingell  
 F. Doggett  
 Brady (PA) Donovan  
 Brady (TX) Doyle, Michael  
 Brown (MD) F.  
 Brownley (CA) Ellison  
 Bustos Engel  
 Butterfield Eshoo  
 Calvert Espaillat  
 Capuano Esty (CT)  
 Carbajal Evans  
 Cárdenas Fitzpatrick  
 Carson (IN) Flores  
 Carter (TX) Fortenberry  
 Cartwright Foster  
 Castor (FL) Frankel (FL)  
 Castro (TX) Frelinghuysen  
 Chu, Judy Fudge  
 Ciilline Gabbard  
 Clark (MA) Gallego  
 Clarke (NY) Garamendi  
 Clay Gomez  
 Cleaver Gonzalez (TX)  
 Clyburn Gottheimer  
 Coffman Green, Al  
 Cohen Green, Gene  
 Cole Grijalva  
 Comstock Gutiérrez  
 Connolly Hanabusa  
 Conyers Harper  
 Cooper Hastings  
 Correa Heck

Poe (TX) Lujan Grisham, M.  
 Poliquin Luján, Ben Ray  
 Ratcliffe Lynch  
 Reed MacArthur  
 Reichert Maloney,  
 Renacci Carolyn B.  
 Rice (SC) Maloney, Sean  
 Roe (TN) Massie  
 Rogers (AL) Mast  
 Rokita Matsui  
 Rooney, Francis McCollum  
 Rothfus McEachin  
 Rouzer McGovern  
 Royce (CA) McNeerney  
 Russell Meehan  
 Scott, Austin Meeks  
 Sensenbrenner Meng  
 Sessions Moolenaar  
 Shuster Moore  
 Smith (MO) Moulton  
 Smith (NE) Murphy (FL)  
 Smith (NJ) Nadler  
 Smith (TX) Napolitano  
 Smucker Neal  
 Stefanik Nolan  
 Stewart Norcross  
 Taylor Nunes  
 Tenney O'Halleran  
 Thornberry P'Rourke  
 Tiberi O'Rourke  
 Tipton Palmer  
 Turner Panetta  
 Wagner Pascrell  
 Walberg Paulsen  
 Walden Payne  
 Walker Pearce  
 Walorski  
 Walters, Mimi  
 Weber (TX)  
 Wenstrup  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Yoho  
 Young (IA)  
 Zeldin

Bilirakis DeSantis  
 Bridenstine Deutch  
 Buchanan Diaz-Balart  
 Costa Garrett  
 Crist Lawson (FL)  
 Cummings Marino  
 Curbelo (FL) Posey  
 DeGette Ros-Lehtinen

NOT VOTING—22

Sherman  
 Shimkus  
 Simpson  
 Sinema  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Soto  
 Speier  
 Stivers  
 Suozzi  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Torres  
 Trott  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz  
 Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Westerman  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Womack  
 Yarmuth  
 Young (AK)

□ 2102

Messrs. HILL, JODY B. HICE of Georgia, DENT, BISHOP of Michigan, WESTERMAN, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Messrs. WOMACK, HARPER, RUSH, PALMER, GOTTHEIMER, DEFAZIO, and O'HALLERAN changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, Messrs. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, CHABOT, MCCAUL, WALDEN, and PALAZZO changed their vote from "no" to "aye." So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

(By unanimous consent, Mr. MCCARTHY was allowed to speak out of order.)

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chairman, I rise for the purpose of a scheduling announcement.

Mr. Chairman, as we continue to track Hurricane Irma, I know many of our Members in southeastern United States are anxious to get home to their families and constituents. So, in order to ensure these Members can get home safely, the last votes for the week will now occur tomorrow afternoon on the Harvey disaster relief package at approximately 12:30 p.m.

The House will complete consideration of H.R. 3354 next week.

Mr. HOYER. Will the gentleman yield?

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

Mr. HOYER. Could the majority leader give us some idea so, when Members leave, they will have some idea of next week's schedule?

I know we are going to discuss that tomorrow as well, but it might be useful to do it tonight as well, just to give them an overview.

Mr. MCCARTHY. The quick overview, as you know, we will complete this appropriations package next week. We have a couple of other items that we will list for you tomorrow, but we will continue to monitor this storm.

I know it is going to hit a couple of States, so we will keep you posted about the schedule for next week as well. As soon as we know, we will keep you updated.

Mr. HOYER. If the gentleman will continue to yield, I thank him for giving us an update. I also thank him for the consideration of our Members who live in the southeast and scheduling Harvey early and then no votes subsequent to that because I have had a lot of my Members talk to me about, as you point out, their desire to get home as quickly as possible with their constituents and with their families.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman, and I yield back the balance of my time.

AMENDMENT NO. 92 OFFERED BY MR. AUSTIN SCOTT OF GEORGIA

The Acting CHAIR. Without objection, 2-minute voting will continue.

There was no objection.

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT) 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 217, noes 193, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 468]

AYES—217

Abraham	Burgess	Dunn
Aderholt	Byrne	Emmer
Allen	Calvert	Espaillat
Amodei	Carter (GA)	Estes (KS)
Arrington	Chabot	Farenthold
Babin	Cheney	Faso
Bacon	Coffman	Ferguson
Banks (IN)	Cole	Fleischmann
Barletta	Collins (GA)	Flores
Barr	Collins (NY)	Foxx
Barton	Comer	Franks (AZ)
Bergman	Comstock	Gaetz
Biggs	Conaway	Gallagher
Bishop (MI)	Cook	Gianforte
Bishop (UT)	Costello (PA)	Gibbs
Black	Cramer	Gohmert
Blackburn	Crawford	Goodlatte
Blum	Culberson	Gosar
Bost	Davidson	Gottheimer
Brady (TX)	Davis, Rodney	Gowdy
Brat	Denham	Granger
Brooks (AL)	DesJarlais	Graves (GA)
Brooks (IN)	Donovan	Graves (LA)
Buck	Duffy	Graves (MO)
Bucshon	Duncan (SC)	Griffith
Budd	Duncan (TN)	Grothman

Guthrie	Massie	Sanford	Quigley	Schneider	Takano	Tipton	Westerman	Yoho
Handel	Mast	Schrader	Raskin	Schweikert	Thompson (CA)	Walberg	Williams	Young (AK)
Harper	McCarthy	Scott, Austin	Rice (NY)	Scott (VA)	Thompson (MS)	Walker	Wittman	
Harris	McCaul	Sensenbrenner	Richmond	Scott, David	Titus	Walters, Mimi	Woodall	
Hartzler	McClintock	Sessions	Rooney, Thomas	Serrano	Tonko			
Hensarling	McHenry	Shimkus	J.	Sewell (AL)	Torres			
Herrera Beutler	McKinley	Shuster	Rosen	Shea-Porter	Vargas			
Hice, Jody B.	McMorris	Simpson	Roybal-Allard	Sherman	Veasey	Adams	Fortenberry	McHenry
Higgins (LA)	Rodgers	Smith (MO)	Ruiz	Sinema	Velazquez	Aderholt	Foster	McKinley
Hill	McSally	Smith (NE)	Ruppersberger	Sires	Visclosky	Aguilar	Fox	McNerney
Holding	Meadows	Smith (NJ)	Rush	Slaughter	Walz	Amodei	Frankel (FL)	McSally
Hollingsworth	Meehan	Smith (TX)	Ryan (OH)	Smith (WA)	Waters, Maxine	Babin	Frelinghuysen	Meehan
Hudson	Messer	Smucker	Sánchez	Soto	Watson Coleman	Bacon	Fudge	Meeks
Huizenga	Mitchell	Stefanik	Sarbanes	Speier	Welch	Barletta	Gabbard	Meng
Hultgren	Moolenaar	Stewart	Schakowsky	Suozi	Wilson (FL)	Barr	Gallagher	Mitchell
Hunter	Mooney (WV)	Stivers	Schiff	Swalwell (CA)	Yarmuth	Barragán	Gallego	Moolenaar
Hurd	Mullin	Taylor				Bass	Garamendi	Moore
Issa	Murphy (PA)	Tenney				Beatty	Gomez	Moulton
Jenkins (WV)	Newhouse	Thompson (PA)	Bilirakis	DeGette	Ros-Lehtinen	Bera	Gonzalez (TX)	Murphy (FL)
Johnson (LA)	Noem	Thornberry	Bridenstine	DeSantis	Ross	Beyer	Gottheimer	Murphy (PA)
Johnson (OH)	Norman	Tiberi	Buchanan	Deutch	Rutherford	Bishop (GA)	Granger	Nadler
Johnson, Sam	Nunes	Tipton	Carter (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Scalise	Bishop (UT)	Graves (GA)	Napolitano
Jones	Olson	Trott	Costa	Garrett	Tsongas	Blumenauer	Green, Al	Neal
Jordan	Palazzo	Turner	Crist	Lawson (FL)	Wasserman	Blunt Rochester	Green, Gene	Newhouse
Joyce (OH)	Palmer	Upton	Cummings	Marino	Schultz	Bonamici	Grijalva	Nolan
Katko	Pearce	Valadao	Curbelo (FL)	Posey	Webster (FL)	Bost	Gutiérrez	Norcross
Kelly (MS)	Perry	Vela				Boyle, Brendan	Hanabusa	Nunes
Kelly (PA)	Pittenger	Wagner				F.	Harper	O'Halleran
King (IA)	Poe (TX)	Walberg				Brady (PA)	Hastings	O'Rourke
King (NY)	Poliquin	Walden				Brady (TX)	Heck	Olson
Kinzinger	Ratliffe	Walker				Brooks (IN)	Herrera Beutler	Pallone
Knight	Reed	Walorski				Brown (MD)	Higgins (NY)	Panetta
Kustoff (TN)	Reichert	Walters, Mimi				Brownley (CA)	Himes	Pascarell
Labrador	Renacci	Weber (TX)				Bucshon	Hollingsworth	Paulsen
LaHood	Rice (SC)	Westrup				Bustos	Hoyer	Payne
LaMalfa	Roby	Westerman				Butterfield	Huffman	Pelosi
Lamborn	Roe (TN)	Williams				Byrne	Huizenga	Perlmutter
Lance	Rogers (AL)	Wilson (SC)				Calvert	Hurd	Peters
Latta	Rogers (KY)	Wittman				Capuano	Issa	Peterson
Lewis (MN)	Rohrabacher	Womack				Carbajal	Jackson Lee	Pingree
LoBiondo	Rokita	Woodall				Cárdenas	Jayapal	Pocan
Loudermilk	Rooney, Francis	Yoder				Carson (IN)	Jeffries	Poliquin
Love	Roskam	Yoho				Carter (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Polis
Lucas	Rothfus	Young (AK)				Cartwright	Jenkins (WV)	Price (NC)
Luetkemeyer	Rouzer	Young (IA)				Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Quigley
Marchant	Royce (CA)	Zeldin				Castro (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Raskin
Marshall	Russell					Chabot	Johnson, E. B.	Reed
						Chu, Judy	Joyce (OH)	Reichert
						Cicilline	Kaptur	Rice (NY)
						Clark (MA)	Katko	Rice (SC)
						Clarke (NY)	Keating	Richmond
						Clay	Kelly (IL)	Roby
						Cleaver	Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)
						Clyburn	Kennedy	Rogers (AL)
						Coffman	Khanna	Rogers (KY)
						Cohen	Kihuen	Rooney, Thomas
						Cole	Kildee	J.
						Collins (NY)	Kilmer	Rosen
						Comstock	Kind	Roskam
						Connolly	King (NY)	Rothfus
						Conyers	Kinzinger	Roybal-Allard
						Cook	Knight	Royce (CA)
						Cooper	Krishnamoorthi	Ruiz
						Correa	Kuster (NH)	Ruppersberger
						Courtney	Kustoff (TN)	Rush
						Cramer	LaHood	Ryan (OH)
						Crawford	Lance	Sánchez
						Crowley	Langevin	Sarbanes
						Cuellar	Larsen (WA)	Schakowsky
						Culberson	Larson (CT)	Schiff
						Davis (CA)	Lawrence	Schneider
						Davis, Danny	Lee	Schrader
						Davis, Rodney	Levin	Schweikert
						DeFazio	Lewis (GA)	Scott (VA)
						Delaney	Lieu, Ted	Scott, Austin
						DeLauro	Lipinski	Scott, David
						DelBene	LoBiondo	Serrano
						Demings	Loeb sack	Sessions
						Denham	Lofgren	Sowell (AL)
						Dent	Lowenthal	Shea-Porter
						DeSaulnier	Lowey	Sherman
						DesJarlais	Lucas	Shimkus
						Dingell	Luetkemeyer	Simpson
						Doggett	Lujan Grisham,	Sinema
						Donovan	M.	Sires
						Doyle, Michael	Luján, Ben Ray	Slaughter
						F.	Lynch	Smith (NE)
						Duffy	MacArthur	Smith (NJ)
						Ellison	Maloney,	Smith (TX)
						Emmer	Carolyn B.	Smith (WA)
						Engel	Maloney, Sean	Smucker
						Eshoo	Marchant	Soto
						Españat	Marino	Speier
						Estes (KS)	Mast	Stefanik
						Esty (CT)	Matsui	Stewart
						Evans	McCarthy	Stivers
						Farenthold	McCaul	Suozi
						Fitzpatrick	McCollum	Swalwell (CA)
						Fleischmann	McEachin	Takano
						Flores	McGovern	Tenney

## NOES—307

## NOT VOTING—23

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

□ 2109

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

AMENDMENT NO. 99 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN  
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr.  
GROTHMAN) on which further pro-  
ceedings were postponed and on which  
the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 105, noes 307,  
not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 469]

AYES—105

Adams	Dingell	Larson (CT)	Abraham	Gibbs	Long
Aguilar	Doggett	Lawrence	Allen	Gohmert	Loudermilk
Amash	Doyle, Michael	Lee	Amash	Goodlatte	Love
Barragán	F.	Levin	Arrington	Gosar	Marshall
Bass	Ellison	Lewis (GA)	Banks (IN)	Gowdy	Massie
Beatty	Engel	Lieu, Ted	Barton	Graves (LA)	McClintock
Bera	Eshoo	Lipinski	Bergman	Graves (MO)	McMorris
Beyer	Esty (CT)	Loeb sack	Biggs	Griffith	Rodgers
Bishop (GA)	Evans	Lofgren	Bishop (MI)	Grothman	Meadows
Blumenauer	Fitzpatrick	Long	Black	Guthrie	Messer
Blunt Rochester	Fortenberry	Lowenthal	Blackburn	Handel	Mooney (WV)
Bonamici	Foster	Lujan Grisham,	Blum	Harris	Mullin
Boyle, Brendan	Frankel (FL)	M.	Brat	Hartzler	Noem
F.	Frelinghuysen	Luján, Ben Ray	Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Norman
Brady (PA)	Fudge	Lynch	Buck	Hice, Jody B.	Palazzo
Brown (MD)	Gabbard	MacArthur	Budd	Higgins (LA)	Palmer
Brownley (CA)	Gallego	Maloney,	Burgess	Hill	Pearce
Bustos	Garamendi	Maloney, Sean	Carter (GA)	Holding	Perry
Butterfield	Gomez	Maloney, Sean	Cheney	Hudson	Pittenger
Capuano	Gonzalez (TX)	Matsui	Collins (GA)	Hultgren	Poe (TX)
Carbajal	Green, Al	McCollum	Comer	Hunter	Ratliffe
Cárdenas	Green, Gene	McEachin	Conaway	Johnson (LA)	Renacci
Carson (IN)	Grijalva	McGovern	Costello (PA)	Johnson, Sam	Rohrabacher
Cartwright	Gutiérrez	McNerney	Davidson	Jones	Rokita
Castor (FL)	Hanabusa	Meeks	Duncan (SC)	Jordan	Rooney, Francis
Castro (TX)	Hastings	Meng	Duncan (TN)	Kelly (MS)	Rouzer
Chu, Judy	Heck	Moore	Dunn	King (IA)	Russell
Cicilline	Higgins (NY)	Moulton	Faso	Labrador	Sanford
Clark (MA)	Himes	Murphy (FL)	Ferguson	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Clarke (NY)	Hoyer	Nadler	Franks (AZ)	Lamborn	Shuster
Clay	Huffman	Napolitano	Gaetz	Latta	Smith (MO)
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Nolan	Gianforte	Lewis (MN)	Taylor
Clyburn	Jayapal	Norcross			
Cohen	Jeffries	O'Halleran			
Connolly	Jenkins (KS)	O'Rourke			
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	O'Rourke			
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Pallone			
Cooper	Kaptur	Panetta			
Correa	Keating	Pascrell			
Courtney	Keating	Pascarell			
Crowley	Kelly (IL)	Payne			
Cuellar	Kennedy	Pelosi			
Davis (CA)	Khanna	Perlmutter			
Davis, Danny	Kihuen	Peters			
DeFazio	Kildee	Peterson			
Delaney	Kilmer	Pingree			
DeLauro	Kind	Pocan			
DelBene	Krishnamoorthi	Polis			
Demings	Kuster (NH)	Price (NC)			
Dent	Langevin				
DeSaulnier	Larsen (WA)				

Thompson (CA) Valadao  
 Thompson (MS) Vargas  
 Thompson (PA) Veasey  
 Thornberry Vela  
 Tiberi Velázquez  
 Titus Visclosky  
 Tonko Wagner  
 Torres Walden  
 Trott Walorski  
 Turner Walz  
 Upton Waters, Maxine

Watson Coleman Knight  
 Weber (TX) Labrador  
 Welch LaHood  
 Wenstrup LaMalfa  
 Wilson (FL) Lamborn  
 Wilson (SC) Lance  
 Womack Latta  
 Yarmuth Lewis (MN)  
 Yoder LoBiondo  
 Young (IA) Long  
 Zeldin Loudermilk  
 Love

Norman Smith (NJ)  
 Nunes Smith (TX)  
 Olson Smucker  
 Palazzo Stefanik  
 Palmer Stewart  
 Paulsen Stivers  
 Pearce Suozzi  
 Perry Taylor  
 Pittenger Tenney  
 Poe (TX) Thompson (PA)  
 Ratcliffe Thornberry  
 Reed

Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Turner  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walker  
 Walorski  
 Walters, Mimi  
 Weber (TX)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Yoho  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (IA)  
 Zeldin

Serrano  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Soto  
 Speier  
 Swalwell (CA)

Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Torres  
 Trott  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Vargas

Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz  
 Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—21

Bilirakis DeSantis  
 Bridenstine Deutch  
 Buchanan Diaz-Balart  
 Costa Garrett  
 Crist Lawson (FL)  
 Cummings Posey  
 Curbelo (FL) Ros-Lehtinen  
 DeGette Ross

Rutherford  
 Scalise  
 Tsongas  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Webster (FL)

Marchant  
 Marino  
 Marshall  
 Massie  
 Mast  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McSally  
 Meadows  
 Messer  
 Mitchell  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Mullin  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Newhouse  
 Noem

Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita  
 Roskam  
 Rothfus  
 Rouzer  
 Royce (CA)  
 Russell  
 Sanford  
 Schweikert  
 Scott, Austin  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Sinema  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)

Walters, Mimi  
 Weber (TX)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Yoho  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (IA)  
 Zeldin

NOT VOTING—22

Bilirakis DeSantis  
 Bridenstine Deutch  
 Buchanan Diaz-Balart  
 Costa Garrett  
 Crist Lawson (FL)  
 Cummings Posey  
 Curbelo (FL) Rooney, Francis  
 DeGette Ros-Lehtinen

Ross  
 Rutherford  
 Scalise  
 Tsongas  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2119

Ms. STEFANIK changed her vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR. There being no further amendments, pursuant to House Resolution 500, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN) having assumed the chair, Mr. WALKER, 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. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 504 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3354.

Will the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER) kindly take the chair.

□ 2120

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. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, with Mr. WALKER (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. 51 printed in House Report 115–297 offered by the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD) had been disposed of.

NOT VOTING—21

Messrs. GAETZ, JOHNSON of Louisiana, and CARTER of Georgia changed their vote from “no” to “aye.” So the amendment was rejected. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

□ 2114

AMENDMENT NO. 110 OFFERED BY MR. YOHO

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 199, noes 212, not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 470]

AYES—199

Abraham Cook  
 Allen Crawford  
 Arrington Culberson  
 Babin Davidson  
 Bacon Davis, Rodney  
 Banks (IN) DesJarlais  
 Barletta Donovan  
 Barr Duffy  
 Barton Duncan (SC)  
 Bergman Duncan (TN)  
 Biggs Dunn  
 Bishop (MI) Emmer  
 Bishop (UT) Estes (KS)  
 Black Farenthold  
 Blackburn Faso  
 Blum Ferguson  
 Bost Fleischmann  
 Brady (TX) Flores  
 Brat Foss  
 Brooks (AL) Franks (AZ)  
 Buck Frelinghuysen  
 Budd Gaetz  
 Burgess Gallagher  
 Byrne Gianforte  
 Calvert Gibbs  
 Carter (GA) Gohmert  
 Chabot Goodlatte  
 Cheney Gosar  
 Coffman Gottheimer  
 Collins (GA) Gowdy  
 Comer Granger  
 Comstock Graves (GA)  
 Conaway Graves (LA)

Adams  
 Aderholt  
 Aguilar  
 Amash  
 Amodei  
 Barragán  
 Bass  
 Beatty  
 Bera  
 Beyer  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Blumenauer  
 Blunt Rochester  
 Bonamici  
 Boyle, Brendan  
 F.  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Brown (MD)  
 Brownley (CA)  
 Bucshon  
 Bustos  
 Butterfield  
 Capuano  
 Carbajal  
 Cárdenas  
 Carson (IN)  
 Carter (TX)  
 Cartwright  
 Castor (FL)  
 Castro (TX)  
 Chu, Judy  
 Cicilline  
 Clark (MA)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Collins (NY)  
 Connolly  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Correa  
 Costello (PA)  
 Courtney  
 Cramer  
 Crowley  
 Cuellar  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny  
 DeFazio  
 Delaney  
 DeLauro  
 DeBene  
 Demings  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DeSaulmier  
 Dingell  
 Doggett

NOES—212

Doyle, Michael  
 F.  
 Ellison  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Espallat  
 Esty (CT)  
 Evans  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Fortenberry  
 Foster  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Fudge  
 Gabbard  
 Gallego  
 Garamendi  
 Gomez  
 Gonzalez (TX)  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Gutiérrez  
 Hanabusa  
 Hastings  
 Heck  
 Higgins (NY)  
 Himes  
 Hoyer  
 Huffman  
 Hultgren  
 Jackson Lee  
 Jayapal  
 Cicilline  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Kaptur  
 Keating  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Kennedy  
 Khanna  
 Kihuen  
 Kildee  
 Kilmer  
 Kind  
 Kinzinger  
 Krishnamoorthi  
 Kuster (NH)  
 Kustoff (TN)  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lawrence  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lieu, Ted  
 Lipinski  
 Loebsack  
 Lofgren  
 Lowenthal  
 Lowey  
 Lucas

Lujan Grisham,  
 M.  
 Luján, Ben Ray  
 Lynch  
 MacArthur  
 Maloney,  
 Carolyn B.  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Matsui  
 McCollum  
 McEachin  
 McGovern  
 McHenry  
 McNerney  
 Meehan  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Moore  
 Moulton  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Nolan  
 Norcross  
 O’Halloran  
 O’Rourke  
 Pallone  
 Panetta  
 Pascrell  
 Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Pingree  
 Pocan  
 Poliquin  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Raskin  
 Rice (NY)  
 Rice (SC)  
 Richmond  
 Roby  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rooney, Thomas  
 J.  
 Rosen  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruiz  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schneider  
 Schrader  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115–297 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 15 by Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.

Amendment No. 18 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 29 by Mr. BIGGS of Arizona.

Amendment No. 31 by Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.

Amendment No. 38 by Mr. ELLISON of Minnesota.

Amendment No. 39 by Mr. LOWENTHAL of California.

Amendment No. 43 by Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.

Amendment No. 50 by Mr. GOODLATTE of Virginia.

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

## AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 191, noes 221, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 471]

AYES—191

Adams	Connolly	Gallego
Aguilar	Conyers	Garamendi
Barragán	Cooper	Gomez
Bass	Correa	Gonzalez (TX)
Beatty	Costello (PA)	Gottheimer
Beyer	Courtney	Green, Al
Bishop (GA)	Crowley	Green, Gene
Blumenauer	Davis (CA)	Grijalva
Blunt Rochester	Davis, Danny	Gutiérrez
Bonamici	DeFazio	Hanabusa
Boyle, Brendan	Delaney	Hastings
F.	DeLauro	Heck
Brady (PA)	DelBene	Higgins (NY)
Brown (MD)	Demings	Himes
Brownley (CA)	DeSaulnier	Hoyer
Bustos	Dingell	Huffman
Butterfield	Doggett	Jackson Lee
Capuano	Donovan	Jayapal
Carbajal	Doyle, Michael	Jeffries
Cárdenas	F.	Johnson (GA)
Carson (IN)	Ellison	Johnson, E. B.
Cartwright	Engel	Jones
Castor (FL)	Eshoo	Kaptur
Castro (TX)	Españat	Keating
Chu, Judy	Esty (CT)	Kelly (IL)
Cicilline	Evans	Kennedy
Clark (MA)	Faso	Khanna
Clarke (NY)	Fitzpatrick	Kihuen
Clay	Foster	Kildee
Cleaver	Frankel (FL)	Kilmer
Clyburn	Fudge	Kind
Cohen	Gabbard	King (NY)

Krishnamoorthi	Napolitano	Scott (VA)	Stefanik	Upton	Williams
Kuster (NH)	Neal	Scott, David	Stewart	Valadao	Wilson (SC)
Lance	Nolan	Serrano	Stivers	Wagner	Wittman
Langevin	Norcross	Sewell (AL)	Taylor	Walberg	Womack
Larsen (WA)	O'Halleran	Shea-Porter	Tenney	Walden	Woodall
Larson (CT)	O'Rourke	Sherman	Thompson (PA)	Walker	Yoder
Lawrence	Pallone	Sinema	Thornberry	Walorski	Yoho
Lee	Panetta	Sires	Tiberi	Walters, Mimi	Young (AK)
Levin	Pascrell	Slaughter	Tipton	Weber (TX)	Young (IA)
Lewis (GA)	Payne	Smith (NJ)	Trott	Wenstrup	Zeldin
Lieu, Ted	Pelosi	Smith (WA)	Turner		
Lipinski	Perlmutter	Soto			
LoBiondo	Peters	Speier			
Loeb	Pingree	Suozi			
Loeb	Pocan	Swalwell (CA)			
Lowenthal	Polis	Takano			
Lowe	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)			
Lujan, Ben Ray	Quigley	Thompson (MS)			
Lynch	Raskin	Titus			
Maloney,	Rice (NY)	Tonko			
Carolyn B.	Richmond	Torres			
Maloney, Sean	Rosen	Vargas			
Matsui	Roybal-Allard	Veasey			
McCollum	Ruiz	Vela			
McEachin	Ruppersberger	Velázquez			
McGovern	Rush	Visclosky			
McNerney	Ryan (OH)	Walz			
Meeks	Sánchez	Waters, Maxine			
Meng	Sarbanes	Watson Coleman			
Moore	Schakowsky	Welch			
Moulton	Schiff	Wilson (FL)			
Murphy (FL)	Schneider	Yarmuth			
Nadler	Schrader				

## NOES—221

Abraham	Franks (AZ)	Marshall
Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	Massie
Allen	Gaetz	Mast
Amash	Gallagher	McCarthy
Amodei	Gianforte	McCaul
Arrington	Gibbs	McClintock
Babin	Gohmert	McHenry
Bacon	Goodlatte	McKinley
Banks (IN)	Gosar	McMorris
Barletta	Gowdy	Rodgers
Barr	Granger	McSally
Barton	Graves (GA)	Meadows
Bera	Graves (LA)	Meehan
Bergman	Graves (MO)	Messer
Biggs	Griffith	Mitchell
Bishop (MI)	Grothman	Moolenaar
Bishop (UT)	Guthrie	Mooney (WV)
Black	Handel	Mullin
Blackburn	Harper	Murphy (PA)
Blum	Harris	Newhouse
Bost	Hartzler	Noem
Brady (TX)	Hensarling	Norman
Brat	Herrera Beutler	Nunes
Brooks (AL)	Hice, Jody B.	Olson
Brooks (IN)	Higgins (LA)	Palazzo
Buck	Hill	Palmer
Bucshon	Holding	Paulsen
Budd	Hollingsworth	Pearce
Burgess	Hudson	Perry
Byrne	Huizenga	Peterson
Calvert	Hultgren	Pittenger
Carter (GA)	Hunter	Poe (TX)
Chabot	Hurd	Poliquin
Cheney	Issa	Ratcliffe
Cheney	Jenkins (KS)	Reed
Coffman	Jenkins (WV)	Reichert
Cole	Johnson (LA)	Renacci
Collins (GA)	Johnson (OH)	Rice (SC)
Collins (NY)	Johnson, Sam	Roby
Comer	Jordan	Roe (TN)
Comstock	Joyce (OH)	Rogers (AL)
Conaway	Katko	Rogers (KY)
Cook	Kelly (MS)	Rohrabacher
Cramer	Kelly (PA)	Rokita
Crawford	King (IA)	Rooney, Francis
Cuellar	Kinzinger	Rooney, Thomas
Culberson	Knight	J.
Davidson	Kustoff (TN)	Roskam
Davis, Rodney	Labrador	Rothfus
Denham	LaHood	Rouzer
Dent	LaMalfa	Royce (CA)
DesJarlais	Lamborn	Russell
Duffy	Latta	Sanford
Duncan (SC)	Lewis (MN)	Schweikert
Duncan (TN)	Long	Scott, Austin
Dunn	Loudermilk	Sensenbrenner
Emmer	Love	Sessions
Estes (KS)	Lucas	Shimkus
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Shuster
Ferguson	Lujan Grisham,	Simpson
Fleischmann	M.	Smith (MO)
Flores	MacArthur	Smith (NE)
Fortenberry	Marchant	Smith (TX)
Fox	Marino	Smucker

Stefanik	Upton	Williams
Stewart	Valadao	Wilson (SC)
Stivers	Wagner	Wittman
Taylor	Walberg	Womack
Tenney	Walden	Woodall
Thompson (PA)	Walker	Yoder
Thornberry	Walorski	Yoho
Tiberi	Walters, Mimi	Young (AK)
Tipton	Weber (TX)	Young (IA)
Trott	Wenstrup	Zeldin
Turner	Westerman	

## NOT VOTING—21

Bilirakis	DeSantis	Rutherford
Bridenstine	Deutch	Scalise
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Tsongas
Costa	Garrett	Wasserman
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Schultz
Cummings	Posey	Webster (FL)
Curbelo (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	
DeGette	Ross	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2125

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

## AMENDMENT NO. 15 OFFERED BY MR. THOMPSON OF PENNSYLVANIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) 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 207, noes 205, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 472]

AYES—207

Abraham	Coffman	Gohmert
Aderholt	Cole	Goodlatte
Allen	Collins (GA)	Gosar
Amodei	Collins (NY)	Gowdy
Arrington	Comer	Granger
Babin	Conaway	Graves (GA)
Bacon	Cook	Graves (LA)
Banks (IN)	Costello (PA)	Graves (MO)
Barletta	Cramer	Griffith
Barr	Crawford	Grothman
Barton	Cuellar	Guthrie
Bergman	Culberson	Handel
Biggs	Davidson	Harper
Bishop (MI)	Davis, Rodney	Harris
Bishop (UT)	DeFazio	Hartzler
Black	Dent	Hensarling
Blackburn	DesJarlais	Herrera Beutler
Blum	Donovan	Hice, Jody B.
Bost	Doyle, Michael	Higgins (LA)
Boyle, Brendan	F.	Hill
F.	Duffy	Holding
Brady (PA)	Duncan (SC)	Hollingsworth
Brady (TX)	Duncan (TN)	Hudson
Brooks (AL)	Dunn	Huizenga
Brooks (IN)	Estes (KS)	Hultgren
Buck	Farenthold	Hunter
Bucshon	Faso	Hurd
Budd	Ferguson	Issa
Burgess	Fleischmann	Jenkins (KS)
Byrne	Flores	Jenkins (WV)
Calvert	Fox	Johnson (LA)
Carter (GA)	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (OH)
Carter (TX)	Gallagher	Johnson, Sam
Cartwright	Gianforte	Jones
Chabot	Gibbs	Jordan



Joyce (OH) Murphy (PA) Shuster  
 Katko Newhouse Simpson  
 Kelly (MS) Noem Smith (MO)  
 Kelly (PA) Nunes Smith (NE)  
 King (IA) Olson Smith (TX)  
 King (NY) Palazzo Smucker  
 Kinzinger Palmer Stefanik  
 Kustoff (TN) Pearce Perry  
 Labrador Pery Peterson  
 LaHood Pittenger  
 LaMalfa Poe (TX)  
 Lamborn Poliquin  
 Larson (CT) Ratchliffe  
 Latta Reed  
 Long Reichert  
 Loudermilk Renacci  
 Love Rice (SC)  
 Lucas Roby  
 Luetkemeyer Marchant  
 Marino Rogers (AL)  
 Marshall Rogers (KY)  
 Massie Rohrabacher  
 Mast Rokita  
 McCarthy Rooney, Thomas  
 McCaul J.  
 McClintock Rothfus  
 McHenry Rouzer  
 McKinley Royce (CA)  
 McMorris Russell  
 Rodgers Ryan (OH)  
 McSally Schweikert  
 Messer Scott, Austin  
 Mitchell Sensenbrenner  
 Mooney (WV) Sessions  
 Mullin Shimkus

NOES—205

Adams Fudge  
 Aguilar Gabbard  
 Amash Gaetz  
 Barragán Gallego  
 Bass Garamendi  
 Beatty Gomez  
 Bera Gonzalez (TX)  
 Beyer Gottheimer  
 Bishop (GA) Green, Al  
 Blumenauer Green, Gene  
 Blunt Rochester Grijalva  
 Bonamici Gutiérrez  
 Brat Hanabusa  
 Brown (MD) Hastings  
 Brownley (CA) Heck  
 Bustos Higgins (NY)  
 Butterfield Himes  
 Capuano Hoyer  
 Carbajal Huffman  
 Cárdenas Jackson Lee  
 Carson (IN) Jayapal  
 Castor (FL) Jeffries  
 Castro (TX) Johnson (GA)  
 Cheney Johnson, E. B.  
 Chu, Judy Kaptur  
 Cicilline Keating  
 Clark (MA) Kelly (IL)  
 Clarke (NY) Kennedy  
 Clay Khanna  
 Cleaver Kihuen  
 Clyburn Kildee  
 Cohen Kilmer  
 Comstock Kind  
 Connolly Knight  
 Conyers Krishnamoorthi  
 Cooper Kuster (NH)  
 Correa Lance  
 Courtney Langevin  
 Crowley Larsen (WA)  
 Davis (CA) Lawrence  
 Davis, Danny Lee  
 Delaney Levin  
 DeLauro Lewis (GA)  
 DelBene Lewis (MN)  
 Demings Lieu, Ted  
 Denham Lipinski  
 DeSaulnier LoBiondo  
 Dingell Loeb sack  
 Doggett Lofgren  
 Ellison Lowenthal  
 Emmer Lowey  
 Engel Lujan Grisham,  
 Eshoo M.  
 Espallat Luján, Ben Ray  
 Esty (CT) Lynch  
 Evans MacArthur  
 Fitzpatrick Maloney,  
 Fortenberry Carolyn B.  
 Foster Maloney, Sean  
 Frankel (FL) Matsui  
 Franks (AZ) McCollum

Speier Torres  
 Suozzi Vargas  
 Swailwell (CA) Veasey  
 Takano Vela  
 Thompson (CA) Velázquez  
 Thompson (MS) Visclosky  
 Titus Wagner  
 Tonko Walker

NOT VOTING—21

Bilirakis DeSantis  
 Bridenstine Deutch  
 Buchanan Diaz-Balart  
 Costa Garrett  
 Crist Lawson (FL)  
 Cummings Posey  
 Curbelo (FL) Ros-Lehtinen  
 DeGette Ross

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2130

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

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

AMENDMENT NO. 18 OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the  
 amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
 ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
 has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
 vice, and there were—ayes 190, noes 218,  
 not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 473]

AYES—190

Adams Crowley  
 Aguilar Cucciar  
 Barragán Davis (CA)  
 Bass Davis, Danny  
 Beatty DeFazio  
 Bera Delaney  
 Beyer DeLauro  
 Bishop (GA) DelBene  
 Blumenauer Demings  
 Blunt Rochester DeSaulnier  
 Bonamici Dingell  
 Brady (PA) Doggett  
 Brown (MD) Doyle, Michael  
 Brownley (CA) F.  
 Bustos Ellison  
 Butterfield Engel  
 Capuano Eshoo  
 Carbajal Espallat  
 Cárdenas Esty (CT)  
 Carson (IN) Evans  
 Cartwright Fitzpatrick  
 Castor (FL) Foster  
 Castro (TX) Frankel (FL)  
 Chu, Judy Fudge  
 Cicilline Gabbard  
 Clark (MA) Gallego  
 Clarke (NY) Garamendi  
 Clay Gomez  
 Cleaver Gonzalez (TX)  
 Clyburn Gottheimer  
 Cohen Green, Al  
 Connolly Green, Gene  
 Conyers Grijalva  
 Cooper Gutiérrez  
 Correa Hanabusa  
 Costello (PA) Heck  
 Courtney Higgins (NY)

Walters, Mimi  
 Walz  
 Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth  
 Zeldin

Luján, Ben Ray  
 Lynch  
 Maloney,  
 Carolyn B.  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Matsui  
 McCollum  
 McEachin  
 McGovern  
 McNeerney  
 McSally  
 Meehan  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Moore  
 Moulton  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Nolan  
 Norcross  
 O'Halleran  
 O'Rourke  
 Pallone  
 Panetta  
 Pascrell  
 Paulsen

Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Pingree  
 Pocan  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Raskin  
 Rice (NY)  
 Richmond  
 Rosen  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruiz  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schneider  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman

Sinema  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Soto  
 Speier  
 Suozzi  
 Swailwell (CA)  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Torres  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz  
 Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth

NOES—218

Abraham  
 Aderholt  
 Allen  
 Amash  
 Amodei  
 Arrington  
 Babin  
 Bacon  
 Banks (IN)  
 Barletta  
 Barr  
 Barton  
 Bergman  
 Biggs  
 Bishop (MI)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Blum  
 Bost  
 Boyle, Brendan  
 F.  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brat  
 Brooks (AL)  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Buck  
 Bucshon  
 Budd  
 Burgess  
 Byrne  
 Calvert  
 Carter (GA)  
 Carter (TX)  
 Chabot  
 Cheney  
 Coffman  
 Cole  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY)  
 Comer  
 Comstock  
 Conaway  
 Cook  
 Cramer  
 Crawford  
 Culberson  
 Davidson  
 Davis, Rodney  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DesJarlais  
 Donovan  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Dunn  
 Emmer  
 Estes (KS)  
 Farenthold  
 Faso  
 Ferguson  
 Fleischmann  
 Flores  
 Fortenberry  
 Foxx  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Gaetz

Gallagher  
 Gianforte  
 Gibbs  
 Gohmert  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar  
 Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (LA)  
 Griffith  
 Grothman  
 Guthrie  
 Handel  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hastings  
 Hensarling  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Hice, Jody B.  
 Higgins (LA)  
 Hill  
 Holding  
 Hollingsworth  
 Hudson  
 Huizenga  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurd  
 Issa  
 Jenkins (KS)  
 Jenkins (WV)  
 Johnson (LA)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jordan  
 Joyce (OH)  
 Katko  
 Kelly (MS)  
 Kelly (PA)  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kinzinger  
 Knight  
 Kustoff (TN)  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Latta  
 Lewis (MN)  
 Long  
 Love  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 MacArthur  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Marshall  
 Massie  
 Mast  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McHenry  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 Meadows  
 Messer

Mitchell  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Mullin  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Newhouse  
 Noem  
 Norman  
 Nunes  
 Olson  
 Palazzo  
 Palmer  
 Pearce  
 Perry  
 Peterson  
 Pittenger  
 Poe (TX)  
 Poliquin  
 Ratchliffe  
 Reed  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Rice (SC)  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita  
 Rooney, Francis  
 Rooney, Thomas  
 J.  
 Roskam  
 Rothfus  
 Rouzer  
 Royce (CA)  
 Russell  
 Sanford  
 Schrader  
 Schweikert  
 Scott, Austin  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Serrano  
 Sessions  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smucker  
 Stefanik  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Taylor  
 Tenney  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Mast  
 Trotter  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Walden  
 Walberg  
 Walorski

Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup  
Westernman  
Williams

NOT VOTING—25

Bilirakis  
Bridenstine  
Buchanan  
Costa  
Crist  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
DeGette  
DeSantis

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2134

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 29 OFFERED BY MR. BIGGS

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) on  
which further proceedings were post-  
poned and on which the ayes prevailed  
by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 184, noes 228,  
not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 474]

AYES—184

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Biggs  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Brooks (AL)  
Buck  
Bueshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Coffman  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Conaway  
Cook  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Denham

DesJarlais  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes (KS)  
Farenthold  
Ferguson  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Foxy  
Franks (AZ)  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Handel  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hunter  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)

Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
Lewis (MN)  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Mastie  
McCaul  
McCarthy  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
McGowan  
McSally  
McSaw  
Meadows  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Newhouse  
Noem

Norman  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pearce  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis

NOES—228

Adams  
Aguilar  
Barragan  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Bergman  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bost  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brooks (IN)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Cole  
Comstock  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DelBene  
Demings  
Dent  
DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donovan  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Españillat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Faso  
Fitzpatrick  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego

Rooney, Thomas  
Tiberi  
Trott  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup  
Westernman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)

Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth  
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—21

Bilirakis  
Bridenstine  
Buchanan  
Costa  
Crist  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
DeGette

DeSantis  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Garrett  
Lawson (FL)  
Posey  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Ross

Rutherford  
Scalise  
Tsongas  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Webster (FL)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2138

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced  
as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 31 OFFERED BY MR. BEN RAY  
LUJÁN OF NEW MEXICO

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. BEN  
RAY LUJÁN) on which further pro-  
ceedings were postponed and on which  
the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 220, noes 191,  
not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 475]

AYES—220

Adams  
Aguilar  
Amash  
Bacon  
Barragan  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Bergman  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blum  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brooks (AL)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buck  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Cole  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper

Correa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duncan (SC)  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Españillat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Fitzpatrick  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Franks (AZ)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gianforte  
Gohmert  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gosar  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Grothman  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa

Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Kinzinger  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch

Maloney, Carolyn B.  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Matsui  
 McCollum  
 McEachin  
 McGovern  
 McKinley  
 McNerney  
 McSally  
 Meehan  
 Meeks  
 Meng  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Moore  
 Moulton  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Newhouse  
 Nolan  
 Norcross  
 O'Halleran  
 O'Rourke  
 Pallone  
 Panetta  
 Pascrell  
 Paulsen  
 Payne  
 Pelosi

Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Peterson  
 Pingree  
 Pocan  
 Poe (TX)  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Raskin  
 Rice (NY)  
 Richmond  
 Rokita  
 Rosen  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruiz  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)  
 Sánchez  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schneider  
 Schrader  
 Schweikert  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sessions  
 Sewell (AL)

Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Sinema  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (WA)  
 Soto  
 Speier  
 Stefanik  
 Suozzi  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Tipton  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Torres  
 Upton  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz  
 Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth  
 Young (IA)

NOES—191

Abraham  
 Aderholt  
 Allen  
 Amodei  
 Arrington  
 Babin  
 Banks (IN)  
 Barletta  
 Barr  
 Barton  
 Biggs  
 Bishop (MI)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Bost  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brat  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Bucshon  
 Budd  
 Byrne  
 Calvert  
 Carter (GA)  
 Carter (TX)  
 Chabot  
 Cheney  
 Coffman  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY)  
 Comer  
 Comstock  
 Conaway  
 Cook  
 Costello (PA)  
 Cramer  
 Crawford  
 Culberson  
 Davidson  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DesJarlais  
 Donovan  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Dunn  
 Emmer  
 Estes (KS)  
 Farenthold  
 Faso  
 Ferguson  
 Fleischmann  
 Flores  
 Fortenberry  
 Foxx  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Gaetz  
 Gallagher  
 Gibbs  
 Goodlatte  
 Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (LA)  
 Graves (MO)

Griffith  
 Guthrie  
 Handel  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hensarling  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Hice, Jody B.  
 Higgins (LA)  
 Hill  
 Holding  
 Hollingsworth  
 Hudson  
 Huiזנגa  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurd  
 Issa  
 Jenkins (KS)  
 Johnson (LA)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones  
 Jordan  
 Joyce (OH)  
 Katko  
 Kelly (MS)  
 Kelly (PA)  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Knight  
 Kustoff (TN)  
 Labrador  
 LaHood  
 Latta  
 Lewis (MN)  
 LoBiondo  
 Long  
 Loudermilk  
 Love  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 MacArthur  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Marshall  
 Massie  
 Mast  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McHenry  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 Meadows  
 Messer  
 Mitchell  
 Moolenaar  
 Mullin  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Noem  
 Norman  
 Nunes  
 Olson

Palazzo  
 Palmer  
 Pearce  
 Perry  
 Pittenger  
 Poliquin  
 Ratcliffe  
 Reed  
 Reichert  
 Renacci  
 Rice (SC)  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rooney, Francis  
 Rooney, Thomas J.  
 Roskam  
 Rothfus  
 Rouzer  
 Royce (CA)  
 Russell  
 Sanford  
 Scott, Austin  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smucker  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Taylor  
 Tenney  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 MacArthur  
 Trott  
 Turner  
 Valadao  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walker  
 Walorski  
 Walters, Mimi  
 Weber (TX)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Yoho  
 Young (AK)  
 Zeldin

NOT VOTING—22

Bilirakis  
 Bridenstine  
 Buchanan  
 Costa  
 Crist  
 Cummings  
 Curbelo (FL)  
 DeGette

DeSantis  
 Deutch  
 Diaz-Balart  
 Garrett  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Lawson (FL)  
 Posey  
 Ros-Lehtinen

Ross  
 Rutherford  
 Scalise  
 Tsongas  
 Wasserman  
 Schultz  
 Webster (FL)

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

□ 2142

Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana changed his vote from "aye" to "no."  
 So the amendment was agreed to.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 38 OFFERED BY MR. ELLISON  
 The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 194, noes 218, not voting 21, as follows:

[Roll No. 476]

AYES—194

Adams  
 Aguilar  
 Barragán  
 Bass  
 Beatty  
 Bera  
 Beyer  
 Bishop (GA)  
 Blumenauer  
 Blunt Rochester  
 Bonamici  
 Boyle, Brendan F.  
 Brady (PA)  
 Brown (MD)  
 Brownley (CA)  
 Bustos  
 Butterfield  
 Capuano  
 Carbajal  
 Cárdenas  
 Carson (IN)  
 Cartwright  
 Castor (FL)  
 Castro (TX)  
 Chu, Judy  
 Cicilline  
 Clark (MA)  
 Clarke (NY)  
 Clay  
 Cleaver  
 Clyburn  
 Cohen  
 Connolly  
 Conyers  
 Cooper  
 Correa  
 Courtney  
 Crowley  
 Davis (CA)  
 Davis, Danny  
 DeFazio  
 Delaney  
 DeLauro  
 DelBene  
 Demings

DeSaulnier  
 Dingell  
 Doggett  
 Doyle, Michael F.  
 Ellison  
 Engel  
 Eshoo  
 Espaillat  
 Esty (CT)  
 Evans  
 Faso  
 Fitzpatrick  
 Foster  
 Frankel (FL)  
 Fudge  
 Gabbard  
 Gallego  
 Garamendi  
 Gomez  
 Gonzalez (TX)  
 Gottheimer  
 Green, Al  
 Green, Gene  
 Grijalva  
 Gutiérrez  
 Hanabusa  
 Hastings  
 Heck  
 Higgins (NY)  
 Himes  
 Hoyer  
 Huffman  
 Jackson Lee  
 Jayapal  
 Jeffries  
 Johnson (GA)  
 Johnson, E. B.  
 Kaptur  
 Keating  
 Kelly (IL)  
 Kennedy  
 Khanna  
 Kilhuen  
 Kildee  
 Kilmer

Kind  
 Krishnamoorthi  
 Kuster (NH)  
 Lance  
 Langevin  
 Larsen (WA)  
 Larson (CT)  
 Lawrence  
 Lee  
 Levin  
 Lewis (GA)  
 Lieu, Ted  
 Lipinski  
 LoBiondo  
 Loeb sack  
 Lofgren  
 Lowenthal  
 Lowey  
 Lujan Grisham, M.  
 Luján, Ben Ray  
 Lynch  
 MacArthur  
 Maloney,  
 Carolyn B.  
 Maloney, Sean  
 Mast  
 Matsui  
 McCollum  
 McEachin  
 McGovern  
 McNerney  
 Meng  
 Moore  
 Moulton  
 Murphy (FL)  
 Nadler  
 Napolitano  
 Neal  
 Nolan  
 Norcross  
 O'Halleran  
 O'Rourke  
 Pallone  
 Panetta  
 Pascrell

Payne  
 Pelosi  
 Perlmutter  
 Peters  
 Pingree  
 Pocan  
 Poliquin  
 Polis  
 Price (NC)  
 Quigley  
 Raskin  
 Reichert  
 Rice (NY)  
 Richmond  
 Rosen  
 Roybal-Allard  
 Ruiz  
 Ruppertsberger  
 Rush  
 Ryan (OH)

Sánchez  
 Sanford  
 Sarbanes  
 Schakowsky  
 Schiff  
 Schneider  
 Schrader  
 Scott (VA)  
 Scott, David  
 Serrano  
 Sewell (AL)  
 Shea-Porter  
 Sherman  
 Sinema  
 Sires  
 Slaughter  
 Smith (NJ)  
 Smith (WA)  
 Soto  
 Speier

Stefanik  
 Suozzi  
 Swalwell (CA)  
 Takano  
 Thompson (CA)  
 Thompson (MS)  
 Titus  
 Tonko  
 Torres  
 Vargas  
 Veasey  
 Vela  
 Velázquez  
 Visclosky  
 Walz  
 Waters, Maxine  
 Watson Coleman  
 Welch  
 Wilson (FL)  
 Yarmuth

NOES—218

Abraham  
 Aderholt  
 Allen  
 Amash  
 Amodei  
 Arrington  
 Babin  
 Bacon  
 Banks (IN)  
 Barletta  
 Barr  
 Barton  
 Bergman  
 Biggs  
 Bishop (MI)  
 Bishop (UT)  
 Black  
 Blackburn  
 Blum  
 Bost  
 Brady (TX)  
 Brat  
 Brooks (AL)  
 Brooks (IN)  
 Buck  
 Bucshon  
 Budd  
 Burgess  
 Byrne  
 Calvert  
 Carter (GA)  
 Carter (TX)  
 Chabot  
 Cheney  
 Coffman  
 Cole  
 Collins (GA)  
 Collins (NY)  
 Comer  
 Comstock  
 Conaway  
 Cook  
 Costello (PA)  
 Cramer  
 Crawford  
 Cuellar  
 Culberson  
 Davidson  
 Davis, Rodney  
 Denham  
 Dent  
 DesJarlais  
 Donovan  
 Duffy  
 Duncan (SC)  
 Duncan (TN)  
 Dunn  
 Emmer  
 Estes (KS)  
 Farenthold  
 Ferguson  
 Fleischmann  
 Flores  
 Fortenberry  
 Foxx  
 Franks (AZ)  
 Frelinghuysen  
 Gaetz  
 Gallagher  
 Gianforte  
 Gibbs  
 Gohmert  
 Goodlatte  
 Gosar

Gowdy  
 Granger  
 Graves (GA)  
 Graves (LA)  
 Griffith  
 Grothman  
 Guthrie  
 Handel  
 Harper  
 Harris  
 Hartzler  
 Hensarling  
 Herrera Beutler  
 Hice, Jody B.  
 Higgins (LA)  
 Hill  
 Holding  
 Hollingsworth  
 Hudson  
 Huiזנגa  
 Hultgren  
 Hunter  
 Hurd  
 Issa  
 Jenkins (KS)  
 Jenkins (WV)  
 Johnson (LA)  
 Johnson (OH)  
 Johnson, Sam  
 Jones  
 Jordan  
 Joyce (OH)  
 Katko  
 Kelly (MS)  
 Kelly (PA)  
 King (IA)  
 King (NY)  
 Kinzinger  
 Knight  
 Kustoff (TN)  
 Labrador  
 LaHood  
 LaMalfa  
 Lamborn  
 Latta  
 Lewis (MN)  
 Long  
 Loudermilk  
 Love  
 Lucas  
 Luetkemeyer  
 Marchant  
 Marino  
 Marshall  
 Massie  
 McCarthy  
 McCaul  
 McClintock  
 McHenry  
 McKinley  
 McMorris  
 Rodgers  
 McSally  
 Meadows  
 Meehan  
 Meeks  
 Messer  
 Mitchell  
 Moolenaar  
 Mooney (WV)  
 Mullin  
 Murphy (PA)  
 Newhouse

Noem  
 Norman  
 Nunes  
 Olson  
 Palazzo  
 Palmer  
 Paulsen  
 Pearce  
 Perry  
 Peterson  
 Pittenger  
 Poe (TX)  
 Ratcliffe  
 Reed  
 Renacci  
 Rice (SC)  
 Roby  
 Roe (TN)  
 Rogers (AL)  
 Rogers (KY)  
 Rohrabacher  
 Rokita  
 Rooney, Francis  
 Rooney, Thomas J.  
 Roskam  
 Rothfus  
 Rouzer  
 Royce (CA)  
 Russell  
 Schweikert  
 Scott, Austin  
 Sensenbrenner  
 Sessions  
 Shimkus  
 Shuster  
 Simpson  
 Smith (MO)  
 Smith (NE)  
 Smith (TX)  
 Smucker  
 Stewart  
 Stivers  
 Taylor  
 Tenney  
 Thompson (PA)  
 Thornberry  
 Tiberi  
 Tipton  
 Trott  
 Turner  
 Upton  
 Valadao  
 Wagner  
 Walberg  
 Walden  
 Walker  
 Walorski  
 Walters, Mimi  
 Weber (TX)  
 Wenstrup  
 Westerman  
 Williams  
 Wilson (SC)  
 Wittman  
 Womack  
 Woodall  
 Yoder  
 Yoho  
 Young (AK)  
 Young (IA)  
 Zeldin

## NOT VOTING—21

Bilirakis	DeSantis	Rutherford
Bridenstine	Deutch	Scalise
Buchanan	Diaz-Balart	Tsongas
Costa	Garrett	Wasserman
Crist	Lawson (FL)	Schultz
Cummings	Posey	Webster (FL)
Curbelo (FL)	Ros-Lehtinen	
DeGette	Ross	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2145

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

AMENDMENT NO. 39 OFFERED BY MR.  
LOWENTHAL

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from California (Mr.  
LOWENTHAL) on which further pro-  
ceedings were postponed and on which  
the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 189, noes 220,  
not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 477]

AYES—189

Adams	Demings	Kind
Aguilar	DeSaulnier	Krishnamoorthi
Barragan	Dingell	Kuster (NH)
Bass	Doggett	Langevin
Beatty	Doyle, Michael	Larsen (WA)
Bera	F.	Larson (CT)
Beyer	Ellison	Lawrence
Bishop (GA)	Engel	Lee
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Levin
Blunt Rochester	Españillat	Lewis (GA)
Bonomici	Esty (CT)	Lieu, Ted
Boyle, Brendan	Evans	Lipinski
F.	Fitzpatrick	Loebsack
Brady (PA)	Fortenberry	Lofgren
Brown (MD)	Foster	Lowenthal
Brownley (CA)	Frankel (FL)	Lowe
Bustos	Fudge	Lujan Grisham,
Butterfield	Gabbard	M.
Capuano	Gallego	Luján, Ben Ray
Carbajal	Garamendi	Lynch
Cárdenas	Gomez	Maloney,
Carson (IN)	Gonzalez (TX)	Carolyn B.
Cartwright	Gottheimer	Maloney, Sean
Castor (FL)	Green, Al	Mast
Castro (TX)	Green, Gene	Matsui
Chu, Judy	Grijalva	McCollum
Cicilline	Gutiérrez	McEachin
Clark (MA)	Hanabusa	McGovern
Clarke (NY)	Hastings	McNerney
Clay	Heck	Meeks
Cleaver	Higgins (NY)	Meng
Clyburn	Himes	Moore
Cohen	Hoyer	Moulton
Connolly	Huffman	Murphy (FL)
Conyers	Jackson Lee	Nadler
Cooper	Jayapal	Napolitano
Correa	Jeffries	Neal
Costello (PA)	Johnson (GA)	Neocross
Courtney	Johnson, E. B.	O'Halleran
Crowley	Kaptur	O'Rourke
Cuellar	Keating	Pallone
Davis (CA)	Kelly (IL)	Panetta
Davis, Danny	Kennedy	Pascrell
DeFazio	Khanna	Payne
Delaney	Kihuen	Pelosi
DeLauro	Kildee	Perlmutter
DeBene	Kilmer	Peters

Pingree	Schneider	Thompson (CA)
Pocan	Schrader	Thompson (MS)
Poliquin	Scott (VA)	Titus
Polis	Scott, David	Tonko
Price (NC)	Serrano	Torres
Quigley	Sewell (AL)	Vargas
Raskin	Shea-Porter	Veasey
Rice (NY)	Sherman	Vela
Richmond	Sinema	Velázquez
Rosen	Sires	Visclosky
Roybal-Allard	Slaughter	Walz
Ruiz	Smith (WA)	Waters, Maxine
Rush	Soto	Watson Coleman
Ryan (OH)	Speier	Welch
Sanchez	Stefanik	Wilson (FL)
Sarbanes	Suozi	Yarmuth
Schakowsky	Swalwell (CA)	
Schiff	Takano	

## NOES—220

Abraham	Graves (LA)	Norman
Aderholt	Graves (MO)	Nunes
Allen	Griffith	Olson
Amash	Grothman	Palazzo
Amodei	Guthrie	Palmer
Arrington	Handel	Paulsen
Babin	Harper	Pearce
Bacon	Harris	Perry
Banks (IN)	Hartzler	Peterson
Barletta	Hensarling	Pittenger
Barr	Herrera Beutler	Poe (TX)
Barton	Hice, Jody B.	Ratcliffe
Bergman	Higgins (LA)	Reed
Biggs	Holding	Reichert
Bishop (MI)	Hollingsworth	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Hudson	Rice (SC)
Black	Huizenga	Roby
Blackburn	Hultgren	Roe (TN)
Blum	Hunter	Rogers (AL)
Bost	Hurd	Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX)	Issa	Rohrabacher
Brat	Jenkins (KS)	Rokita
Brooks (AL)	Jenkins (WV)	Rooney, Francis
Buck	Johnson (LA)	Rooney, Thomas
Bucshon	Johnson (OH)	J.
Budd	Johnson, Sam	Roskam
Burgess	Jones	Rothfus
Byrne	Jordan	Rouzer
Calvert	Joyce (OH)	Royce (CA)
Carter (GA)	Katko	Russell
Carter (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Sanford
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert
Cheney	King (IA)	Scott, Austin
Coffman	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Cole	Kinzinger	Sessions
Collins (GA)	Knight	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Shuster
Comer	Labrador	Simpson
Comstock	LaHood	Smith (MO)
Conaway	LaMalfa	Smith (NE)
Cook	Lamborn	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Lance	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Latta	Smucker
Culberson	Lewis (MN)	Stewart
Davidson	LoBiondo	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	Long	Taylor
Denham	Loudermilk	Tenney
Dent	Love	Thompson (PA)
DesJarlais	Lucas	Thornberry
Donovan	Luetkemeyer	Tiberi
Duffy	MacArthur	Tipton
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Trott
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Turner
Dunn	Marshall	Upton
Emmer	Massie	Valadao
Estes (KS)	McCarthy	Wagner
Farenthold	McCaul	Walberg
Faso	McClintock	Walden
Ferguson	McHenry	Walker
Fleischmann	McKinley	Walorski
Flores	McMorris	Walters, Mimi
Fox	Rodgers	Weber (TX)
Franks (AZ)	McSally	Wenstrup
Frelinghuysen	Meadows	Westerman
Gaetz	Meehan	Williams
Gallagher	Messer	Wilson (SC)
Gianforte	Mitchell	Wittman
Gibbs	Mooleenaar	Womack
Gohmert	Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Goodlatte	Mullin	Yoder
Gosar	Murphy (PA)	Yoho
Gowdy	Newhouse	Young (AK)
Granger	Noem	Young (IA)
Graves (GA)		Zeldin

## NOT VOTING—24

Bilirakis
Bridenstine
Brooks (IN)

Buchanan	Cummings
Costa	Curbelo (FL)
Crist	DeGette

DeSantis	Posey	Tsongas
Deutch	Ros-Lehtinen	Wasserman
Diaz-Balart	Ross	Schultz
Garrett	Ruppersberger	Webster (FL)
Lawson (FL)	Rutherford	
Nolan	Scalise	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

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

□ 2149

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

AMENDMENT NO. 43 OFFERED BY MR. YOUNG OF  
ALASKA

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

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

## RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 215, noes 196,  
not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 478]

AYES—215

Abraham	Duncan (SC)	Johnson, Sam
Aderholt	Duncan (TN)	Jones
Allen	Dunn	Jordan
Amash	Emmer	Joyce (OH)
Amodei	Estes (KS)	Katko
Arrington	Farenthold	Kelly (MS)
Babin	Faso	Kelly (PA)
Bacon	Ferguson	Kind
Banks (IN)	Fleischmann	King (IA)
Barletta	Flores	Kinzinger
Barr	Fortenberry	Knight
Barton	Fox	Kustoff (TN)
Bergman	Franks (AZ)	Labrador
Biggs	Frelinghuysen	LaHood
Bishop (MI)	Gallagher	LaMalfa
Bishop (UT)	Gianforte	Lamborn
Black	Gibbs	Latta
Blackburn	Gohmert	Lewis (MN)
Blum	Gonzalez (TX)	Long
Bost	Goodlatte	Loudermilk
Brady (TX)	Gosar	Love
Brat	Gowdy	Lucas
Brooks (AL)	Granger	Luetkemeyer
Brooks (IN)	Graves (GA)	Marchant
Buck	Graves (LA)	Marino
Bucshon	Graves (MO)	Marshall
Budd	Green, Gene	Massie
Burgess	Griffith	Mast
Byrne	Grothman	McCarthy
Calvert	Guthrie	McCaul
Carter (GA)	Handel	McClintock
Carter (TX)	Harper	McHenry
Chabot	Harris	McKinley
Cheney	Hartzler	McMorris
Coffman	Hensarling	Rodgers
Cole	Herrera Beutler	Meadows
Collins (GA)	Hice, Jody B.	Messer
Collins (NY)	Higgins (LA)	Mitchell
Comer	Hill	Mooleenaar
Comstock	Holding	Mooney (WV)
Conaway	Hollingsworth	Mullin
Cook	Hudson	Murphy (PA)
Cramer	Huizenga	Newhouse
Crawford	Hultgren	Noem
Cuellar	Hunter	Norman
Culberson	Hurd	Nunes
Davidson	Issa	Olson
Davis, Rodney	Jenkins (KS)	Palazzo
Dent	Jenkins (WV)	Palmer
DesJarlais	Johnson (LA)	Paulsen
Duffy	Johnson (OH)	Pearce

Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Roskam  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Russell

Sanford  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner

Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

NOES—196

Adams  
Aguilar  
Barragan  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
Demings  
Denham  
DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Donovan  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Espallat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Fitzpatrick  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi

Gomez  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
King (NY)  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebsock  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Nolan

Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Reichert  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce (GA)  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schradler  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suozi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Tanner  
Tenney  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Upton  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Walters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—22

Bilirakis  
Bridenstine  
Buchanan  
Costa  
Crist  
Cummins

Curbelo (FL)  
DeGette  
DeSantis  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Gaetz

Garrett  
Lawson (FL)  
Posey  
Ros-Lehtinen

Ross  
Rutherford  
Scalise

Tsongas  
Wasserman  
Schultz

Webster (FL)

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

□ 2152

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

AMENDMENT NO. 50 OFFERED BY MR. GOODLATTE  
The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished  
business is the demand for a recorded  
vote on the amendment offered by the  
gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GOOD-  
LATTE) on which further proceedings  
were postponed and on which the ayes  
prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the  
amendment.  
The Clerk redesignated the amend-  
ment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote  
has been demanded.

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

The vote was taken by electronic de-  
vice, and there were—ayes 214, noes 197,  
not voting 22, as follows:

[Roll No. 479]

AYES—214

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Culberson  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DesJarlais  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn

Emmer  
Estes (KS)  
Farenthold  
Ferguson  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Handel  
Harper  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight

Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
Lewis (MN)  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luettekemyer  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin  
Murphy (PA)  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Norman  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Pearce  
Perry  
Peterson  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher

Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Roskam  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Sanford  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson

Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Harris  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Joyce (OH)  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebsock  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano

NOES—197

Adams  
Aguilar  
Barragan  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Clever  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Correa  
Courtney  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DelBene  
DeSaulnier  
Dingell  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Espallat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Faso  
Fitzpatrick  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gomez

Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Harris  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Joyce (OH)  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebsock  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano

Neal  
Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascrell  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Rosen  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sanchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schradler  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suozi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Tanner  
Taylor  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Walters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Wittman  
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—22

Bilirakis  
Bridenstine  
Buchanan  
Costa  
Crist  
Cummins  
Curbelo (FL)  
DeGette

Demings  
DeSantis  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart  
Garrett  
Lawson (FL)  
Posey  
Ros-Lehtinen

Ross  
Rutherford  
Scalise  
Tsongas  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Webster (FL)

□ 2156

So the amendment was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 55 OFFERED BY MRS. BLACKBURN

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. BERGMAN). It is now in order to consider amendment No. 55 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. Each amount made available by this Act (other than an amount required to be made available by a provision of law) is hereby reduced by 1 percent.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACKBURN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

□ 2200

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I know that we have a lot of activity on the House floor tonight, which I think is a good thing. It shows that the people's House is here, that we are working, and that we are meeting the needs of the American people. One of those is making certain that we fund the activity of this government, and that we do it in a responsible way.

I think that as I come to offer my amendment, that I offer every single year, on this piece of legislation, Mr. Chairman, it is very important to note that this Appropriations Committee has done a phenomenal job of reining in out-of-control spending.

One of the lessons that should have been learned over the past couple of years is that it is very clear the American people understand that Washington does not have a revenue problem, it has a spending problem. As I said, Washington does not have a revenue problem, it has a spending problem.

We know that the bureaucracy has an insatiable appetite for the taxpayers' money. We see it all of the time. It is why we are having a vote to raise the debt ceiling. It is why we are right at \$20 trillion in debt. It is because the spending is, indeed, out of control.

The work that has been done by this committee to prepare these appropriations bills is so vitally important, and it is to be commended. I think we have to look at this Interior Appropriations bill and realize that last year it was a \$32.28 billion bill. This year, they have worked that spending down to \$31.4 billion, and that is, indeed, commendable. In this bill, they have cut the spending at the EPA a total of 27 percent, and that is, indeed, commendable.

The amendment that I bring forward tonight is to reduce that budget authority by an additional 1 percent. And I do this in calling for a penny-on-a-dollar cut, to challenge the bureauc-

racy to match the great work that has been done by our colleagues, on both sides of the aisle, as they have worked through to reduce what we spend to cut out waste, to look for fraud, to find ways that the taxpayer dollar is being abused, and to end that abuse.

And, indeed, we know that saving a penny on a dollar is something we can do. It is important to our children and grandchildren. Indeed, I think we have a moral responsibility to do that.

And there are areas where we can do this. I will give you a couple of examples where there is more that we could be doing.

One is in ceiling fan regulations through the EPA. Some of the regulations they have put on ceiling fans, which actually reduce energy consumption, are absolutely ridiculous. We know that they yield a benefit, especially for people that live in areas, like I live in, in Tennessee.

So while we recognize the vital work of the Department of the Interior, we also realize there are areas where more could be done to curb the waste, and where we could challenge the rank and file employees in these bureaucracies.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I want to commend my colleague for her consistent work to protect taxpayer dollars, and I certainly support her in all of the endeavors that she has done over the years to do that. But this is not the type of approach that I can support. I certainly like the idea of challenging the agencies, and I believe that the agencies are going to meet that challenge to cut spending in a responsible way.

This bill has made some very tough choices, within a subcommittee allocation, that adheres to the current law. The Budget Committee asked us to meet certain budget caps, and we have done so in this bill, while asking that we increase spending for our national security, which is in woeful shape.

So we had to make some very difficult tradeoffs. This bill, in its current form, balances our needs, those tradeoffs carefully weighed for their respectful impacts. We prioritize funding for fire suppression, PILT, national parks—maybe the most popular agency in the United States Government—and meeting our legal and moral obligations in Indian Country.

Unfortunately, the process that the gentlewoman proposes—an across-the-board cut—would cut all those programs, including Indian health, national park programs, and other programs, which already are taking significant cuts.

This amendment makes no distinction between where we need to be spending to invest in, say, energy independence, or to limit spending to meet our deficit controls.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment, but I certainly support the fact that we are trying to get our budgets in line.

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I do appreciate the chairman's work, and the committee's good work.

I do want to point out that across-the-board cuts work. We see them work in our State governments, and we see them work in our local communities. And certainly families see these work, where they go in and they just shave a little out of everything that they are spending.

If you look at the discretionary spending components of our Federal budget and you say, Let's find a way to save one penny out of every dollar that has been appropriated, then you put yourself on the road to reducing what the Federal Government spends, what they take from the taxpayer and then spend.

We are spending too much money on programs that we don't need, programs that have outlived their usefulness, and programs that future generations don't even realize that they are going to have to pay for.

So, let's do the fiscally responsible thing. Let's challenge these agencies, let's cut one more penny out of the dollar, and do this for our children, for our grandchildren, and for the fiscal health of our Nation.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, I strongly oppose this amendment.

This amendment discriminately cuts programs in this bill without any thought to the merit of what is contained in this bill.

For example, in Indian Health Service, it really means fewer patients being seen. It means fewer safety inspectors ensuring accidents don't occur. Deferred maintenance in our drinking water, sanitation, and infrastructure. We will lose investments in environmental infrastructure, and, with that, jobs will be lost.

But the EPA, as has been pointed out quite a bit tonight for cuts and for shifting funding around within this bill, is \$2.2 billion less than 2010: 2,000 fewer employees. So employees are being pulled out of my region and your region and all over to respond down in Harvey, meaning work isn't being done. And I bet they are going to get the call to leave their families and go look at sewer systems that have broken apart, and water systems that don't have the ability for safe drinking water. This is an agency that was funded and cut again in this bill, and they have real jobs to do.

So when you discriminately cut across, you are also cutting across those programs that we are relying right now for the EPA to do in Harvey.



And then the Forest Service just notified us that they are out of money for fire suppression. So we are going to cut the Forest Service across 1 percent?

There might be places where you and I could agree, Mr. Chairman, where we could be doing some cuts, and I could work with my colleagues on it. But across the board, this year, in this bill, is something I can't support.

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

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

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

Mrs. BLACKBURN. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

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

AMENDMENT NO. 56 OFFERED BY MR. PALMER

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 56 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used by the Environmental Protection Agency to carry out the powers granted under section 3063 of title 18, United States Code.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, the Environmental Protection Agency 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. In total, over the period from fiscal year 2006 to 2015, the EPA spent an estimated \$715 million for its criminal enforcement program. This money could have been better spent on such things as improvement of our water systems.

These 200 special agents were equipped with guns and ammunition up to 30-millimeter, camouflage and other deceptive equipment, night vision, unmanned aircraft, and other military-style equipment.

A 2015 report by Open the Books, noted that EPA spent \$24,700 on ammunition between 75-millimeter and 125-millimeter, and \$23,000 on ammunition over 125-millimeter. It is difficult for me to imagine that the EPA has a legitimate use for ammunition of that size.

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. These include the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association, the Federal Reserve Board, and the National Institutes of Health, among others.

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 local or State law enforcement when there is a need for armed protection.

My amendment would prohibit funding for EPA's armed agents and begin to address the troubling trend of militarization in our Federal agencies.

Claim: While I appreciate my colleague's concerns about the militarization of federal agencies, this amendment reaches too far.

Response: It is not my amendment, but the EPA that has reached too far. EPA is the poster child for government overreach, and they have clearly abused the police powers they've been granted.

Claim: This amendment puts EPA employees at risk of bodily harm. They deserve to come home to their families at night.

Response: I agree that every federal employee should be able to come home safe to their families and this amendment would not impact their ability to do so. EPA and any other federal agency that believes that their activities could result in a threat to their employees have the ability to coordinate armed protection with local or state or federal law enforcement.

Claim: This amendment would give criminals a free pass to pollute our air and water and ignore the laws on the books.

Response: My amendment would not hinder EPA's ability to enforce the laws on the books and no one wants to see our air and water polluted. However, we cannot ignore the facts that EPA's criminal enforcement division could be mistaken for a military operation at this point. I want to see our laws enforced, but I have serious doubts that it takes 200 heavily armed EPA agents to accomplish that goal.

Claim: We should have a debate over EPA's need for armed agents but this is not the correct venue for that debate. The debate should take place in the authorizing committees.

Response: That same argument could be applied to every limitation amendment offered to an appropriations bill, but that doesn't stop limitations from being offered and adopted. That said, I am happy to continue this debate should a bill reauthorizing these activities come up.

We recently increased funding for the Capitol Police by \$29.2 million which could be more than covered by the reduction I am seeking to EPA Criminal Enforcement.

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

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

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

□ 2215

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I understand, and I have taken a lot of criticism over the last few years for cutting EPA's budget by 27 percent over the last number of years. However, I believe this amendment is just going too far.

We have a new administration. We have a new Administrator. I think there is a new day over at EPA. None of us want to see our rivers polluted, toxic waste either on the ground or in the air, and I think this administration will administer the law properly.

We may not always agree on where it is appropriate to draw the line on environmental laws and regulations. Some think some standards are too stringent, some think they are not tough enough, and that is a fair policy debate to have. However, we know that no matter where the line is ultimately drawn, there are individuals out there who are willingly and knowingly trying to find ways around those laws. As such, EPA needs the ability to look into criminal activity, whether it is illegal dumping of waste, negligent dumping of toxics or oil, or the illegal importation of products from other countries by those who would choose to ignore United States law.

So we can debate the law and what is appropriate, but we can't give criminals a free pass or ignore the laws that are on the books. Mr. Chair, I must oppose the amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same, and I encourage a "no" vote.

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the chairman's great work on the appropriations bill and have great respect for him, but I would like to respond to some of the comments.

This is not a cut to the EPA's budget. This is a redirection of funds away from a militarized division of the EPA. There is no effort at all here to diminish the EPA's ability to carry out its core functions. If there is a problem where armed agents or armed personnel are involved, they need to rely on people who are trained to deal with such situations. Actually, I think this would allow the EPA to redirect its funds to make sure that our environment is protected.

So with all due respect, I want to make sure that it is understood that this is not a cut to the EPA's budget. This is a redirection of resources and a demilitarization of a Federal agency that, frankly, I have seen in my own State of Alabama where they showed up at a city water system in full body armor, bulletproof vests, carrying AR15s—at a city water system. It was totally uncalled for.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I understand the gentleman's concerns. I would suggest that he go down to the Administrator's office, our new Administrator, Mr. Pruitt, and meet with

him. I don't think that there is any desire on his part to militarize the Environmental Protection Agency, and I think that he will see this new Administrator wanting to do the right thing.

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

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

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chair, again, I appreciate the response of the chairman, who, I again want to reiterate, has done a fine job in the appropriations process, and I appreciate his concerns about this.

I intend to meet with Secretary Pruitt. I have known him for quite some time and have full confidence in his ability to lead the EPA in a much better direction than it has been over the last few years.

He inherited this problem. This is not an effort by the EPA to militarize. They already are militarized. This example I gave you from the State of Alabama is just one example of other instances in the State of Alabama, other instances around the country.

We depend on law enforcement to handle confrontational situations. I don't think anyone expects a Federal agency to have people who are trained to the degree that our law enforcement is to handle situations where someone might get injured or killed.

So it is, I think, totally appropriate for us at this point to redirect this funding, to remove this funding for armed agents, who, by the way, as I said early on, and if you want to see this report from Open the Books, we are purchasing 75-millimeter ammunition, 30-millimeter ammunition. It is hard to imagine what purpose they have for ammunition of that size.

Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this amendment, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes."

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. 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 Alabama will be postponed.

Mr. CALVERT. 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. LAMBORN) having assumed the chair, Mr. BERGMAN, 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. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30,

2018, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF SENATE AMENDMENT TO HOUSE AMENDMENT TO SENATE AMENDMENT TO H.R. 601, REINFORCING EDUCATION ACCOUNTABILITY IN DEVELOPMENT ACT

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-299) on the resolution (H. Res. 509) providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 601) to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of assistance provided under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to promote quality basic education in developing countries, to better enable such countries to achieve universal access to quality basic education and improved learning outcomes, to eliminate duplication and waste, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 504 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 3354.

Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN) kindly resume the chair.

□ 2224

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. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, with Mr. BERGMAN (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 56 printed in House Report 115-297 offered by the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER) had been postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 57 OFFERED BY MR. CARBAJAL

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 57 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to process any application under the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act (43 U.S.C. 1331 et seq.) for a permit to drill or a permit to modify that would authorize use of hydraulic fracturing or acid well stimulation treatment in the Pacific Outer Continental Shelf.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, I am offering my amendment on behalf of my constituents on the central coast of California. It simply prevents the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management from issuing any new permits that would allow companies to use hydraulic fracturing or acid well stimulation, otherwise known as fracking, in Federal waters off the West Coast. It will prohibit the use of fiscal year 2018 funds to process any new applications for this purpose. This would provide us more time to study whether offshore fracking is safe for the environment and public health.

In 2013, we learned that offshore fracking had been occurring off California's coast for more than two decades. In the Santa Barbara Channel alone, there have been more than a dozen documented instances of offshore fracking, yet we know very little about the environmental and health impacts this has had on our communities.

Already, the United States Geological Survey has concluded that the practice of injecting pressurized water into deep rock formations causes earthquakes. My constituents deserve to know the risks associated with offshore fracking on our environment, marine life, and public health.

My constituents have seen the devastating impacts of some of the largest oil spills in California's history, like the 1969 Santa Barbara oil spill. My amendment echoes my constituents' concern surrounding the impacts of offshore fracking and prohibits the use of funds to process any new applications for this purpose.

This is a commonsense measure that we should implement until we know all the facts and risks associated with this practice.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, last year, May of 2016, in the previous administration, the Department of the Interior issued a finding of no significant impact with respect to these operations; thus followed a review of 23 oil and gas platforms currently operating offshore in the State of California. The review drew upon the best available science and reaffirms that these operations are operating safely, as they should.

This amendment is nothing more than another attempt to restrict offshore development, and I oppose the amendment and encourage my colleagues to vote “no.”

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chairman, I will note that oil platforms off California's coast are already permitted to dump 9 billion gallons of wastewater, including fracking chemicals, into the ocean each year.

Fracking increases air pollution and can expose coastal communities to air pollutants that cause cancer and other illnesses.

Most offshore fracking jobs have occurred within 3 miles of the coast. Injecting fracking wastewater underground can induce earthquakes, and all of southern California's offshore injection wells are within 3 miles of an active fault.

These are just a few reasons why it is important to pass this amendment.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I oppose 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 California (Mr. CARBAJAL).

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

Mr. CARBAJAL. 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 California will be postponed.

□ 2230

AMENDMENT NO. 59 OFFERED BY MR. PERRY

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 59 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act shall 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 504, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

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

This amendment would prevent funds from being used to expand EPA authority pursuant to section 115 of the Clean Air Act.

Now, this isn't an amendment to assail the Clean Air Act, but there is a flaw with it, which is section 115. That section of the Clean Air Act allows the EPA to mandate State emissions levels to whatever amount the agency deems appropriate if they find two things. They have to find that U.S. emissions endanger a foreign nation; and the endangered nation has a reciprocal agreement to prevent or control emissions in their own nation.

Now, it was previously argued that the Paris climate agreement met those requirements. When they wrote the Clean Air Act back in the 1970s, they never foresaw the Paris Agreement. And the Paris Agreement is not a treaty. It is an agreement.

Fortunately, President Trump's decision to withdraw from the agreement has alleviated those prior concerns. Whether you agree with this President or the last one or the future President is immaterial. The point is that this portion of the law shouldn't exist. That authority shouldn't exist at the executive level, especially when we don't do treaties anymore.

Despite the temporary relief, the fact remains that section 115 of the Clean Air Act is just simply bad policy. Section 115 delegates an incredible amount of authority to the executive branch without any safeguards, without any oversight by the legislative branch.

This amendment would block the use of section 115 to delegate this power over the energy sector, over our States, to the unelected, unaccountable bureaucrats at the EPA.

In the future, such expansive authority at the EPA could be economically devastating and could threaten the reliability and viability of our Nation's energy sector without any checks and balances.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. So the gentleman was talking about the Paris climate agreement, which the Trump administration withdrew from?

Mr. PERRY. Will the gentleman yield?

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. PERRY. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. And then you said you were worried about the administration using section 115 of the Clean Air Act to impose regulations.

It has been my experience, from my point of view, representing my constituents, we were disappointed about the withdrawal from the Paris climate agreement, and we haven't seen this administration be aggressive on clean air.

So could you please explain to me your concerns about the Trump administration and section 115 of the Clean Air Act? Because, if they are doing

things that you are concerned about, maybe I need to take a fresher look at what the Trump administration is doing, because I have seen them do nothing but block, cut back, and deny the ability to move forward on the clean air agreement. So I am confused to the point of your amendment.

The Obama administration is gone, and the Trump administration has removed almost everything I care passionately about with clean air.

Mr. PERRY. If the gentlewoman will continue to yield, what I am concerned about is not necessarily the Trump administration or the Obama administration. Any administration with the unbridled power that section 115 gives the administration, without any checks or balances, to make an agreement with another nation and then enforce—have their agency enforce their regulations at whatever they deem appropriate on every single State in the United States, without any ability of Congress to intervene whatsoever.

It is not particular to this administration, the last administration, or any future administration. It is particular to all of them. The authority, in my opinion, should not exist for them to do that without any checks and balances from the legislative branch.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Reclaiming my time, the Perry amendment would only be in effect for 1 year because this is not a policy bill. This is an appropriations bill. So the gentleman's concerns about having long-term consequences of a future President in the future would not be addressed by this particular amendment.

So I oppose the amendment. It is a long line of Republican amendments on the attack of the clean air and the EPA's authority. But I think this really makes it crystal clear the point that we shouldn't be doing deep policy that you want to discuss on an appropriations bill because it only lasts for a year.

As far as I know, the Trump administration has nothing up its sleeve to improve air quality over the next year, so I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment. And I urge my colleagues who care about these policy situations: You control the House, you control the Senate. Please go to the committees of jurisdiction.

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Chair, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT).

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment was adopted on the floor last year. I believe it is a good amendment. I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Mr. PERRY. 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.

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 60 printed in House Report 115-297.

It is now in order to consider amendment No. 61 printed in House Report 115-297.

AMENDMENT NO. 62 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 62 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to "Onshore Oil and Gas Operations; Federal and Indian Oil and Gas Leases; Site Security", published at 81 Fed. Reg. 81356 (November 17, 2016).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Onshore Order 3, put in place by the last administration, creates a number of unnecessary and duplicative burdens that cause energy production to be much more difficult.

Now, many people visualize that oil wells are drilled into the ground and then they just produce oil on their own; that it flows to the surface magically, and it remains unabated through the life of the oil well. It is not true at all.

What actually happens is that there is a pool of oil at the bottom of the well, and as it is produced, the production gets smaller each day until eventually the small production is classified as stripper well production.

Now, the Saudi Arabians, about every 10 years, come in and kill the stripper wells because that would be approximately 2 to 3 billion barrels of oil a year they could produce that would be shut down here.

In my home county of Lee County, New Mexico, we hunker down when we see these economic attacks coming, and we simply make it through; not because it is economic, not because it is productive, but because it is one of the few economic drivers of New Mexico. Oil and gas provides about 40 percent of our teachers' pay, 40 percent of police pay. So it is just our way of life.

But the stripper wells are not extremely economic. So when this Onshore Order 3 came into place, it actually is assisting the Saudi Arabians to try to drive stripper wells out of existence because it is the small producers, it is the guys who will stay there and produce the wells when nobody has economic interest in them. They like sweeping up the crumbs off of the energy table.

So Onshore Order 3 puts in processes that require monitoring that is already

provided at the point of sale. So it is not as if somehow the government's being cheated. It just is trying to squeeze more out of these uneconomic wells.

The estimates are that we have shut down a great number of those wells, affecting teachers' pay, affecting the economy of New Mexico, killing jobs.

So my amendment is very simple. It would prevent funds from being used to fund the BLM Onshore Order Rule No. 3.

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

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, once again, there might be some very legitimate points that can be worked on out of these stripper wells that are at the end of their life, and we might find some common ground on some of your issues, but this is the appropriations bills and this isn't the place to do it. It should be done in the Policy Committee.

Mr. Chair, we should be going to the Policy Committee, and we should be asking the Policy Committee to take up and have hearings on these issues that are very important to some of the Members here in this House.

So when I look at this amendment on an Appropriations Committee bill, what it says to me is that it is continuing the administration's agenda that favors oil and gas industry ahead of other uses of our public lands. It says to me that the administration has rolled back and abolished a lot of rules that have been made over many years that are contained and outlined in the Administrative Procedure Act, which includes a consideration of public and travel comments so you can go and register your comment and your concern on it.

The whole point of the site security rule is to protect against the theft of oil and to make sure that the oil and gas production is properly accounted for.

So this rule that we are talking about today also streamlines the process for companies to get new measurement technologies to make sure that they are using the most innovative technology. I think, after 25 years, most businesses, most people who want to make sure that they are paying for product, want to make sure that it is being measured and accounted for right.

This rule was also recommended by the GAO and the Department of the Interior's IG, the Royalty Policy Committee regarding the BLM's production of verification efforts. And those are things that, quite often, we do to safeguard and to protect to make sure that the taxpayer, when involved on public lands, is receiving fair value for the royalty.

So there is a rulemaking process that is comprehensive. There is a rule-

making process that is transparent. And there is also a way to change the rule that is comprehensive, transparent, and allows the public to have their voice, and that is to address these issues in the Policy Committee.

So the main reason—and I want to be really clear about this—for opposing many of these amendments is they are properly done in the Policy Committee, a committee which I served on when I first came here. Mr. Chair, I think that is where these amendments need to start being direct so that we can do the real work and make sure that when Members come to the floor, that they know that we have had a full vetting and full transparency.

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

□ 2245

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the committee and subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the amendment. I appreciate my colleague for bringing the Bureau of Land Management's Onshore Order No. 3 to the House's attention. Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, again, I appreciate what my chairman of the subcommittee is saying in helping Members here, but we have a lot of work to do just doing the oversight on how money is spent and appropriated to make sure that we are doing our due diligence when we appropriate funds, that they are used in the way that this Congress has asked for them to be used. There is a Policy Committee to look at what is happening with policy and to make sure that we move policy forward.

Mr. Chair, sometimes when amendments like this come to the floor, I just think we are failing totally as a Congress to do our due diligence in the Policy Committee, and then there is so much time spent on policy in the Appropriations Committee, we fail to do our due diligence on what has to happen for oversight for the tax dollars that we do appropriate in these bills.

It is my hope that the Policy Committee will step up, speak out, and start requesting that these bills be heard in the committee of jurisdiction and not just put on as riders on our bills.

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. PEARCE for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. Chairman, this rule by the BLM is a classic example of agency overregulation at its finest. Should the new regulations take effect, lessees and operators will be forced to maintain original gas charts, measurement tickets, calibrations, verifications, prover

and configuration reports, pumper and gauger field logs, volume statements, event logs, seal records, and gas analysis.

Most of these documents have nothing to do with determining the amount of production at a lease and will force businesses to hire more staff just to keep records.

This will also likely result in more Federal employees to oversee the bureaucracy. This makes zero sense and is simply creating work and overregulation for no reason. I urge a “yes” vote.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I think it is clear that what is at stake is 2.6 billion barrels of oil a day made from wells that make maybe one or two barrels, three barrels a day. They are not extremely economic, but those businesses are located in New Mexico. Those businesses keep their headquarters there. They are just small mom-and-pop operators that care enough about the energy business to stay out there, and so when the government does things that says we are not going to let you operate, that we are going to shut you down, it accomplishes what the Saudi Arabians have never been able to accomplish, and that is defeat the spirit that says we can survive any attacks.

Mr. Chair, again, I urge people to support this amendment and the underlying bill, H.R. 3354, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 63 OFFERED BY MR. PEARCE

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 63 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to finalize, implement, or enforce the rule submitted by the Bureau of Land Management relating to “Waste Prevention, Production Subject to Royalties, and Resource Conservation”, published at 81 Fed. Reg. 83008 (November 18, 2016).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Mexico for 5 minutes.

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

Mr. Chairman, the venting and flaring rule was, again, put in place by the last administration, intending for BLM to regulate methane. Historically, that had been regulated by the EPA.

Now, keep in mind that methane production from oil wells is down 21 per-

cent since 1990, while production is going up. Production is going up, methane production is down. So we wonder why the administration came at the last second to put this rule into place.

Basically, the argument is exactly the same for opposing that venting and flaring rule that what is at stake are not the good wells. Those wells are going to produce in their economic with whatever burdens are placed on them. What is at stake are the stripper wells which, again, make up 2.6 billion barrels of production in the U.S. every day, 145 million barrels of production in the State of New Mexico. So you can imagine the economic catastrophe if that 145 million barrels weren’t available to the State to both tax and to provide jobs.

Again, 40 percent of New Mexico’s pay, roughly the teachers’ pay, the police pay, roughly that much comes from oil and gas production. You can do the math and see how much New Mexico would be affected if this venting and flaring rule continues to place the burden on the well.

The estimates are for each well that a cost of \$60,000 is going to be required to come into compliance. Again, keep in mind that this rule comes after the methane is more carefully controlled today under greater production than it ever has been. The estimates are that we will lose thousands of wells if this venting and flaring rule continues.

Again, it is the stripper wells which are most at harm. If we lose the 2.6 billion barrels of stripper well production every year because of the high cost of implementation of the venting and flaring rule, that is going to mean we are less energy independent, that we rely more on outside sources. It is going to drive the price of gasoline up. The people who can afford it least are the people at the bottom of the economic ladder. They will be the ones penalized most by rising prices of gasoline and decreasing supplies of oil.

Mr. Chair, again, I would urge people to support this amendment, the underlying bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 2 minutes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM).

Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico. Mr. Chair, I want to thank my colleague for yielding me time.

Mr. Chair, yesterday the House passed a \$7.9 billion downpayment to address the destruction caused by Hurricane Harvey, which is projected now to cost as much as \$180 billion—by far, today, the costliest hurricane to hit the United States.

Today, we are considering an amendment which would prohibit BLM from implementing a rule to address the

wasteful venting, flaring, and leaking of methane, which is a climate change-causing emission 30 times more powerful than carbon dioxide.

New Mexico is currently home to the largest methane hot spot in the world. Not only is methane a powerful greenhouse gas, but every cubic foot of gas that is wasted into the atmosphere cheats hardworking New Mexican taxpayers out of precious royalty and tax payments which go toward public education, infrastructure, and community development programs.

Our State desperately needs these investments, and we cannot afford to let money disappear into thin air. BLM, in fact, should work with stakeholders, especially small independent producers who have low-producing wells to make this workable. But taking a sledgehammer to our Nation’s energy policy is a shortsighted and counterproductive effort.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and to collaborate to make this rule effective for producers and taxpayers alike.

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

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, the House has spoken several times on the Bureau of Land Management’s methane regulation in the past 2 years. I understand the administration is reviewing the regulation and that litigation is ongoing.

In the meantime, I think action is needed, and so I support this amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR).

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of this amendment. The BLM venting and flaring rule, or the BLM methane rule, represents one of the Obama administration’s most egregious abuses of executive power designed to destroy responsible energy production on Federal land.

BLM exceeded statutory authority by attempting to regulate air quality; authority that is vested solely with the EPA. Methane emissions from oil and natural gas have significantly declined in recent decades without duplicative Federal regulations in a time when oil and gas production in the U.S. has surged.

It is frustrating that this rule is somehow cloaked under the idea that it will benefit taxpayers. It won’t. It is an onerous rule with no connection to the reality of the physics and chemistry of energy production. It will reduce American energy production on Federal land and, therefore, reduce royalties due to the U.S. Treasury.

This amendment brings accountability to executive rulemaking. I thank Congressman PEARCE and applaud him, as well as Congressmen

Westerman and Cramer for their similar amendments crippling other Obama rules.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE) has expired.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, as I said, I rise in opposition to this amendment, as clearly this amendment would prohibit BLM from regulating flaring, venting, and leaking of methane from Federal onshore oil and gas operations. In 2016, the BLM finalized its rule which updated regulations that were almost over 30 years old. We have learned a lot about how we have to be more diligent about capturing energy and making America more energy secure, because this rule would prevent the waste of an estimated 65 billion cubic feet of natural gas a year and save taxpayers \$330 million annually.

BLM has a responsibility to the taxpayers, and that means capturing what is flared off, what is burnt off, which is potential energy. We have developed technologies in the past 30 years to capture this and make it work even more effectively for the taxpayers when we lease out these leases and royalties.

Just for a fact, I share that the Bakken oil field, when it was at its height, flared more—I am from the Twin Cities—flared more and brighter than the metropolitan area in St. Paul and Minneapolis. That is how bright the flare was that the satellites captured at night. That was burning energy, energy consumption that should have been captured because we owe it to future generations to get it right when it comes to our energy production.

Mr. Chairman, the amendment is bad for public health, it shortchanges the American taxpayers, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it. I don't think we are going to change each other's minds on this because the bottom line is, and I have been consistent with this, this belongs in the Policy Committee. This only would change something for a year. You would have to come back year after year after year. If there is something where we can find common ground on, we can find it in the Policy Committee. We can't find it on an Appropriations Committee where it expires every year.

I ride the elevator with the gentleman, Mr. Chair, and I am sure he is going to enlighten me some more.

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

□ 2300

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

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. 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 New Mexico will be postponed.

The Acting CHAIR. The Chair understands that amendment No. 64 will not be offered.

AMENDMENT NO. 65 OFFERED BY MR. MCEACHIN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 65 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS FOR DEVELOPING  
A NEW 5-YEAR-OFFSHORE-PLAN

SEC. \_\_\_\_\_. None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to prepare a five-year offshore oil and gas leasing program that would schedule any Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas lease sale before 2022.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

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

Mr. Chairman, my amendment is simple. It would prevent the Department of the Interior from preparing a new 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program that schedules leases before the year 2022.

Mr. Chairman, offshore drilling carries real consequences, from the industrialization of our coasts to the inescapable risk of another BP Deepwater Horizon-like disaster. Those risks can not be eliminated.

As Deepwater Horizon made clear, accidents can inflict damage of an almost unimaginable scale. BP has spent billions of dollars responding to that disaster.

That figure reflects liabilities that arose from massive and irreparable damage to our environment, permanent harm to economically essential industries, and countless other impacts on the Gulf Coast residents' quality of life. We have to make sure that other regions are never exposed to those kind of harms. That is why my amendment is important.

In the event of a drilling accident, thriving coastal economies could be decimated. Industries that rely upon a healthy marine environment—everything from the tourist trade to our fisheries—could disappear overnight.

If a spill were big enough—and we have seen that they can be enormous—the economic consequences would ripple throughout the national economy, hurting millions of Americans who live many miles from the sea. Again, we cannot afford such economic risks.

It is equally foolish to risk the natural beauty, fragile habitats, and irreplaceable species for the benefit of a few massive oil and gas companies.

Our coasts are home to some of our most iconic and unique wildlife. Healthy oceans are critical to traditional ways of life, having provided subsistence resources for many generations.

Those places, those species, those customs are part of why we live in the greatest country on Earth. No other place could match the richness and diversity of the United States of America. We must not endanger the incredible heritage in a quest for dirty energy, especially the kind of fuels that can drive catastrophic changes to our climate, with grave and permanent consequences for our society.

It is important to note that prohibiting the preparation of a new leasing program does not stop any of the currently scheduled lease sales until 2022 from happening. My amendment just puts us back on the regular schedule for writing the next plan.

Prohibiting the preparation of a new leasing program, however, does ensure that millions of taxpayer dollars are not spent reworking a plan that was just completed this year.

Restarting a new 5-year leasing process would throw away 2½ years and tens of millions of dollars of effort, ignore overwhelming bipartisan opposition from millions of people up and down our coasts, and eliminate the protections that President Obama provided for the fragile Arctic.

Mr. Chairman, the risk of a new 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program are simply too high and the consequences are too severe.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this amendment.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I certainly sympathize with many of the comments that the sponsor of this amendment has brought up. Certainly, none of us have any intention of trashing the environment, of causing environmental degradation in any of our coastal areas in the United States.

But the thing is that this amendment doesn't cut production. It would not result in any reduction in oil and gas exploration and production activities. And if it were to do that, then all that would happen is it would increase our dependence upon foreign imports of oil.

The reality and statistics are very clear. You are less safe transporting energy than you are producing it. The statistics are very clear. Putting it into a ship is less safe. Putting it into a pipeline is less safe than actually producing it. So you are not doing anything to benefit the environment.

The next thing is that, within approximately 1 month of the Obama administration's being sworn into office in 2009—as I recall, I believe it was on February 10—Secretary Salazar stood



up and said: We are rewriting the 5-year offshore leasing plan of the previous administration.

They walked right in and said: We are throwing this out.

Which the amendment's sponsor said was billions of dollars in implications and much planning.

It is exactly what the Obama administration did. So if the Trump administration chooses to take a fresh look at these resources and these resources, then I want to quote the Obama administration saying that these are offshore energy resources that belong to all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, I want to make one other note. If you read the amendment, it says that none of the funds made available in this act may be used to repair a 5-year offshore oil and gas leasing program that would schedule any Outer Continental Shelf oil and gas lease sale before 2022. This wouldn't just prohibit making changes to it, such as, perhaps, the idea of expanding it if public comments and other input found that that was the best thing to do, but it also would prevent slowing down the lease sale schedule.

Mr. Chairman, I urge opposition to this amendment. While I certainly support the gentleman's intent to prevent any type of environmental harm and degradation, I just want to say in closing that I was the lead trustee for the State of Louisiana in the Deepwater Horizon spill.

When you look at Outer Continental Shelf energy production, we had produced trillions of cubic feet of natural gas. We had produced billions of barrels of oil. What the courts found in the BP incident was that there was gross negligence and willful misconduct.

They didn't find that there were problems with the rules and other things. That is why, as the gentleman correctly stated, that they had to spend tens of billions of dollars paying for their gross negligence and willful misconduct, which is very different than the trillions of cubic feet of natural gas, and billions of barrels of oil that we have produced safely; we produced them in the United States; and we have not put them in pipelines and tankers in other less safe mechanisms of transportation.

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

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Chairman, what is the balance of my time?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 1½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT), the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chair, this amendment would prevent the Department of the Interior from performing a necessary and thorough review of the existing 5-year plan. Meanwhile, the

committee encouraged a review of the 5-year plan in the 2017 omnibus, which we just enacted just a few months ago. For these reasons and others, I certainly urge a "no" vote on this amendment.

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I just want to say that, once again, while I understand the gentleman's intent to prevent any type of environmental degradation—I think everyone shares that objective—the reality is that this amendment doesn't do anything to advance that objective. And potentially, should there be some type of emergent situation where you would want to slow down lease sales, this amendment would actually prohibit that from happening.

We should take a fresh look with public input and with the best science to determine where we produce, how we produce, to maximize domestic energy production, to maximize or to reduce dependence upon foreign energy, to maximize economic opportunities and employment opportunities in the United States.

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

Mr. MCEACHIN. Mr. Chairman, just briefly, of course, I was not here at the time, but it was my understanding that this is nothing unlike what the other side of the aisle did during the Obama administration. So what this amendment seeks to do, in many cases, is not that unusual.

And while the gentleman is correct, the size of the payments that BP had to make were because of a certain type of conduct: What we want to do is just freeze things where they are.

While I acknowledge that there is a possibility that somehow someone wanted to slow down the process, I don't believe that this administration would do just that.

Again, millions of dollars have been spent. Much time has been spent in developing this plan. I think we just need to leave it in place.

Mr. Chair, I ask 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 Virginia (Mr. MCEACHIN).

The amendment was rejected.

AMENDMENT NO. 66 OFFERED BY MR. GROTHMAN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 66 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

SEC. \_\_\_\_ . None of the funds made available by this Act may be used to implement, administer, or enforce the rule entitled "National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone" published by the Environmental Pro-

tection Agency in the Federal Register on October 26, 2015 (80 Fed. Reg. 65292).

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of my amendment to H.R. 3354. The purpose of my amendment is to prohibit use of funds made available by this act to implement, administer, and enforce the EPA's National Ambient Air Quality Standards for Ozone rule, which was originally published on October 26, 2015.

This rule will make the standards more stringent in other places, in the State of Wisconsin, up and down Lake Michigan, including counties such as Sheboygan County. As you make these standards more stringent—first of all, it makes no sense because they don't take in the fact that there are areas like mine in which the ozone is coming from outside my district.

For example, Sheboygan County, whatever they do, I don't think they could ever meet those standards because there is so much ozone coming up from the Chicago area. But there is an effect to these standards as well.

The standards make it more difficult for industry along Lake Michigan to operate, to comply with the standards, putting us at a competitive disadvantage not only with other parts around the country, but a competitive disadvantage compared to other areas around the world with much more pollution than we have. Right now our ozone is much less than it was when I was a child. Quite frankly, when I was a child, nobody complained anyway.

Another thing about these ozone standards, it is something that people who are looking out for that not particularly wealthy people should pay attention to. When you aren't meeting the standards, it creates a situation in which your owners of automobiles have to have their cars tested every year. And sometimes these cars have to go through very expensive repairs to meet the standards.

Now, there are people who are going to think that is no big deal because they are maybe wealthy Congressmen and they need to buy a car every 3 or 4 years and they don't have a problem. But if you are somebody who has a 10- or 15-year-old car, maybe you can only afford to spend \$500, \$1,000 on a car, and then once a year you have to get the car tested. You flunk the test and you have to put \$1,000 or \$1,500 into it. No wonder we have some people in this country who can't get ahead as long as the environmental extremists are running the EPA.

So, in any event, I think it would be good if we don't spend any more money implementing this new rule. Give the EPA more time to reconsider this rule and come up with something a little bit more reasonable.

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

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

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, while I understand the gentleman's intent, I share his concern with the 2015 ozone standards, the bill's language in the amendment goes a little too far. It ties this new administration's hands with respect to reconsideration or flexibility efforts that they are trying to build in at the present time.

Meanwhile, the ozone language in the underlying bill provides the necessary administrative relief for communities to comply with the overlapping 2008 and 2015 requirements. I think that this administration understands the complexities that are being imposed by this 2015 requirement. They are trying to deal with it. Mr. Pruitt has indicated that publicly.

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

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

The amendment was rejected.

□ 2315

AMENDMENT NO. 67 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 67 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

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

Time after time, the Federal Government refuses to follow the original in-

tent of the Endangered Species Act. The government designates land as critical habitat despite not meeting the ESA definition, and the government consistently refuses to remove plants and animals from threatened or endangered status even when these species are flourishing and are no longer in need of ESA protections.

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

Under the act, the purpose of a 5-year review is to ensure that threatened or endangered species have the appropriate level of protection. The reviews assess each threatened and endangered species to determine whether its status has changed since the time of its listing or its last status review and whether its status should be changed or maintained.

Because the act grants extensive protection to a species, including harsh penalties for landowners and other citizens, it makes sense to regularly verify if a plant or animal is being properly classified or should be delisted. Despite this commonsense requirement, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service has acknowledged that it has neglected its responsibility to conduct the required reviews for hundreds of listed species.

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

Now, I am sure you will hear the ranking member say that the problem is that there is simply not enough money to comply with the law, but the reality is that megasettlements and overzealous regulators have caused the number of species listed under the endangered species list to balloon to unmanageable levels. For the recovery of a threatened or endangered species or plant to be successful, we must prioritize our limited resources to where they are most critically needed.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in ensuring that the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service complies with the ESA and that we do not provide money in this bill that would violate current law. This exact amendment was added to the fiscal year '16 Interior Appropriations bill by voice vote and was added to the fiscal year '17 bill by a bipartisan rollcall vote.

Mr. Chairman, I ask Members to support this amendment for the third time, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

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

Ms. McCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Colorado is right. We have had this conversation in this Chamber, Mr. Chair, before. The Service does attempt to comply with the statutory mandate and to review the status of listed species every 5 years to determine whether or not it is classified as threatened or endangered.

It is correct. The Service has a backlog in reviews due to funding limitations. This year it is a 17 percent listing reduction contained in this bill so that they have been working on the backlog. But the Service still has only been able to complete 100 to 120 reviews per year, which is half of what is needed.

So in this bill, you and I might agree that there are things that could happen and that money isn't always the solution to a problem, but in this bill you might be surprised to know that it has cost another \$3.4 million, so that only builds up the backlog all the more.

That is not necessarily the fault of the chairman of the subcommittee, Mr. Chair. It is just the fact that the allocation that our subcommittee had to work with, tough choices had to be made. I know that the chairman was trying to balance a lot of things.

The gentleman talked about the court and the environment. I would love to have a conversation with the gentleman more about that, because it is my understanding—and I want to make sure I have it correct before we go into depth about it because, as the gentleman knows, we have a good relationship, and I want to make sure that I am correct when I say things—that actually some of the things that have been happening in court have actually helped to reduce some of the costs that the gentleman is thinking about because it is in place.

I will get the information, Mr. Chair, and share it with the gentleman later.

But the fact is that this amendment would not remove species without review from the list of species protected by the ESA so that the ESA's prohibition, again, would still remain, and it still would be the ability of citizens to sue or force compliance even with what the gentleman is proposing. So funding cannot be used to enforce the ESA for species with late reviews; it is going to leave the species unprotected.

Proposed language would prohibit the Service from working with the agencies. It would prohibit working with developers and landowners to comply, compliance to section 7 consultations or section 10 permits for Federal and private projects that could potentially affect the species. So as you can see, the other thing it doesn't do is the proposed language would not affect the ability of third parties to sue those agencies or landowners.

So I agree with the gentleman that we need to do a better job of making sure that these reviews are done in a timely fashion. I agree that, when a species has attained a classification where it is no longer threatened or it is no longer endangered, it should come off. So I think we have a lot in common.

But I think that the challenge with this amendment is that, without the funding, in order for the Service to do the job that it has to do, it just kind of puts the Service in a box in which we are saying you are not doing a good job and, therefore, we are going to start changing the way in which we proceed.

So I, right now, have to oppose this amendment. But as I said, in the policy committee I think that there is room for some of us to come together and to make improvement, but legislating this rider for 1 year at a time on this appropriations bill doesn't allow us to have the deep, transparent, and open discussion that we need to have to resolve your issue.

So at this time I oppose the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the gentlewoman's comments.

If we get additional resources in the future, I would love to make sure that Fish and Wildlife has the resources to make sure they meet their mandates, and they should meet them now.

One of the mandates they have is review the status of every listed species every 5 years and a corresponding change in the status if it is called for by those reviews. Instead of doing those reviews, in many cases, the Service chooses to spend the money to list more species.

If the government isn't willing to shoulder the responsibilities that come with listing species under the ESA, perhaps it shouldn't be listing those species in the first place. So I think they need to meet their obligations under the law.

I certainly support this amendment, and I encourage Members to support the amendment and vote for it.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for that statement.

I will say to the gentlewoman from Minnesota that I would love to work with her on this. I know that, in the Natural Resources Committee, we are going to be looking at some of the different facets of the Endangered Species Act, and I hope we can continue this dialogue.

This amendment seeks to make the agency comply with the law. That provision is in there for a reason, so let's enforce what Congress, in its wisdom, put into the law many years ago.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for support of the amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

The amendment was agreed to.

AMENDMENT NO. 68 OFFERED BY MR. LAMBORN

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 68 printed in House Report 115-297.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

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

LIMITATION ON USE OF FUNDS

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 504, the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Colorado.

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

Mr. Chairman, the Preble's meadow jumping mouse is a tiny rodent with a body approximately 3 inches long, a 4- to 6-inch-long tail, and large hind feet adapted for jumping. This largely nocturnal mouse lives primarily in streamside ecosystems along the foothills of southeastern Wyoming south to Colorado Springs, in my district, along the eastern ridge of the Front Range of Colorado.

To evade predators, the mouse can jump, like a miniature kangaroo, up to 18 inches high. In 1998, it leaped onto the Endangered Species list, a move that has hindered development from Colorado Springs, Colorado, to Wyoming.

Among projects that have been affected: the Jeffco Parkway southeast of Rocky Flats, an expansion of Chatfield Reservoir, and housing developments in El Paso County along tributaries of Monument Creek. Builders, landowners, and local governments in affected areas have incurred hundreds of millions of dollars in added costs because of this mouse.

Protecting the Preble's mouse has even been placed ahead of protecting human life and property.

On September 11, 2013, Colorado experienced a major flood event that damaged or destroyed thousands of homes, important infrastructure, and public works projects. As a result of the Preble's mouse being listed as an endangered species, many restoration projects were delayed as Colorado sought a waiver. In fact, FEMA was so concerned that they sent out a notice that stated: "Legally required review may cause some delay in projects undertaken in the Preble's mouse habitat." It went on to warn that "local of-

officials who proceed with projects without adhering to environmental laws risk fine and could lose Federal funding for their projects."

While a waiver was essentially granted, the scientific evidence simply does not justify these delays or the millions of dollars in taxpayer money that go toward protecting a mouse that is actually part of a larger group that roams throughout half of the North American continent.

Scientific studies have concluded that the Preble's mouse does not warrant protection because it isn't a subspecies at all and is actually related to the Bear Lodge jumping mouse. Even the scientist that originally classified this mouse as a subspecies has since recanted his work and agrees that the Preble's mouse subspecies designation is no longer defensible.

Moreover, the Preble's mouse has a low conservation parity score. What that means is that hundreds of millions of dollars have already been spent on protection efforts that could have and should have been spent on other more sensitive species.

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

This exact amendment was added to the fiscal year '16 Interior Appropriations bill by voice vote and was added to the fiscal year '17 bill by a bipartisan rollcall vote. Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this amendment for a third time.

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

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

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

□ 2330

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chairman, clearly, what this amendment does—and it is different from the other amendment—is prohibit the Fish and Wildlife Service from implementing or enforcing the threatened species listing of the Preble's meadow jumping mouse under the Endangered Species Act. It full-out restricts the Service from offering any critical protections to preserve the species.

Once a species like this is listed under the Endangered Species Act, the role of the Fish and Wildlife Service is fairly permissive. They can help parties comply with the act as they carry out their other activities.

The Service right now is reviewing and considering all the comments that they received during the public comment period, and a draft recovery plan is being worked through to develop a final recovery plan. But with this

amendment, the Service would not be able to continue to recover the species. All the Endangered Species Act prohibitions would still apply.

So, in other words, we would stop them from moving forward, but they would still be under jurisdiction to comply. They wouldn't be able to comply by working with agencies and land developers and landowners to provide the ESA compliance.

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

Another limitation that the Service would have would be undertaking the required status reviews of subspecies or initiating any rulemaking or downlisting or delisting species.

So now we are talking about deep dives into what the U.S. Fish and Wildlife may or may not be impacted by doing or helping landowners or developers on an appropriations bill.

Quite frankly, as I have been saying all night—and I understand people have the right to come here with these amendments—the Service has a responsibility to implement the Endangered Species Act. They are charged with fulfilling their legal requirements. When they don't fulfill their legal requirements, it makes them more vulnerable to lawsuits, which I know is not the goal of the author of this amendment, Mr. Chair. But when there are lawsuits incurred, it creates more costs for American taxpayers.

The gentleman's amendment would just undermine the Service's ability to work collaboratively with States and local communities. It opens the Service up for lawsuits and it would create even more uncertainty for landowners and make them vulnerable, as I said, to lawsuits.

I think we should be working to support the Fish and Wildlife efforts, not blocking the agency from doing its job and going back to what we discussed earlier, that is working through the committees of authorization, and then the authorizing committees having conversations with the Appropriations Committee on how they can achieve their goals, this being one of them.

Because of those reasons, I do not support this amendment. I thank the gentleman for bringing this forward, but at this time I cannot support it.

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

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) to weigh in on this issue.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to jump up and support this amendment. Obviously, the agency has not leaped fast enough and problems persist. So I encourage my colleagues to vote "yes" on this amendment, and

I know it will squeak by with a large margin.

Mr. LAMBORN. Mr. Chairman, I will conclude by saying there is one other sort of a temporary element in this whole episode. And that is when you go from Colorado into Wyoming, the mouse is no longer threatened or endangered. There is a political boundary line between the two States.

In its wisdom, the Fish and Wildlife Service says that if you go north far enough across the State line, it is no longer threatened or endangered. There is an element of arbitrariness that I think also calls into question why this was ever done in the first place.

Mr. Chairman, I would ask support 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 Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN).

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. LAMBORN) having assumed the chair, Mr. BERGMAN, 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. 3354) making appropriations for the Department of the Interior, environment, and related agencies for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes, had come to no resolution thereon.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. GARRETT (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today.

#### SENATE BILLS AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

Bills and a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 597. An act to increase Federal Pell Grants for the children of fallen public safety officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the workforce; in addition, to the Committee on the Judiciary; and to the Committee on the Budget for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

S. 652. An act to amend the Public Health Services Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 849. An act to support programs for mosquito-borne and other vector-borne disease surveillance and control; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

S. 1165. An act to designate the medical center of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Huntington, West Virginia, as the Hershel "Woody" Williams VA Medical Center; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. Con. Res. 23. Concurrent resolution authorizing the use of Emancipation Hall in the Capitol Visitor Center for a ceremony to present the Congressional Gold Medal to the Filipino Veterans of World War II; to the Committee on House Administration.

#### ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled a bill of the House of the following title, which was thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 624. An act to restrict the inclusion of social security account numbers on Federal documents sent by mail, and for other purposes.

#### SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 1616. An act to award the Congressional Gold Medal to Bob Dole, in recognition for his service to the nation as a soldier, legislator, and statesman.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 8, 2017, 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:

2397. A letter from the Acting Chairman, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Twenty-fourth Report to Congress on Progress Made in Licensing and Constructing the Alaska Natural Gas Pipeline, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 16523; Public Law 109-58, Sec. 1810; (119 Stat. 1126); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2398. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a Declaration of a Public Health Emergency and Waiver and/or Modification of Certain HIPAA, and Medicare, Medicaid, and Children's Health Insurance Program Requirements, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 247d(a); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 319(a) (as amended by Public Law 107-188, Sec. 144(a)); (116 Stat. 630) and 42 U.S.C. 1320b-5(d); Public Law 107-188, Sec. 143; (116 Stat. 628); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2399. A letter from the Deputy General Counsel for Operations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting a notification of a federal vacancy, nomination, and action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2400. A letter from the Archivist of the U.S., National Archives and Records Administration, transmitting the Administration's FY 2017 Commercial and Inherently Governmental Activities Inventory, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2401. A letter from the Associate General Counsel for General Law, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting four notices for a discontinuation of service in an acting role and a nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2402. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Maritime Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting a notification of a designation of acting officer, and action on nomination, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2403. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Special Local Regulation; Washburn Board Across the Bay, Lake Superior; Chequamegon Bay, WI [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0169] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received September 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2404. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone: Vengeance Sunken Barge, San Francisco, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0310] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2405. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone: Verdigris River, Catoosa, OK [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0514] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2406. A letter from the Attorney, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Drawbridge Operation Regulation; Cerritos Channel, Long Beach, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0473] (RIN: 1625-AA09) received September 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2407. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone: City of Benicia Independence Day Fireworks Display, Benicia, CA [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0323] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2408. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's interim rule — Anchorage Grounds; Lower Mississippi River below Baton Rouge, LA, including South and Southwest Passes; New Orleans, LA [Docket No.: USCG-2014-0991] (RIN: 1625-AA01) received September 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2409. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Safety Zone: City of Valdez 4th Fireworks, Port Valdez; Valdez, AK [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0092] (RIN: 1625-

AA00) received September 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2410. A letter from the Attorney, CG-LRA, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Pacific Ocean, Mamala Bay, Oahu, Hawaii — Hokulea Arrival [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0421] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2411. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; City of Oswego Independence Day Celebration; Lake Ontario, Oswego, NY [Docket No.: USCG-2017-0324] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received September 1, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 3326. A bill to increase accountability, combat corruption, and strengthen management effectiveness at the World Bank; with an amendment (Rept. 115-298). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SESSIONS: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 509. Resolution providing for consideration of the Senate amendment to the House amendment to the Senate amendment to the bill (H.R. 601) to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of assistance provided under the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to promote quality basic education in developing countries, to better enable such countries to achieve universal access to quality basic education and improved learning outcomes, to eliminate duplication and waste, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-299). Referred to the House Calendar.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico):

H.R. 3692. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to provide for additional flexibility with respect to medication-assisted treatment for opioid use disorders, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3693. A bill to repeal the debt ceiling; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BANKS of Indiana:

H.R. 3694. A bill to provide for an independent assessment of the future of cooperative threat reduction; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself and Mr. COFFMAN):

H.R. 3695. A bill to provide for the confidentiality of information submitted in requests for the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. RUSH, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 3696. A bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to award grants to establish, or expand upon, master's degree programs in orthotics and prosthetics, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK (for herself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. LABRADOR, and Mr. GOODLATTE):

H.R. 3697. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act with respect to aliens associated with criminal gangs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee (for himself and Mr. KIND):

H.R. 3698. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act to limit the overall rate of return for crop insurance providers and remove the requirement of budget neutrality in the Standard Reinsurance Agreement; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. KAPTUR (for herself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. EVANS, and Ms. ADAMS):

H.R. 3699. A bill to promote and enhance urban agricultural production and agricultural research in urban areas, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KIND (for himself and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3700. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend qualified zone academy bonds for 4 years and to reduce the private business contribution requirement with respect to such bonds; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. WELCH, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CLAY, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. CILLINE, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATY, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. CORREA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. EVANS, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. WILSON of Florida):

H.R. 3701. A bill to remove all statutes of individuals who voluntarily served the Confederate States of America from display in the Capitol of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. RUSH):

H.R. 3702. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide incentives for the expansion of manufacturing in the

United States; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3703. A bill to prohibit the employment of school bus drivers with serious moving violations; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. PALLONE (for himself and Mr. RUIZ):

H.R. 3704. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve behavioral health outcomes for American Indians and Alaskan Natives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Natural Resources, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 3705. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to require the use of certified mail and plain language in certain debt collection activities; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. RUIZ (for himself and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 3706. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to improve the public health system in tribal communities and increase the number of American Indians and Alaska Natives pursuing health careers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. SANCHEZ (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. KILMER):

H.R. 3707. A bill to establish a tax credit for on-site apprenticeship programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 3708. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to exclude from gross income de minimus gains from certain sales or exchanges of virtual currency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. BROWN of Maryland):

H.R. 3709. A bill to provide greater access to higher education for America's students; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. EVANS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 3710. A bill to reauthorize appropriations for the Jacob K. Javits Fellowship Program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GARRETT (for himself, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. COMSTOCK, Mr. BEYER, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. BRAT, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. TAYLOR, Mr. GOODLATTE, and Mr. WITTMAN):

H.J. Res. 117. A joint resolution condemning the violence and domestic terrorist attack that took place during events between August 11 and August 12, 2017, in Charlottesville, Virginia, recognizing the first responders who lost their lives while monitoring the events, offering deepest con-

lences to the families and friends of those individuals who were killed and deepest sympathies and support to those individuals who were injured in the attack, expressing support for the Charlottesville community, rejecting White nationalists, White supremacists, the Ku Klux Klan, neo-Nazis, and other hate groups, and urging the President and the President's Cabinet to use all available resources to address the threats posed by those groups; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico:

H. Res. 508. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 1084) to address slow economic growth and spur investment and development in underserved communities across America; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas (for himself, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. TSONGAS, and Mr. TURNER):

H. Res. 510. A resolution commemorating the 70th anniversary of the establishment of the Air Force as an independent military service and celebrating the Air Force for 70 years of serving and defending the United States; to the Committee on Armed Services.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 3692.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article One, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 3693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution under the General Welfare Clause.

By Mr. BANKS of Indiana:

H.R. 3694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8, Clause 12  
"The Congress shall have the power to raise and support armies"

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 3695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I; Section 8; Clause 1 of the Constitution states The Congress shall have Power To lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . .

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H.R. 3697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 4 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution—The Congress shall have

Power to establish a uniform Rule of Naturalization, and uniform Laws on the subject Bankruptcies throughout the United States.

By Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee:

H.R. 3698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8—this bill regulates Commerce among the several states.

Amendment V—the bill assures that citizens' liberty and property (their businesses and livelihood) are not deprived, that the government does not take property (market share, potential for profit and livelihood) without just compensation.

By Ms. KAPTUR:

H.R. 3699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. KIND:

H.R. 3700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 7, Clause 1

"All Bills for raising Revenue shall originate in the House of Representatives"

By Ms. LEE:

H.R. 3701.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I of the United States Constitution and its subsequent amendments, and further clarified and interpreted by the Supreme Court of the United States.

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 3702.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
According to Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Ms. MENG:

H.R. 3703.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 3704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Clause 18 of Section 8; Article I of the Constitution

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 3705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Clause 1 of Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mr. RUIZ:

H.R. 3706.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution

By Ms. SANCHEZ:

H.R. 3707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section 7

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 3708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 ("To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes");

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 ("To coin Money, regulate the Value thereof, and of



foreign Coin, and fix the Standard of Weights and Measures"); and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 ("To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any Department or Officer thereof.");

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia:

H.R. 3709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 3710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

By Mr. GARRETT:

H.J. Res. 117.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, U.S. Constitution

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
 H.R. 36: Ms. TENNEY.  
 H.R. 168: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. EVANS, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
 H.R. 173: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LUETKEMEYER, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. PEARCE.  
 H.R. 299: Mr. CUMMINGS.  
 H.R. 486: Mr. MCCAUL.  
 H.R. 496: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. POLIS.  
 H.R. 525: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. ESTES of Kansas.  
 H.R. 545: Mr. ESTES of Kansas and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.  
 H.R. 548: Mr. STIVERS.  
 H.R. 559: Mr. ALLEN.  
 H.R. 643: Mr. BROOKS of Alabama.  
 H.R. 762: Mr. ENGEL.  
 H.R. 771: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY and Mrs. DINGELL.  
 H.R. 807: Mr. BUCSHON.  
 H.R. 812: Mr. GRIJALVA and Mr. KENNEDY.  
 H.R. 820: Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. TIBERI, and Mr. EVANS.  
 H.R. 866: Mr. MEEKS.  
 H.R. 947: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama.  
 H.R. 991: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 1057: Mr. BANKS of Indiana.  
 H.R. 1148: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. DENT, and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.  
 H.R. 1243: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.  
 H.R. 1261: Mr. BYRNE and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.  
 H.R. 1276: Mr. GARAMENDI.  
 H.R. 1322: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.  
 H.R. 1334: Mr. MCCAUL.  
 H.R. 1406: Mr. BEYER and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
 H.R. 1413: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
 H.R. 1456: Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
 H.R. 1457: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. LUCAS.  
 H.R. 1468: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana and Ms. STEFANIK.  
 H.R. 1472: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
 H.R. 1516: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.  
 H.R. 1528: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 1556: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. DEFAZIO, and Mr. PERLMUTTER.  
 H.R. 1566: Mr. YARMUTH and Mr. CUMMINGS.  
 H.R. 1606: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.  
 H.R. 1639: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
 H.R. 1661: Mr. GARAMENDI.  
 H.R. 1664: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut.  
 H.R. 1676: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. HIMES, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. BERA, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.  
 H.R. 1739: Ms. MATSUI.  
 H.R. 1749: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.  
 H.R. 1796: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Mr. O'ROURKE.  
 H.R. 1810: Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota and Ms. GABBARD.  
 H.R. 1847: Mr. ROTHFUS.  
 H.R. 1861: Mr. MARCHANT.  
 H.R. 1864: Mr. HIMES.  
 H.R. 1865: Mr. MCGOVERN.  
 H.R. 1874: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut and Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 1896: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. RUTHERFORD.  
 H.R. 1897: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. RUTHERFORD.  
 H.R. 1898: Mr. KING of New York.  
 H.R. 2029: Mr. THORNBERRY.  
 H.R. 2133: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH, Mr. DESANTIS, and Mr. CARTER of Texas.  
 H.R. 2142: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.  
 H.R. 2148: Mr. COFFMAN.  
 H.R. 2197: Mr. KHANNA.  
 H.R. 2285: Mr. VALADAO.  
 H.R. 2287: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.  
 H.R. 2290: Mr. DOGGETT.  
 H.R. 2306: Ms. DELAURO.  
 H.R. 2310: Mr. GOODLATTE.  
 H.R. 2323: Mr. GOMEZ.  
 H.R. 2359: Mr. WILLIAMS.  
 H.R. 2401: Mr. DELANEY, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. VALADAO, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 2434: Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. PEARCE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. BLUNT ROCH-ESTER, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. DESAULNIER.  
 H.R. 2450: Mr. MARCHANT.  
 H.R. 2482: Mr. STIVERS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. VEASEY, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. HECK, Ms. HANABUSA, and Miss RICE of New York.  
 H.R. 2544: Ms. NORTON.  
 H.R. 2556: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
 H.R. 2661: Mr. CRAMER.  
 H.R. 2679: Mr. POLIQUIN.  
 H.R. 2723: Mrs. COMSTOCK and Mr. THORNBERRY.  
 H.R. 2740: Mr. KIHUEN.  
 H.R. 2788: Ms. DEGETTE and Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
 H.R. 2821: Ms. SÁNCHEZ.  
 H.R. 2851: Mr. MACARTHUR.  
 H.R. 2890: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. TIPTON.  
 H.R. 2901: Mr. MEEHAN.  
 H.R. 2907: Mr. CRAMER.  
 H.R. 2926: Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
 H.R. 2933: Ms. JAYAPAL.  
 H.R. 2954: Mr. DUFFY.  
 H.R. 2974: Ms. JAYAPAL.  
 H.R. 2995: Mr. BEYER, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. PETERS, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. POLIS, and Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas.  
 H.R. 3032: Mr. LOWENTHAL.  
 H.R. 3039: Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 3051: Mr. CLEAVER.  
 H.R. 3052: Mr. FITZPATRICK.  
 H.R. 3214: Mr. CÁRDENAS.  
 H.R. 3223: Mr. DESANTIS, Mr. POSEY, Mr. YOHO, and Mr. GAETZ.  
 H.R. 3271: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio and Mr. BUCSHON.  
 H.R. 3274: Ms. TITUS and Mrs. COMSTOCK.  
 H.R. 3282: Mr. HUIZENGA.  
 H.R. 3312: Mr. TIPTON, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. GOSAR, and Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.  
 H.R. 3314: Mr. KHANNA, Mr. WELCH, and Mr. TED LIEU of California.  
 H.R. 3325: Mr. NEWHOUSE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HECK, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
 H.R. 3334: Mr. EVANS.  
 H.R. 3394: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.  
 H.R. 3395: Mr. LANCE, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. DENT.  
 H.R. 3440: Mr. MOULTON, Mr. KIND, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. KILMER, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. PETERS, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. CRIST, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.  
 H.R. 3447: Mr. MEEHAN.  
 H.R. 3458: Mrs. NAPOLITANO.  
 H.R. 3459: Mr. HECK.  
 H.R. 3493: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.  
 H.R. 3497: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. LATTA, and Mr. COLE.  
 H.R. 3507: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
 H.R. 3536: Mr. GRIJALVA.  
 H.R. 3576: Ms. TENNEY, Mr. LAMALFA, and Ms. STEFANIK.  
 H.R. 3591: Miss RICE of New York.  
 H.R. 3635: Mr. MULLIN.  
 H.R. 3640: Mr. GALLAGHER.  
 H.R. 3668: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.  
 H.R. 3684: Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.  
 H.J. Res. 115: Mr. COHEN.  
 H. Con. Res. 28: Mr. LOUDERMILK.  
 H. Con. Res. 77: Mr. YARMUTH.  
 H. Res. 128: Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Mr. CARTWRIGHT.  
 H. Res. 220: Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. HANABUSA, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.  
 H. Res. 244: Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. KIHUEN, and Ms. NORTON.  
 H. Res. 257: Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. KATKO, Mr. FASO, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. TENNEY, and Ms. ROSEN.  
 H. Res. 274: Mr. POSEY, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, and Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico.  
 H. Res. 276: Ms. CASTOR of Florida.  
 H. Res. 401: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.  
 H. Res. 436: Ms. STEFANIK.  
 H. Res. 486: Mr. COHEN and Mr. GARRETT.  
 H. Res. 488: Mr. ELLISON.  
 H. Res. 490: Ms. JENKINS of Kansas and Mr. HURD.  
 H. Res. 496: Mr. SCOTT of Virginia and Mr. YARMUTH.  
 H. Res. 507: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.