



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 118th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 170

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, APRIL 30, 2024

No. 74

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. MILLER of Illinois).

DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,
April 30, 2024.

I hereby appoint the Honorable MARY E. MILLER to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

MIKE JOHNSON,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Margaret Grun Kibben, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, as we grieve the loss of one of our own, we meditate on Your unfailing name. As we mourn the death of Congressman Donald Payne, Jr., we give thanks that forever and ever You are our God, our guide even to the end.

Lead us in these days to give proper accounting to the faithfulness of Your servant. Following in his father's footsteps, the younger Representative Payne forged his own path, breaking ground on which You established his path of faithful service.

Thank You for raising up this devoted servant from Newark, New Jersey, to serve in the Nation's Capital, for equipping the Garden State Parkway fare collector to ultimately serve as a tenured Congressman, for adorning him not just with a bow tie, but with a large and generous spirit.

Grant Congressman Payne, Jr., rest from his labors and eternal respite from his earthly journey. May his wife, Beatrice; his children, Donald, Jack, and Yvonne find healing in the solace of Your presence and certainty in Your provision in the outpouring of the love

and support of his friends and colleagues.

In You, O Lord, do we each live and move and have our being. And in Your holy name we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mrs. FISCHBACH 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

SUPPORTING MILITARY FAMILIES AT BATTLE CREEK AIR NA- TIONAL GUARD

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

Mr. HUIZENGA. Madam Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Battle Creek Air National Guard's efforts to better support military families and their children in southwest Michigan.

One of the unique challenges military families face is where to get childcare,

especially during weekend drills. With this in mind, the 110th Wing's efforts to support families led to the establishment of the second Air National Guard Childcare Facility program.

Partnering with the Augusta Child Development Center, the program provides childcare for over 20 children of military members during regular and rescheduled drills.

Since the start of the program, the base has seen an increase in productivity and positivity that has allowed them to strengthen their mission readiness, retention, and talent management. It is wonderful to see the 110th Wing develop and lead this innovative approach to improve the lives of military families not only in southwest Michigan, but across the Nation.

As the Month of the Military Child comes to a close, I thank all of our servicemembers and applaud the Michigan Air National Guard's leadership and commitment to supporting their military families.

REMEMBERING ANTHONY J. SCALA, JR.

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

Mr. LAWLER. Madam Speaker, today, I rise to recognize Anthony J. Scala, Jr.

Anthony's unwavering commitment to excellence was evident in every facet of his life. From his distinguished career in electrical construction as president of Lowy & Donnath, to his dedicated service on so many advisory boards, including as a longtime member of the board of trustees at Manhattan College, my alma mater, Anthony's expertise and leadership left an indelible mark. He was a proud Jasper.

Beyond his professional endeavors, Anthony's true joy emanated from his cherished moments with family, his

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.

H2703

passion for boating, restoring his Jeep, and his craftsmanship as a builder. His love knew no bounds, evident in his role as a devoted husband to Mary Ellen; father to Anthony, Christopher, and Victoria; grandfather to Jackson, Ali May, Annaleigh, Anthony, and Evelyn; and as a good friend.

As we honor Anthony's memory, let us remember his kindness, generosity, and steadfast dedication to his loved ones and community. Though he may have left us, his spirit lives on in the hearts of all those who were fortunate enough to know him. May we carry forward his legacy of compassion and service as we bid farewell to a beloved friend. I will miss Anthony, as I know so many others will, too.

CONGRATULATING SHERIFF E.W. VIAR, JR., ON HIS RETIREMENT

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

Mr. GOOD of Virginia. Madam Speaker, I rise to recognize the service of former Amherst County Sheriff E.W. Viar, Jr.

Sheriff Viar completed almost 40 years of service in law enforcement, including 8 years as the sheriff of Amherst County. He led many successful public safety initiatives, including expanding the K-9 program, using drone technology, and ensuring that there were school resource officers in every school to protect our students.

Through his diligence and dedication to public service, Sheriff Viar worked tirelessly to create a safe county for all Amherst residents. I thank Sheriff Viar for his extensive career of service in law enforcement, and I wish him the very best in his retirement.

Sheriff Viar is an example of the courage and bravery demonstrated by each member of law enforcement who selflessly works every day to keep our communities safe. I am honored to represent those like Sheriff Viar serving in law enforcement in Virginia's Fifth District, and I thank them for their continued commitment and sacrifice.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 615, PROTECTING ACCESS FOR HUNTERS AND ANGLERS ACT OF 2023; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2925, MINING REGULATORY CLARITY ACT OF 2024; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3195, SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST RESTORATION ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 764, TRUST THE SCIENCE ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3397, WESTERN ECONOMIC SECURITY TODAY ACT OF 2023; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6285, ALASKA'S RIGHT TO PRODUCE ACT OF 2023; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6090, ANTISEMITISM AWARENESS ACT OF 2023

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1173 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1173

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House any bill specified in section 2 of this resolution. All points of order against consideration of each such bill are waived. The respective amendments in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in each such bill shall be considered as adopted. Each such bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in each such bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on each such bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 2. The bills referred to in the first section of this resolution are as follows:

(a) The bill (H.R. 615) to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture from prohibiting the use of lead ammunition or tackle on certain Federal land or water under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

(b) The bill (H.R. 2925) to amend the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1993 to provide for security of tenure for use of mining claims for ancillary activities, and for other purposes.

(c) The bill (H.R. 3195) to rescind Public Land Order 7917, to reinstate mineral leases and permits in the Superior National Forest, to ensure timely review of Mine Plans of Operations, and for other purposes.

SEC. 3. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 764) to require the Secretary of the Interior to reissue regulations removing the gray wolf from the list of endangered and threatened wildlife under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of

debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 4. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3397) to require the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to withdraw a rule of the Bureau of Land Management relating to conservation and landscape health. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-32 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 5. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6285) to ratify and approve all authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders issued pursuant to Federal law necessary for the establishment and administration of the Coastal Plain oil and gas leasing program, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources now printed in the bill, modified by the amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution, shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 6. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6090) to provide for the consideration of a definition of antisemitism set forth by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance for the enforcement of Federal antidiscrimination laws concerning education programs or activities, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the

Committee on the Judiciary or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Minnesota is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ), 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.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, we are here to debate the rule providing for consideration of six bills to support our natural resources, public lands, and outdoor recreation.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Committee on Natural Resources and provides each bill one motion to recommit.

The rule further provides for consideration of the Antisemitism Awareness Act under a closed rule, with 1 hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the Committee on the Judiciary and one motion to recommit.

□ 1015

First and foremost, House Republicans stand with Israel and are horrified by the increase in harassment on college campuses toward Israel and its allies. For years, Jewish college students have faced increasing anti-Semitism, and since October 7 there has been an over 300 percent increase in incidents on campuses.

Students are supposed to be protected from harassment, but it has been made abundantly clear that the leaders of these institutions are not going to do anything to stop it. Instead, they are allowing large-scale harassment to reign, forcing Jewish students to stay home.

Since these institutions refuse to protect their students, it is time for Congress to take action. H.R. 6090 clearly defines anti-Semitism according to the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance's working definition. This will empower universities to take clear steps to keep Jewish students safe and respond to hostile, hateful speech not protected under the First Amendment.

Additionally, the bills under this rule protect domestic energy production; reverse the Biden administration's stop to push mineral production in my home State of Minnesota; and, finally, delist the gray wolf from the endangered species list. I am proud to stand in support of these today.

The gray wolf is an ESA success story. Its numbers in most of the country are thriving to the point where they have become a menace across much of northern Minnesota. The only reason it has not been delisted as yet is because there are a handful of activist groups and judges that would like to keep it listed forever. Rather than pushing for radical environmental activism, we should be celebrating the fact that the ESA achieved its goal and gratefully turn management and conservation efforts back to the States.

Madam Speaker, America is home to a wealth of natural resources, but this administration and my colleagues on the other side of the aisle continue to wage war on domestic production. From energy in Alaska to minerals in Minnesota, the bills under this rule empower our domestic producers.

H.R. 6285 reverses Biden's decision to ban oil and gas development in the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska, supporting energy independence, good-paying jobs, lower fuel prices, and economic security that comes with it.

H.R. 3397 will ensure rural economies across the West maintain access to public lands for grazing, energy and mineral development, recreation, and timber production.

H.R. 615 upholds State wildlife management authority to protect against baseless claims that traditional lead fishing tackle and ammunition should be restricted.

H.R. 2925 would ensure responsible mineral development can continue on Federal lands. It unlocks mining projects across Western States, returning to the past 100 years of precedence and removing uncertainty created by the Rosemont decision from the Ninth Circuit.

H.R. 3195 helps the United States meet the rise in demand for critical minerals across the world by unlocking access to critical minerals in Minnesota. The Biden administration is leaving America at a disadvantage while adversaries, like China, work to expand their global influence. We cannot let this happen. We can be both good stewards of our public lands and take advantage of the many resources they provide.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

(Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Minnesota for the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

America was blessed by our creator with natural beauty and an abundance of natural resources—from grazing to farmlands, to minerals, fossil fuels, solar and wind—so we could feed our families and fuel our progress.

We owe the American people, and most importantly, our children and grandchildren a duty to protect those resources so they are available for fu-

ture generations and Americans are not left with public lands that have been degraded, mines that have been depleted, and profits shipped off to foreign corporations.

We owe a duty to those who love the forests and rivers in Minnesota or the rangeland in the Southwest to protect it and allow its use for recreation, grazing, and extraction.

The Natural Resources bills that Republicans have made in order with this rule fail to protect America's blessed creation for future generations. The bills would eliminate environmental protections and increase mining corporations' ability to take public lands from the American people for free.

Let me repeat that because Americans may not know that right now mining corporations—those big, profitable mining corporations—do not pay a dime in royalties when they take Americans' gold, silver, copper, or other precious minerals.

That takes me to H.R. 2925, the Mining Regulatory Clarity Act. The 1872 mining law that we operate under now is old. It needs updating. It gives away our public resources for free. In the arid West, it allows mining companies to use as much precious water as they want and doesn't require those big corporations to fully clean up after themselves.

Last week, I visited the Pecos Watershed, a vital resource for northern New Mexico communities and a river that flows to Texas. In that watershed, a foreign company had mined, polluted, and abandoned the people and the river that I visited.

We need to protect this type of land with these kinds of water resources, but H.R. 2925 would actually make it harder to protect this and other watersheds. It favors the biggest mining corporations and, even worse, favors foreign corporations.

We all know there is a long history of bad actors exploiting, misusing, and abusing their mining claims. H.R. 2925 would give away our Federal lands to these bad actors. Under the Republicans' proposal, corporations with the money could put four sticks in the ground, pay a fee, and then claim that land for mining without even proving the existence of minerals. The Republican proposal would also loosen restrictions so these corporations, even those based in countries like China or Russia, could more easily exploit American natural resources for free.

Why would Republicans work on a bipartisan basis to ban China from mining American data with TikTok but then be okay with China mining American natural resources for free?

In the Rules Committee, I introduced an amendment to prohibit our adversaries, like China, from taking our public lands and minerals. Sadly, every Republican on the Rules Committee voted against making in order these amendments to prevent foreign adversaries from accessing these valuable American resources.

I also introduced an amendment that would require mining corporations to make sure our waterways are not contaminated. Republicans blocked that, too.

Our current 150-year-old mining laws are not equipped for today's environmental challenges, but Republicans' response is to make it easier, not harder, for these greedy mining corporations to take what they want and leave their messes behind.

As if that weren't enough, this rule also makes in order what we should call the no public use on public lands act. This bill would overturn a new Bureau of Land Management rule that finally recognizes conservation and public land management as a value on par with other uses.

The BLM rule does not change their existing land management processes. BLM will continue to allow grazing, drilling, and other extraction on managed lands. What it does do is allow BLM to also include the important goal of conservation of the public lands as they consider new applications for Americans' public lands.

I might remind my Republican colleagues that they are turning their back on a great legacy, a great Republican legacy, from the Clean Water Act, the EPA, and the words of that great Republican President, Teddy Roosevelt, who said: "Conservation is a great moral issue, for it involves the patriotic duty of ensuring the safety and continuance of the Nation."

This patriotic goal of conservation and preservation is vital so our grandchildren can one day see the beauty that the West holds, and farmers and ranchers agree. They and other stewards of our land actively engaged with the Biden administration in the development of this rule. Congress should listen to the science and the stewards of this land on this issue instead of trying to dictate what is best for the West from D.C.

We should also continue President Biden's policy of ensuring our energy independence and security, all while growing American industry. I must also point out that the Biden BLM rule explicitly prevents foreign entities from holding conservation or mitigation leases, something that I might remember and remind our Republicans they were unwilling to do with regards to mining.

The rule also allows a bill that ignores science and would prevent regulation of lead-based tackle and ammunition. Didn't we learn our lesson with leaded gasoline and its harmful effects on people and the environment? Apparently not. Lead is poison.

We all have heard of and sometimes seen the death of bald eagles and other magnificent birds who have consumed even the smallest amount of lead buckshot or fragmented lead ammo. Lead finds its way onto hunters' and anglers' tables, too. One study found that there were lead fragments in 34 percent of ground venison burgers. Do you want your children to consume lead?

Every year, I make tamales for Christmas, and as my family has done for generations, we use wild game—deer, elk, and antelope—that has been hunted in New Mexico. We are grateful for lead-free ammunition because we don't want to poison ourselves or our environment.

This rule also makes in order a bill to undo the Biden administration's work to protect one of the world's most fragile and significant ecosystems, the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge.

In recent years we have seen record amounts of oil and gas production in the United States. We are the top producer of oil in the world right now. We can do that while also preserving the beautiful lands that make "America the Beautiful" the right song to sing.

Finally, Madam Speaker, I want to address the issue of anti-Semitism not just on college campuses but also across the country since October 7. Let me be clear: Anti-Semitism and hate in any form is simply unacceptable anywhere in our country. This rise in hatred across the United States should be a wake-up call for our democracy.

However, last fall, House Republicans proposed a 25 percent budget cut to the office that is actively investigating incidents of anti-Semitism on campuses. If you care about anti-Semitism, why do you take away the resources from the office that is prosecuting those kinds of claims?

Well, yesterday we got an answer why. My Republican Rules Committee colleague, Representative MASSIE, was very honest describing what this bill really is about when he said: "Everybody has introduced almost at this point a bill to deal with something along these lines since October 7. None of them actually get to anything real. I think it is a political ping-pong game, of course. We"—meaning Republicans—"get to serve every time, and a lot of these"—meaning resolutions like this—"are just political traps. I call them sticky traps designed to split the Democratic Party and get them stuck in the sticky trap."

I thank Mr. MASSIE for his refreshing honesty and candor, but if we wanted to actually do something real, we could. Rather than doing a sticky trap, we could take up my colleague Congresswoman MANNING's bipartisan bill, H.R. 7921, the Countering Anti-Semitism Act, which would designate a senior official at the Department of Education to counter anti-Semitism on college campuses, among many other solutions that are also based on Biden's policy regarding attacking anti-Semitism. If we want to deal with anti-Semitism on college campuses, I suggest a bill with real solutions is a good place to start.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1030

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. LAWLER).

Mr. LAWLER. Madam Speaker, it is good to know that my Democratic colleague would rather children in Congo mine for cobalt than to create American jobs here and put in place environmental safeguards. I thank my colleague for putting that on the record.

Madam Speaker, today, I rise in support of the rule to bring my Anti-Semitism Awareness Act to the floor. I thank Chairman BURGESS, Chairman JORDAN, Leader SCALISE, and Speaker JOHNSON for their support for consideration of this bill and their leadership in combating anti-Semitism on college campuses.

What is happening on college campuses right now is horrifying. We have seen folks at these encampments telling Jews to go back to Poland, as if they weren't kicked out of their homes, murdered in cold blood, and sent to death camps less than a century ago. The leader of the protest at Columbia called for death to Zionists. There was a sign at George Washington calling for a final solution, which was the name of Hitler's plan to exterminate Jews. People are shouting that they are Hamas and calling for the burning of Tel Aviv to the ground. They chant for intifada and "from the river to the sea."

These are not peaceful protesters expressing their constitutional right to free speech. These are illegal encampments where demonstrators engage in harassment and urge violence against Jewish students, Jewish Americans, the U.S. Government, the Israeli Government, and more.

I unequivocally condemn the college administrators who haven't acted to quell these encampments and who have enabled their campuses to become unsafe environments for Jewish students.

At the Federal level, we must give the Department of Education the tools to identify and prosecute any anti-Semitic hate crimes committed and hold college administrators accountable for refusing to address anti-Semitism on their campuses.

This legislation defines anti-Semitism using the IHRA working definition and its contemporary examples so that there can be no confusion or interpretation when it comes to the heinous act of discrimination and violation of title VI of the Civil Rights Act. It has broad bipartisan support in the House and Senate and 59 cosponsors in the House, including over a dozen Democrats.

This is not about dividing Democrats. This has broad bipartisan support. If there are people in your Conference who embrace anti-Semitism, that is not our fault. That is something you should be rooting out.

When people engage in harassment or bullying of Jewish individuals, where they justify the killing of Jews or use blood libel or hold Jews collectively responsible for actions of the Israeli Government, that is anti-Semitic. There is no question about it.

It is unfortunate that we need to clarify that these actions are anti-Semitic, but it makes this bill that much more necessary. What is happening at Columbia, Yale, UCLA, and so many other schools is reprehensible and alarming, but it cannot be discouraging.

We must act so that the anti-Semitism on college campuses stops immediately. Our country's antidiscrimination laws must work for all of us, including Jewish students.

My Democratic colleagues are tripping all over themselves because of electoral politics. They are worried about votes in Michigan and Minnesota and trying to placate a pro-Hamas element of their party, people who are parroting Hamas talking points.

Literally, when I was at Columbia University last Wednesday with Speaker JOHNSON, Hamas endorsed the protesters on the campus grounds, saying that they are the future leaders of America. If those are the future leaders of America, God help us.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. LAWLER. Madam Speaker, we should be very clear: Charlottesville was wrong. January 6 was wrong. Taking over a courthouse in Portland was wrong. Burning down a police station in Minneapolis was wrong. Breaking in and seizing control of the library at Columbia University is wrong.

Let's call it all out and stop being a bunch of cowards. Anti-Semitism needs to be rooted out, and any Member who votes against this bill should hang their head in shame.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, how dare the party of Donald Trump and MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE come down here and lecture Democrats about anti-Semitism. Remember, the leader of the Republican Party, Donald Trump, dines with Holocaust deniers and said there were "fine people on both sides" at a rally where white supremacists chanted: "Jews will not replace us." Representative MARJORIE TAYLOR GREENE appeared on stage at a white nationalist rally alongside a Holocaust denier. She tweeted anti-Semitic videos and talks about Jewish space lasers.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from Politico titled: "Donald Trump dined with white nationalist, Holocaust denier Nick Fuentes."

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

There was no objection.

[From POLITICO, Nov. 25, 2022]

DONALD TRUMP DINED WITH WHITE NATIONALIST, HOLOCAUST DENIER NICK FUENTES

(By Meridith McGraw)

Former President Donald Trump hosted white nationalist and antisemite Nick

Fuentes at his Mar-a-Lago resort in Palm Beach on Tuesday night, according to multiple people familiar with the event.

Fuentes, who frequently posts racist content in addition to Holocaust revisionism, was brought as a guest of rapper Kanye West, who now goes by Ye.

In a post to his social media site, Trump confirmed the gathering.

"This past week, Kanye West called me to have dinner at Mar-a-Lago," he wrote. "Shortly thereafter, he unexpectedly showed up with three of his friends, whom I knew nothing about. We had dinner on Tuesday evening with many members present on the back patio. The dinner was quick and uneventful. They then left for the airport."

However eventful, the dinner reflects a remarkable moment in an extremely early 2024 campaign cycle: the frontrunner for the Republican presidential nomination breaking bread with a man who frequently posts racist content and Holocaust revisionism, brought there by a rapper who is launching his own presidential campaign under the shadow of his own antisemitic remarks.

"If it was any other party, breaking bread with Nick Fuentes would be instantly disqualifying for Trump," said Democratic National Committee spokesperson Ammar Moussa. "The most extreme views have found a home in today's MAGA Republican party."

In a statement, the White House said, "Bigotry, hate, and antisemitism have absolutely no place in America—including at Mar-A-Lago. Holocaust denial is repugnant and dangerous, and it must be forcefully condemned."

It underscores how few guardrails currently exist within the former president's political operation, with few aides there to screen guests or advise against and manage such gatherings.

Indeed, after POLITICO first reported the sighting of Fuentes at Trump's club, people in Trump's orbit denied the former president met with Fuentes at all. Only later was it revealed that he not only met with Fuentes but dined with him.

Karen Giorno, a former Trump strategist who is also now working for West's 2024 campaign, confirmed to POLITICO that she was also at the dinner with Trump, West and Fuentes.

Fuentes, who was present at the Charlottesville "Unite the Right" rally in 2017, has made a series of offensive and racist statements on his shows including that Trump was wrong to disavow white supremacy. He has been removed from YouTube and other social media sites. Trump's dinner with Fuentes comes just one week after the former president announced he is seeking re-election, and soon after West publicly made a series of antisemitic comments that cost him millions in endorsement deals.

In a separate statement, Trump denied knowing who Fuentes was, stating that the "dinner meeting was intended to be Kanye and me only, but he arrived with a guest whom I had never met and knew nothing about." Both that statement and the Truth Social post did not include a denunciation of West's or Fuentes' recent comments.

West discussed the dinner in a video titled "Mar-a-lago debrief," which he posted to Twitter. In it, he said that Trump was "impressed by Fuentes" because "unlike so many of the lawyers and so many people that he was left with on his 2020 campaign, he's actually a loyalist."

West went on to say he told Trump, "Why when you had the chance, did you not free the January sixers? And I came to him as someone who loves Trump."

And I said, 'Go and get Corey [Lewandowski] back, go and get these people

that the media tried to cancel and told you to step away from.'" The video includes photos of former advisers including Giorno and Roger Stone, and also conspiracy theorist Alex Jones.

Describing the event to Milo Yiannopoulos, a far-right provocateur who he hired to help with his campaign, West said that he also asked Trump to be his running mate in 2024, and said that Trump was "screaming" at him during the dinner, and that the former president called his ex-wife profanities.

"When Trump started basically screaming at me at the table, telling me I was going to lose. I mean, has that ever worked for anyone in history? I'm like, whoa, whoa, hold on, hold on Trump, you're talking to Ye," West said.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD an article from The Atlantic titled: "Trump Defends White-Nationalist Protesters: 'Some Very Fine People on Both Sides'."

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

There was no objection.

[From The Atlantic, Aug. 15, 2017]

TRUMP DEFENDS WHITE-NATIONALIST PROTESTERS: 'SOME VERY FINE PEOPLE ON BOTH SIDES'

(By Rosie Gray)

President Trump defended the white nationalists who protested in Charlottesville on Tuesday, saying they included "some very fine people," while expressing sympathy for their demonstration against the removal of a statue of Confederate General Robert E. Lee. It was a strikingly different message from the prepared statement he had delivered on Monday, and a reversion to his initial response over the weekend.

Speaking in the lobby of Trump Tower at what had been billed as a statement on infrastructure, a combative Trump defended his slowness to condemn white nationalists and neo-Nazis after the melee in central Virginia, which ended in the death of one woman and injuries to dozens of others, and compared the tearing down of Confederate monuments to the hypothetical removal of monuments to the Founding Fathers. He also said that counterprotesters deserve an equal amount of blame for the violence.

"What about the alt-left that came charging at, as you say, at the alt-right?" Trump said. "Do they have any semblance of guilt?"

"I've condemned neo-Nazis. I've condemned many different groups. But not all of those people were neo-Nazis, believe me," he said.

"You had many people in that group other than neo-Nazis and white nationalists," Trump said. "The press has treated them absolutely unfairly."

"You also had some very fine people on both sides," he said.

The Unite the Right rally that sparked the violence in Charlottesville featured several leading names in the white-nationalist alt-right movement, and also attracted people displaying Nazi symbols. As they walked down the street, the white-nationalist protesters chanted "blood and soil," the English translation of a Nazi slogan. One of the men seen marching with the fascist group American Vanguard, James A. Fields, is charged with deliberately ramming a car into a crowd of counterprotesters, killing 32-year-old counterprotester Heather Heyer.

Trump on Tuesday made an explicit comparison between Confederate generals and Founding Fathers such as George Washington and Thomas Jefferson. "Many of

those people were there to protest the taking down of the statue of Robert E. Lee,” Trump said. “This week, it is Robert E. Lee. And I notice that Stonewall Jackson is coming down. I wonder, is it George Washington next? And is it Thomas Jefferson the week after? You know, you have to ask yourself, where does it stop?”

The substance of Trump’s unscripted remarks hewed more closely to his initial reaction to Charlottesville on Saturday, when he blamed “many sides” for what happened. On Monday, after two days of relentless criticism, Trump gave a stronger statement, saying “racism is evil” and specifically condemning white supremacists, the Ku Klux Klan, and neo-Nazis. Speaking to reporters shortly afterward, white nationalist Richard Spencer told reporters he didn’t see Trump’s remarks as a condemnation of his movement.

Tuesday’s appearance made it even clearer that those words had been forced on the president. Throughout his campaign, he was reluctant to disavow the white nationalists who have formed a vocal segment of his supporters. Asked if he had spoken to Heyer’s family in the days since her death, Trump said “we will be reaching out.”

Trump also addressed swirling rumors about the status of his chief strategist, Steve Bannon, who has come in for another round of speculation this week that his job may be in danger. Trump is reportedly angry about the recent book Devil’s Bargain, by the Bloomberg Businessweek writer Joshua Green, which portrays Bannon as the key reason for Trump’s election victory.

The president defended Bannon as having been unfairly attacked as a racist in the press, but declined to say if he still has confidence in him.

“I like Mr. Bannon, he is a friend of mine,” Trump said. “But Mr. Bannon came on very late. You know that. I went through 17 senators, governors, and I won all the primaries. Mr. Bannon came on very much later than that. I like him. He is a good man. He is not a racist, I can tell you that. He is a good person. He actually gets very unfair press in that regard. We’ll see what happens with Mr. Bannon. But he is a good person, and I think the press treats him, frankly, very unfairly.”

The remarks echo what Trump told the New York Post earlier this year during a similar moment of uncertainty about Bannon’s position. “I like Steve, but you have to remember he was not involved in my campaign until very late,” Trump told the Post in April.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I would like to enter into the record, actually, my objection to this absurd attack on Democrats for pointing out that this bill has in the title “anti-Semitism,” but there are problems with it.

We need to address anti-Semitism and look at the root causes. Instead, what are we doing? We are debating codifying a definition that numerous Jewish organizations, including Jewish Action, the Jewish Council for Public Affairs, and the New Israel Fund, among others, oppose.

The reason these organizations oppose it is because we cannot equate criticism of Israeli policies with anti-Semitism. They are two very different things.

We need to remember that we are constitutionally bound to protect free speech, even, and more importantly, when it is speech with which we do not agree.

Yesterday, for example, in the Rules Committee hearing for this bill, Representative FRY called Prime Minister Netanyahu’s work in Gaza remarkable. He praised it. I personally don’t think it is remarkable that over 35,000 people, most of them children and women, are dead. I don’t think it is remarkable that over 130 hostages are still not home.

Netanyahu is being protested in his own country for these and many other things. I don’t think it is remarkable that 27 kids have already died of malnutrition and that famine is imminent for 1.1 million Gazans.

Saying none of this is anti-Semitic.

I am Catholic with Sephardi heritage, and I think that my love that comes from the teaching and my spirituality calls upon me to talk about these things. That is not anti-Semitic.

That is the worry that these Jewish organizations, ACLU, and others talk about today. If we really want to move forward on combating anti-Semitism, let’s fund the office that investigates and takes action against those colleges that fail to protect their students. Let’s move forward with Congresswoman MANNING’s bipartisan bill, H.R. 7921, the Countering Antisemitism Act.

We should investigate how these issues continue to seep into our schools and communities.

We could do real work to address these root causes. Instead, we’re debating a definition that numerous Jewish organizations, including Jewish Action, The Jewish Council for Public Affairs, and the New Israel Fund, oppose.

The reason these organizations oppose it is because we cannot equate criticism of Israeli policies with Antisemitism. That is free speech.

Yesterday, in the Rules Committee Hearing for this very bill, Representative FRY called Prime Minister Netanyahu’s work during this war “remarkable.”

I don’t think it’s remarkable that over 35,000 people are dead.

I don’t think it’s remarkable that over 130 hostages are still not back home today.

I don’t think it’s remarkable that 27 kids died of malnutrition or that Famine is imminent for 1.1 million Gazans.

Saying all of this could be construed as antisemitic if we adopt the definition we’re debating today.

That is not helping us move forward or address the scourge of antisemitism that’s hurting our students and their families.

To move us forward in the fight against antisemitism, we could consider Congresswoman MANNING’s bipartisan bill H.R. 7921, the Countering Antisemitism Act.

This bill would designate a senior official at the Department of Education to counter antisemitism on college campuses, among other solutions.

We could increase funding at the Office for Civil Rights so the office has the resources to actually investigate and address antisemitism on college campuses.

If we want to deal with antisemitism on college campuses then I would suggest that these are good places to start.

Madam Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up H.R. 17, a

bill to help with pay disparities for women in the workforce and strengthen our economy.

Madam Speaker, rising costs are affecting American families and the American worker, but instead of helping families put more money in their pockets to save for retirement, to send their kids to college, or to simply put food on the table, House Republicans are focused on helping Big Oil and Big Mining corporations.

My colleagues constantly talk about the economic hardship Americans face, but instead of bringing legislation to actually address that, nearly every bill in this rule would create a corporate giveaway at the expense of our public lands.

We see where their real priorities are—with the biggest corporations, foreign corporations, even Chinese corporations—but House Democrats are focused on the American people.

That is why we must bring up H.R. 17, the Paycheck Fairness Act, to address the wage gap for women of this country and make sure families aren’t cheated out of dollars and paychecks that they deserve.

Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with any 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 Mexico?

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, to discuss our proposal.

Ms. DELAURO. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding time.

Madam Speaker, today, Americans are living paycheck to paycheck. They struggle with the high cost of living and wages that are not rising fast enough to keep up. Instead of addressing the real challenges that face American families, my Republican colleagues are wasting time with messaging bills.

Madam Speaker, the gentleman on the other side of the aisle may recall that for a recent continuing resolution, he voted against a billion dollars in aid to Israel. The gentleman from New York voted against a billion-dollar increase in aid to Israel.

If we defeat the previous question, I will bring up H.R. 17, the Paycheck Fairness Act, to ensure women are paid fairly for their work.

On average, a woman still earns only 84 cents for every dollar that a man makes, according to the American Association of University Women. The disparity is even worse for women of color.

The pay gap exists in every State, regardless of geography, occupation, education, or work patterns.

This is not just a problem for a few years out of a woman's career. It is a systemic disadvantage that compounds over a lifetime. This gap can put women hundreds of thousands of dollars behind in earnings over their careers and, in turn, severely reduce the amount they receive from Social Security, pensions, or investments after their working years are over. That puts more strain on working families and our safety net as a whole to support them in their older years.

Unequal pay is not just an issue of fairness. It is a major economic burden on families across the country.

America is in a cost-of-living crisis for many reasons. Families are living paycheck to paycheck. They can't pay their bills. They can't put food on the table. They can't get the healthcare they need for themselves and their families.

This cost-of-living issue, if you continue to deal with unequal payment for women in our workforce, only adds to economic insecurity.

The pay gap persists because of loopholes in the Equal Pay Act. The Paycheck Fairness Act fixes those loopholes by mandating better data collection, protecting employees against retaliation for discussing wages or salaries, and removing obstacles to lawsuits that challenge systemic discrimination. In short, it gives the Equal Pay Act the teeth that it needs to get the job done.

At the end of the day, it is really this simple: Men and women in the same job deserve the same pay. It is true in the House of Representatives, but not true pretty much everywhere else in this country. If we truly believe that, we should act on it.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I am disturbed by my colleagues who are shameless enough to argue in favor of anti-Semitism. It is not covered by the First Amendment. It is hateful.

Universities have been rewarding bad behavior and punishing the ones being attacked, who now don't feel safe enough to go to class. This cannot be the norm.

I am disappointed in the universities that are standing by and allowing this and equally disappointed in my colleagues who do not see it as a problem.

Stopping anti-Semitism is not a messaging tactic like the other side implies. Stopping anti-Semitism is something we must do.

Madam Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. MILLER).

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Madam Speaker, what is really sad for me is that, on both sides of the aisle, we have issues. I think some of my colleagues on my side of the aisle have Russian disinformation, and on the other side of the aisle, it seems that there is a lot of Hamas disinformation. I truly do not understand why it is so hard to just call it out. I digress.

□ 1045

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of the Antisemitism Awareness Act.

Requiring the Department of Education to use the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance working definition of anti-Semitism when enforcing Federal anti-discrimination laws will help to protect Jewish students across the country from violence and hate as we see it exploding every single day within our country.

Anti-Semitism has spread like wildfire on college campuses, and it is rearing its ugly head in the wake of Hamas' ruthless attack on Israel.

College students celebrate terrorists who brutally murder innocent civilians as martyrs, and faculty members call Hamas' assault exhilarating.

When I saw a sign at the Columbia protest—if you want to call it a protest—the sign said: “Free Palestine,” and right next to it, it said: final solution.

What does the “final solution” mean, I ask my colleagues across the aisle? I understand it is rhetorical, but you all know what final solution means.

Me being just one of two Jewish Republicans in the House and in the Senate, that means the end of Israel and the Jewish people. That is why that is in the definition of the IHRA, to be abundantly clear.

The abhorrent behavior underscores the clear need for Federal policy to protect Jewish students on these unfriendly campuses.

Usage of the IHRA definition in this context is a key step in calling out anti-Semitism where it is and ensuring anti-Semitic hate crimes on college campuses are properly investigated and prosecuted. College campuses should be safe havens for learning, not nests of hatred.

I urge my colleagues to say enough is enough and to support the Antisemitism Awareness Act.

I will ask my other colleagues on the other side of the aisle just one more time. When you see a sign—and you are Jewish in this country—on a college campus, and you say that being an anti-Zionist is not being an anti-Semitic—which being an anti-Zionist is being an anti-Semite, to be very clear—but when you see “final solution,” I think you have a hard time accepting, especially when my family, almost two-thirds of them, were annihilated at Auschwitz.

We came to this country, and now my daughter is going to grow up in this world and look at a sign that says, “final solution?”

I speak for myself. I speak for no one else. It is abhorrent, and you all need to condemn this type of behavior and rhetoric that has consumed our country.

Enough is enough. Please. Just be a human and put your politics and political affiliation aside for a second.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members on both sides of the aisle to address their re-

marks to the Chair and not to each other in the second person.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I just want to make the record clear. Democrats and President Biden have repeatedly and constantly, and not just since October 7, condemned anti-Semitism and taken actual actions to actually address it, and that is the problem with what we are hearing.

As their own Rules Committee member has said it, these are about sticky bills. They are not about getting solutions.

We must remember that most of the bills in the rule today are actually talking about our natural resources and how Republicans want to turn the clock back on the progress that Americans have been demanding for decades to protect our natural beauty but also to protect our natural resources for Americans.

I want to talk a little bit about mining reform, a 1872 mining law that says it all. That law is way too old and needs fixing. Well, how do we make sure we go about fixing it?

The Republicans' proposal is to just give more of it away. It makes it easier for foreign corporations and for big, greedy corporations to take that land, to take those natural resources.

What do Democrats propose? We propose responsible mining reform that allows for critical minerals to be extracted without destroying our environment.

My good friend and ranking member, the former chair of the House Natural Resources Committee, introduced the Clean Energy Minerals Reform Act, of which I am a cosponsor.

That kind of bill would require annual rental payments for claimed public lands, treating mine operators the same way we treat oil and gas or any other ones. Let's make them pay for our resources. They belong to us.

Imagine if the \$300 billion in profits that is going to those foreign corporations went to Americans instead.

We would set a royalty rate of not less than 5 percent and not greater than 8 percent, based on gross income.

We would make sure that there would be a reclamation fund, so when the mining companies go in there and make their mess that there would be a way for us to clean it up.

I can tell you, New Mexico is littered. In Colorado, all the intermountain areas are left with these abandoned mines that leach acid into our rivers and streams and make it so that we cannot hike and camp on those lands.

I have picked up those rocks that when they are exposed to air and water create sulfuric acid, and they leave piles of them.

Those are the things that we must be doing. We must give the Secretary of the Interior the right to protect our public lands, to protect the waters of Minnesota, right, and to protect the waters of this great country.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KEAN), my colleague.

Mr. KEAN of New Jersey. Madam Speaker, I thank Mrs. Fischbach from the Rules Committee for yielding me time.

Madam Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and in support of H.R. 6090, the Antisemitism Awareness Act, introduced by Mr. LAWLER from New York.

On October 7, 2023, Hamas launched a brutal surprise attack on the State of Israel in which 1,200 Israeli citizens lost their lives. This represented the most significant attack on Israel since the Yom Kippur War.

After those attacks, there was a massive increase and an outpouring of hatred toward the State of Israel and an increase in anti-Semitism.

Let's look at the facts. According to data from the Anti-Defamation League, from October 7, 2023, until the end of last year, there were more than 5,204 anti-Semitic incidents tracked by the ADL—more than the whole of 2022 in more than 2 months.

Unfortunately, there has been no greater breeding ground for anti-Semitism than on the campuses of our Nation's colleges and universities.

Jewish parents across my district and across this country are concerned for their children away at college.

Jewish students should feel safe on college campuses. The anti-Semitic actions on college campuses across this country and a muted response from university administrators is absolutely unacceptable.

While I respect the right to free speech as guaranteed by the First Amendment, the situation on campuses across the country has simply gotten out of control.

Unfortunately, the Biden administration has not taken the steps needed to adequately protect Jewish students, and I am glad that we, as Congress, are taking this important step.

If colleges and universities are not willing to take the steps necessary to combat anti-Semitism and to protect their own students, we must ensure that there are consequences.

Madam Speaker, I urge adoption of the rule and passage of this bill.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

The natural resources bills that we are dealing with here today, as I pointed out, are a great gift to big mining corporations and overturn decades of work by local organizations and by the public in these areas who want to see their lands protected.

What is interesting is Republicans are putting forward these bills, even though the American public and their own constituents are not interested in seeing what they are doing.

While Republicans are helping out the big mining corporation fans, their constituents want the opposite.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the article titled: "Analysis: Public Comments Overwhelmingly Support BLM Public Lands Rule."

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

There was no objection.

ANALYSIS: PUBLIC COMMENTS OVERWHELMINGLY SUPPORT BLM PUBLIC LANDS RULE

DENVER.—A new statistical analysis of more than 150,000 public comments finds nearly universal support for the Bureau of Land Management's proposed Conservation and Landscape Health Rule, colloquially known as the Public Lands Rule.

The Center for Western Priorities performed a sentiment analysis on a random sample of 10,000 public comments submitted to regulations.gov as of the morning of July 5, 2023, in the closing hours of a 90-day public comment period.

CWP's analysis found 92 percent of the comments encouraged the Interior Department to adopt the Public Lands Rule as written or strengthen its conservation measures. 4.5 percent of comments encouraged the department to withdraw or significantly weaken the rule. Another 3.5 percent of comments did not express a clear opinion in support or opposition to the rule. The statistical analysis has a margin of error of ± 0.5 percent.

"This analysis shows overwhelming—though not surprising—levels of support for the Biden administration's conservation agenda," said Jennifer Rokala, executive director at the Center for Western Priorities. "Americans know that public lands are central to the Western way of life, and that they will play a pivotal role in the nation's response to the climate crisis. The support expressed during the comment period shows that the BLM is on the right track to restoring balance across the West."

The analysis used a combination of automated and manual classification of comments to categorize them as primarily "supportive," "opposed," or "neutral" on the proposed rule. The full set of analyzed comments and the toolchain used for the sentiment analysis are available online.

BLM's proposed Public Lands Rule would clarify how land managers across the West implement the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, known as FLPMA. The text of FLPMA's "multiple use" mandate has always placed conservation alongside other uses of public lands, including mining, oil and gas drilling, and grazing. But BLM's implementation of the law has never explicitly treated conservation as one of those uses. The proposed rule would bring BLM's implementation of the law in line with its text and congressional intent by providing guidance on the use of FLPMA's leasing authority to restore or conserve land to help BLM reach its goals. The proposed rule also increases the use of BLM's land health standards across all BLM lands, rather than just rangelands, and clarifies procedures for the identification and designation of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern (ACECs), another pillar in the text of FLPMA.

Despite a coordinated industry effort to kill or weaken the proposed rule, CWP's analysis found limited opposition in the public comments, with an estimated 7,000 out of 152,000 comments encouraging BLM to withdraw or weaken the rule. By contrast, an estimated 138,000 comments supported the rule and its goals. The estimated 5,000 comments that were neutral largely encouraged BLM to add specific language around wilderness or wild horses and burros to the rule without

expressing clear support or opposition to the overall goals of the rulemaking.

The sheer number of comments submitted reflect the passion Americans have for public lands. The comments CWP reviewed included coordinated campaigns by conservation and business groups, technical comments from governments and scientists, and even handwritten, heartfelt letters from public lands users.

"The public comments show that congressional attempts to short-circuit this rule are misguided," Rokala added. "The American people aren't falling for the fear-mongering and disinformation coming from the oil and gas industry, even if some members of Congress are. Voters want the Biden administration to restore degraded landscapes while also making sure public lands play a central role in our renewable energy future."

The Bureau of Land Management will review and use the public comments during the next step of the rulemaking process to revise, clarify, and improve the proposed rule. The revised rule would then be reviewed by the White House Office of Management and Budget before being finalized and published in the Federal Register. The revision process could take up to a year to complete.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, that analysis found that the Biden administration's Public Lands Rule received 92 percent of support in public comments.

Madam Speaker, 92 percent of the 150,000 Americans who commented on this rule agreed that the BLM is moving in the right direction by protecting our public lands.

Many of them were farmers, ranchers, and stewards of the land. In fact, one farmer said to me: I recognize how important it is to allow our land to recover so that we can use it in the future for grazing.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the following article titled: "The 2023 Conservation in the West Poll from Colorado College."

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, the article can be found here: <https://www.coloradocollege.edu/other/stateoftherockies/conservationinthewest/2023.html>

This survey found that 82 percent of voters across 8 Western States support the conservation of our public lands and waters. Let's listen to the people on the ground.

While Republicans want to mine the beautiful forests of Minnesota, constituents actually want to protect the area from sulfite or copper mining.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the article titled: "The Campaign to Save the Boundary Waters 2022 Post-Election Poll."

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, the article can be found here: <https://www.savetheboundarywaters.org/sites/default/files/resource-file/Campaign%20To%20Save%20The%20Boundary%20>

Waters%20____%202022%20Post-Election%20Poll%20Results.pdf

Madam Speaker, the poll found over 70 percent of Minnesotans support proposed legislation to permanently protect the boundary waters from risks associated with sulfite or copper mining.

The boundary waters are one of the most visited national recreational areas in the United States. I look forward to going and looking at those lakes and those rivers and those forests and how they are intertwined and how those canoes glide along their surfaces.

Minnesotans know what that beauty looks like, and they want to make sure that the mining that is proposed by the Trump administration—and I might remind people that the Trump administration overturned actions by Obama, so they could give two leases to a Chilean billionaire—a Chilean billionaire, who it so happens, was a landlord of the President's daughter.

These kinds of dealings with foreign corporations, we must say “no” to. Why would Minnesotans want to take their precious natural resources and have them leased so a Chilean billionaire can make even more money?

We are urging our Republican colleagues to listen to their constituents, to listen to the people who are speaking on these issues, to vote against these rules, and to vote against these bills.

Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time, and I am prepared to close.

Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Madam Speaker, the bills my Republican colleagues have proposed today threaten to overturn regulations put in place to make sure that we are responsible in our use of natural resources.

The Biden administration has worked to reverse many of the Trump-era policies that just help the rich get richer.

For too long, what we have seen in America is the rich keep getting richer, and it appears that Republicans, certain Republicans, but most definitely former President Trump favored the richest corporations.

In turn, I ask my colleagues to think about what our role is here in Congress. I remind my colleagues of these powerful words from the Conference of Bishops.

“We show our respect for the creator by our stewardship of creation. Care for the Earth is not just an Earth Day slogan, it is a requirement of our faith. We are called to protect people and the planet, living our faith in relationship with all of God's creation.”

□ 1100

It is possible to protect the planet and still be a leader in energy. In the last 3 years, the Biden administration has invested over \$18 billion toward Federal, State, local, and Tribal land conservation efforts in all 50 States.

Contrary to what my colleagues claim, the U.S. has had record oil and gas production under the Biden administration. We produced an average of 12.9 million barrels of crude oil, millions more than are coming out of Russia and Saudi Arabia.

Regulations are important. They prevent catastrophic environmental disasters, like the 137 oil spills that occurred during the second year of the Trump administration.

Remember, there will be no more elk to hunt, no more breathtaking lakes reflecting the sunlight to hike to, and no more oil and minerals to drill for if we do not listen to the experts about protecting our lands and waters. Wildlife protections and mining regulations are in place to make sure future generations of Americans can enjoy the same beautiful landscapes and profit off of America's resources.

Finally, I need to remind everybody, we all condemned October 7. We all have condemned Hamas. It is a terrorist organization. However, we have taken up these resolutions over and over again.

Once again, our Republican colleague has spoken the truth when he has said that these are sticky resolutions simply intended to divide the Democrats. Let's not work on division. Let's come together in love and a belief in each of our individual strengths to push back against the hatred that we see and to do it in a manner that is not partisan, that uplifts our morality, that uplifts our empathy for all, and that addresses all the forms of hatred that we see.

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

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

House Republicans trust the American people to be good stewards of the land. The amount of regulations in place under this administration is insulting, and it is economically unsound.

While China and our adversaries are bolstering their capabilities, the Biden administration is tying our hands behind our backs. The bills counter Federal Government overreach, empower producers, and protect our lands. I am proud to stand in support of these bills today.

The gray wolf should be taken off the endangered species list. The American people should be permitted to access the wealth of resources this land provides, and they should be trusted to manage their lands at the State level without the Federal Government breathing down their neck at every turn.

Finally, universities are failing to keep their Jewish students safe, so Congress is taking action.

Those in the Jewish community should know that House Republicans support them and condemn the failed actions of universities to intervene. I am hopeful that H.R. 6090 clarifies the definition of anti-Semitism so that these universities finally run out of ex-

cuses for their inaction. Stopping anti-Semitism is something we must do.

Madam Speaker, I support the rule and the underlying legislation, and I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1173 OFFERED BY
Ms. LEGER FERNANDEZ OF NEW MEXICO

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 7. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the bill (H.R. 17) to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide more effective remedies to victims of discrimination in the payment of wages on the basis of sex, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce or their respective designees; and (2) one motion to recommit.

SEC. 8. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 17.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Madam 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. LEGER FERNANDEZ. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1130

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VAN DREW) at 11 o'clock and 30 minutes a.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Jacobs	Miller (WV)	Scott
James	Miller-Meeks	Sessi
Jayapal	Moolenaar	Sewer
Jeffries	Moore (UT)	Sherri
Johnson (GA)	Moore (WI)	Sherr
Johnson (LA)	Moran	Simp
Johnson (SD)	Morelle	Slotk
Joyce (OH)	Moskowitz	Smith
Joyce (PA)	Moulton	Smith
Kamlager-Dove	Mrvan	Smith
Kaptur	Mullin	Smuc
Kean (NJ)	Murphy	Soren
Keating	Nadler	Soto
Kelly (IL)	Napolitano	Span
Kelly (MS)	Neal	Stans
Kelly (PA)	Neguse	Stant
Khanna	Newhouse	Staull
Kiggans (VA)	Nickel	Steele
Kildee	Norcross	Stefaf
Kiley	Norman	Stell
Kilmer	Nunn (IA)	Steve
Kim (CA)	Obernolte	Stric
Kim (NJ)	Ocasio-Cortez	Strov
Krishnamoorthi	Omar	Suozz
LaHood	Owens	Taka
LaLota	Pallone	Tenne
LaMalfa	Palmer	Than
Lamborn	Panetta	Thom
Landsman	Pappas	Thom
Larsen (WA)	Pascrell	Thom
Larson (CT)	Peltola	Timm
Latta	Pence	Titus
LaTurner	Perez	Tlaib
Lawler	Peters	Toku
Lee (CA)	Pettersen	Tonk
Lee (FL)	Pfluger	Torre
Lee (NV)	Phillips	Torre
Lee (PA)	Pingree	Trahan
Leger Fernandez	Pocan	Turne
Lesko	Porter	Unde
Letlow	Posey	Valad
Levin	Pressley	Van L
Lieu	Quigley	Van L
Lofgren	Ramirez	Van O
Loudermilk	Raskin	Varga
Lucas	Reschenthaler	Vasqu
Luetkemeyer	Rodgers (WA)	Vease
Luttrell	Rogers (AL)	Veláz
Lynch	Rogers (KY)	Wagn
Mace	Rose	Walbr
Malliotakis	Ross	Wasse
Maloy	Rouzer	Sch
Mann	Ruiz	Watc
Manning	Ruppersberger	Watc
Mast	Rutherford	Wats
Matsui	Ryan	Webe
McBath	Salazar	Webs
McCaul	Salinas	Wens
McClain	Sanchez	Weste
McClellan	Sarbanes	Wext
McCollum	Scalise	Willia
McGarvey	Scanlon	Willia
McGovern	Schakowsky	Willia
McHenry	Schiff	Wilso
Meeks	Schneider	Wilso
Menendez	Scholten	Wittr
Meng	Schrier	Wom
Meuser	Schweikert	Yaky
Mfume	Scott (VA)	Zinke
Miller (OH)	Scott, Austin	

Bean (FL)	Fry	McCormick
Biggs	Fulcher	Miller (IL)
Boebert	Good (VA)	Mills
Brecheen	Gosar	Mooney
Burchett	Hageman	Moore (AL)
Burlison	Harris	Ogles
Cammack	Harshbarger	Perry
Cline	Higgins (LA)	Rosendale
Cloud	Hunt	Roy
Clyde	Jackson (TX)	Self
Collins	Jordan	Spartz
Crane	Kustoff	Steube
Davidson	Luna	Tiffany
Doggett	Massie	Waltz
Donalds	McClintock	

NOT VOTING—21

Adams	Granger	Nehls
Blumenauer	Greene (GA)	Pelosi
Burgess	Grijalva	Smith (NE)
Caraveo	Kuster	Swalwell
Cole	Langworthy	Sykes
Curtis	Magaziner	Trone
Diaz-Balart	Molinaro	Wild

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ABANDONED WELL REMEDIATION
RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT
ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4877) to amend the Energy Policy Act of 2005 to direct the Secretary of Energy to carry out a research, development, and demonstration program with respect to abandoned wells, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. LUCAS) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 333, nays 75, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 157]

YEAS—333

Aderholt	Castro (TX)	Ferguson
Aguilar	Chavez-DeRemer	Finstad
Allred	Cherfilus-	Fischbach
Amo	McCormick	Fitzpatrick
Amodei	Chu	Fleischmann
Armstrong	Ciscmani	Fletcher
Auchincloss	Clark (MA)	Flood
Bacon	Clarke (NY)	Foster
Baird	Cleaver	Foushee
Balderson	Clyburn	Foxx
Balint	Cohen	Frankel, Lois
Barr	Connolly	Franklin, Scott
Barragán	Correa	Frost
Beatty	Costa	Gallego
Bentz	Courtney	Garamendi
Bera	Craig	Garbarino
Bergman	Crawford	Garcia (IL)
Beyer	Crenshaw	Garcia (TX)
Bice	Crockett	Garcia, Mike
Bilirakis	Crow	Garcia, Robert
Bishop (GA)	Cuellar	Gimenez
Blunt Rochester	D'Esposito	Golden (ME)
Bonamici	Davids (KS)	Goldman (NY)
Bost	Davis (IL)	Gomez
Bowman	Davis (NC)	Gonzales, Tony
Boyle (PA)	De La Cruz	Gonzalez,
Brown	Dean (PA)	Vicente
Brownley	DeGette	Gooden (TX)
Buchanan	DeLauro	Gottheimer
Bucshon	DeBene	Graves (LA)
Budzinski	Deluzio	Graves (MO)
Burgess	DeSaulnier	Green (TN)
Bush	Dingell	Green, Al (TX)
Calvert	Doggett	Guthrie
Carbajal	Duarte	Harder (CA)
Cárdenas	Duncan	Hayes
Carey	Dunn (FL)	Hern
Carl	Emmer	Hill
Carson	Escobar	Himes
Carter (GA)	Eshoo	Hinson
Carter (LA)	Espaillat	Horsford
Cartwright	Estes	Houlahan
Casar	Evans	Hoyer
Case	Ezell	Hoyle (OR)
Casten	Fallon	Hudson
Castor (FL)	Feeenstra	Huffman

Huizenga	Menendez	Scott (VA)
Hunt	Meng	Scott, Austin
Ivey	Mfume	Scott, David
Jackson (IL)	Miller (OH)	Sessions
Jackson (NC)	Miller (WV)	Sewell
Jackson Lee	Miller-Meeks	Sherman
Jacobs	Mills	Sherrill
James	Molinaro	Simpson
Jayapal	Moolenaar	Slotkin
Jeffries	Moore (UT)	Smith (MO)
Johnson (GA)	Morelle	Smith (NJ)
Johnson (SD)	Moskowitz	Smith (WA)
Jordan	Moulton	Smucker
Joyce (OH)	Mrvan	Sorensen
Joyce (PA)	Mullin	Soto
Kamlager-Dove	Nadler	Spanberger
Kaptur	Napolitano	Stansbury
Kean (NJ)	Neal	Stanton
Keating	Neguse	Stauber
Kelly (IL)	Newhouse	Steel
Kelly (PA)	Nickel	Stefanik
Khanna	Norcross	Steil
Kiggans (VA)	Nunn (IA)	Stevens
Kildee	Obernolte	Strickland
Kiley	Ocasio-Cortez	Strong
Kilmer	Omar	Suozzi
Kim (CA)	Owens	Takano
Kim (NJ)	Pallone	Tenney
Krishnamoorthi	Panetta	Thanedar
Kuster	Pappas	Thompson (CA)
LaHood	Pascarella	Thompson (MS)
LaLota	Peltola	Thompson (PA)
Lamborn	Pence	Titus
Landsman	Perez	Tlaib
Larsen (WA)	Peters	Tokuda
Larson (CT)	Pettersen	Tonko
Latta	Phillips	Torres (CA)
LaTurner	Pingree	Torres (NY)
Lawler	Pocan	Trahan
Lee (CA)	Porter	Trone
Lee (FL)	Posey	Turner
Lee (NV)	Pressley	Underwood
Lee (PA)	Quigley	Valadao
Leger Fernandez	Ramirez	Van Drew
Letlow	Raskin	Van Orden
Levin	Reschenthaler	Vargas
Lieu	Rodgers (WA)	Vasquez
Lofgren	Rogers (AL)	Veasey
Lucas	Rogers (KY)	Velazquez
Luetkemeyer	Rose	Wagner
Luttrell	Ross	Walberg
Lynch	Rouzer	Wasserman
Mace	Ruiz	Schultz
Malliotakis	Ruppersberger	Waters
Maloy	Ryan	Watson Coleman
Manning	Salazar	Webster (FL)
Matsui	Salinas	Wenstrup
McBath	Sánchez	Westerman
McCaul	Barbanes	Wexton
McClain	Scalise	Williams (GA)
McClellan	Scanlon	Williams (NY)
McCullom	Schakowsky	Wilson (FL)
McGarvey	Schiff	Wilson (SC)
McGovern	Schneider	Wittman
McHenry	Scholten	Womack
Meeks	Schrier	Yakym

NAYS—75

Alford	Fitzgerald	McClintock
Allen	Fry	McCormick
Arrington	Fulcher	Meuser
Babin	Gaetz	Miller (IL)
Banks	Good (VA)	Mooney
Bean (FL)	Gosar	Moore (AL)
Biggs	Griffith	Moran
Bishop (NC)	Grothman	Norman
Boebert	Guest	Ogles
Brecheen	Hageman	Palmer
Burchett	Harris	Pfluger
Burlison	Harshbarger	Rosendale
Cammack	Higgins (LA)	Roy
Carter (TX)	Houchin	Rutherford
Cline	Issa	Schweikert
Cloud	Jackson (TX)	Self
Clyde	Kelly (MS)	Spartz
Collins	Kustoff	Steube
Comer	LaMalfa	Tiffany
Crane	Lesko	Timmons
Davidson	Loudermilk	Van Duyne
DesJarlais	Luna	Waltz
Donalds	Mann	Weber (TX)
Edwards	Massie	Williams (TX)
Ellzey	Mast	Zinke

Ezell	LaMalfa	Rodgers (WA)	NAYS—10				Emmer	Kim (CA)	Phillips
Fallon	Lamborn	Rogers (AL)	Biggs	Lesko	Roy	Escobar	Kim (NJ)	Pingree	
Feenstra	Landsman	Rogers (KY)	Brecheen	Norman	Self	Eshoo	Krishnamoorthi	Pocan	
Ferguson	Larsen (WA)	Rose	Clyde	Perry		Espauillat	Kuster	Porter	
Finstad	Larson (CT)	Ross	Harris	Rosendale		Estes	Kustoff	Posey	
Fischbach	Latta	Rouzer				Evans	LaHood	Pressley	
Fitzgerald	LaTurner	Ruiz				Ezell	LaLota	Quigley	
Fitzpatrick	Lawler	Ruppersberger				Fallon	LaMalfa	Ramirez	
Fleischmann	Lee (CA)	Rutherford	Adams	Diaz-Balart	Nehls	Feenstra	Lamborn	Raskin	
Fletcher	Lee (FL)	Ryan	Blumenauer	Granger	Smith (NE)	Ferguson	Landsman	Reschenthaler	
Flood	Lee (NV)	Salazar	Caraveo	Grijalva	Swalwell	Finstad	Larsen (WA)	Rodgers (WA)	
Foster	Lee (PA)	Salinas	Cole	Langworthy	Sykes	Fischbach	Larson (CT)	Rogers (AL)	
Foushee	Leger Fernandez	Sánchez	Curtis	Magaziner	Wild	Fitzgerald	Latta	Rogers (KY)	
Foxx	Letlow	Sarbanes				Fitzpatrick	LaTurner	Rose	
Frankel, Lois	Levin	Scalise				Fleischmann	Lawler	Rosendale	
Franklin, Scott	Lieu	Scanlon				Fletcher	Lee (CA)	Ross	
Frost	Lofgren	Shakowsky				Flood	Lee (FL)	Rouzer	
Fry	Loudermilk	Schiff				Foster	Lee (NV)	Roy	
Fulcher	Lucas	Schneider				Foushee	Lee (PA)	Ruiz	
Gaetz	Luetkemeyer	Scholten				Foxx	Leger Fernandez	Ruppersberger	
Gallego	Luna	Schrier				Frankel, Lois	Lesko	Rutherford	
Garamendi	Luttrell	Schweikert				Franklin, Scott	Letlow	Ryan	
Garbarino	Lynch	Scott (VA)				Frost	Levin	Salazar	
Garcia (IL)	Mace	Scott, Austin				Fry	Lieu	Salinas	
Garcia (TX)	Malliotakis	Scott, David				Fulcher	Lofgren	Sánchez	
Garcia, Mike	Maloy	Sessions				Gaetz	Loudermilk	Sarbanes	
Garcia, Robert	Mann	Sewell				Gallego	Lucas	Scalise	
Gimenez	Manning	Sherman				Garamendi	Luetkemeyer	Scanlon	
Golden (ME)	Massie	Sherill				Garbarino	Luna	Schakowsky	
Goldman (NY)	Mast	Simpson				García (IL)	Luttrell	Schiff	
Gomez	Matsui	Slotkin				Garcia (TX)	Lynch	Schneider	
Gonzales, Tony	McBath	Smith (MO)				Garcia, Mike	Mace	Scholten	
Gonzalez,	McCaull	Smith (NJ)				Garcia, Robert	Malliotakis	Schrier	
Vicente	McClain	Smith (WA)				Gimenez	Maloy	Schweikert	
Good (VA)	McClellan	Smucker				Golden (ME)	Mann	Scott (VA)	
Gooden (TX)	McClintock	Sorensen				Goldman (NY)	Manning	Scott, Austin	
Gosar	McCollum	Soto				Gomez	Massie	Scott, David	
Gottheimer	McCormick	Spanberger				Gonzales, Tony	Mast	Self	
Graves (LA)	McGarvey	Spartz				Gonzalez,	Matsui	Sessions	
Graves (MO)	McGovern	Stansbury				Vicente	McBath	Sewell	
Green (TN)	McHenry	Stanton				Good (VA)	McCaull	Sherman	
Green, Al (TX)	Meeks	Stauber				Gooden (TX)	McClain	Sherill	
Greene (GA)	Menendez	Steel				Gosar	McClellan	Simpson	
Griffith	Meng	Stefanik				Gottheimer	McClintock	Slotkin	
Grothman	Meuser	Steil				Graves (LA)	McCollum	Smith (MO)	
Guest	Mfume	Steube				Graves (MO)	McCormick	Smith (NJ)	
Guthrie	Miller (IL)	Stevens				Green (TN)	McGarvey	Smith (WA)	
Hageman	Miller (OH)	Stevens				Green, Al (TX)	McGovern	Smucker	
Harder (CA)	Miller (WV)	Strickland				Greene (GA)	McHenry	Sorensen	
Harshbarger	Miller-Meeks	Strong				Griffith	Meeks	Soto	
Hayes	Mills	Suozzi				Grothman	Menendez	Spanberger	
Hern	Molinaro	Takano				Guest	Meng	Spartz	
Higgins (LA)	Moolenaar	Tenney				Guthrie	Meuser	Stansbury	
Hill	Mooney	Thanedar				Hageman	Mfume	Stauber	
Himes	Moore (AL)	Thompson (CA)				Harder (CA)	Miller (IL)	Strong	
Hinson	Moore (UT)	Thompson (MS)				Harris	Miller (OH)	Strong	
Horsford	Moore (WI)	Thompson (PA)				Harshbarger	Miller (WV)	Stefanik	
Houchin	Moran	Tiffany				Hayes	Miller-Meeks	Steil	
Houahan	Morelle	Timmons				Hern	Mills	Steube	
Hoyer	Moskowitz	Titus				Higgins (LA)	Molinaro	Stevens	
Hoyle (OR)	Moulton	Tlaib				Hill	Moolenaar	Strickland	
Hudson	Mrvan	Tokuda				Himes	Mooney	Takano	
Huffman	Mullin	Tonko				Horsford	Moore (UT)	Tenney	
Huizenga	Murphy	Torres (CA)				Houahan	Moore (WI)	Thanedar	
Hunt	Nadler	Torres (NY)				Hoyer	Morelle	Thompson (CA)	
Issa	Napolitano	Trahan				Hoyle (OR)	Moskowitz	Thompson (MS)	
Ivey	Neal	Trone				Moskowitz	Moulton	Thompson (PA)	
Jackson (IL)	Neguse	Turner				Huffman	Mrvan	Tiffany	
Jackson (NC)	Newhouse	Underwood				Moran	Mullin	Timmons	
Jackson (TX)	Nickel	Valadao				Morelle	Trahan	Titus	
Jackson Lee	Norcross	Van Drew				Hunt	Murphy	Titus	
Jacobs	Nunn (IA)	Van Duyne				Issa	Nadler	Tlaib	
James	Obernolte	Van Orden				Nadler	Napolitano	Tokuda	
Jayapal	Ocasio-Cortez	Vargas				Ocasio-Cortez	Neal	Tonko	
Jeffries	Ogles	Vasquez				Van Drew	Nunn (IA)	Underwood	
Johnson (GA)	Omar	Veasey				Van Duyne	Obernolte	Valadao	
Johnson (SD)	Owens	Velázquez				Velázquez	Perez	Vasquez	
Jordan	Pallone	Wagner				Wagner	Perez	Veasey	
Joyce (OH)	Palmer	Walberg				Walberg	Peters	Velázquez	
Joyce (PA)	Panetta	Waltz				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
Kamlager-Dove	Pappas	Wasserman				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
Kaptur	Pascrell	Schultz				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
Kean (NJ)	Pelosi	Schultz				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
Keating	Peltola	Waterson				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
Kelly (IL)	Pence	Watson Coleman				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
Kelly (MS)	Perez	Weber (TX)				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
Kelly (PA)	Peters	Webster (FL)				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
Khanna	Pettersen	Wenstrup				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
Kriggans (VA)	Pfluger	Westerman				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
Kildee	Phillips	Wexton				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
Kiley	Pingree	Williams (GA)				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
Kilmer	Pocan	Williams (NY)				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
Kim (CA)	Porter	Williams (TX)				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
Kim (NJ)	Posey	Wilson (FL)				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
Krishnamoorthi	Pressley	Wilson (SC)				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
Kuster	Quigley	Wittman				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
Kustoff	Ramirez	Womack				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
LaHood	Raskin	Yakym				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	
LaLota	Reschenthaler	Zinke				Wasserman	Peters	Velázquez	

□ 1218
So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

VETERAN FRAUD REIMBURSEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 4016) to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve the repayment by the Secretary of Veterans Affairs of benefits misused by a fiduciary, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 413, nays 0, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 160]

YEAS—413

Aderholt	Brown	Clyde							
Aguilar	Brownley	Cohen							
Alford	Buchanan	Collins							
Allen	Bucson	Comer							
Allred	Budzinski	Connolly							
Amo	Burchett	Correa							
Amodei	Burgess	Costa							
Armstrong	Burlison	Courtney							
Arrington	Bush	Craig							
Auchincloss	Calvert	Crane							
Babin	Cammack	Crawford							
Bacon	Carbajal	Crenshaw							
Baird	Cárdenas	Crockett							
Balderson	Carey	Crow							
Balint	Carl	Cuellar							
Banks	Carson	D'Esposito							
Barr	Carter (GA)	Davids (KS)							
Barragán	Carter (IA)	Davidson							
Bean (FL)	Carter (TX)	Davis (IL)							
Beyer	Castor (FL)	Davis (NC)							
Bice	Castro (TX)	DelBene							
Biggs	Chavez-DeRemer	DeLa Cruz							
Bilirakis	Cherif	DeSaulnier							
Bishop (GA)	McCormick	DesJarlais							
Bishop (NC)	Chu	Dingell							
Blunt Rochester	Ciscomani	Doggett							
Boebert	Clark (MA)	Donalds							
Bonamici	Clarke (NY)	Duarte							
Bost	Cleaver	Duncan							
Bowman	Cline	Dunn (FL)							
Cloud	Dunn	Ellsley							
Brecheen	Clyburn	Kiley							
		Kilmer							

Westerman	Williams (TX)	Womack	Dean (PA)	Joyce (PA)	Palmer	Velázquez	Weber (TX)	Wilson (FL)
Wexton	Wilson (FL)	Yakym	DeGette	Kamlager-Dove	Panetta	Wagner	Webster (FL)	Wilson (SC)
Williams (GA)	Wilson (SC)	Zinke	DeLauro	Kaptur	Pappas	Walberg	Wenstrup	Wittman
Williams (NY)	Wittman		DelBene	Kean (NJ)	Pascrell	Waltz	Westerman	Womack
NOT VOTING—15								
Adams	Diaz-Balart	Nehls	DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL)	Peletola	Schultz	Williams (GA)	Yakym
Blumenauer	Granger	Smith (NE)	DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Pelosi	Watson	Williams (NY)	Zinke
Caraveo	Grijalva	Swalwell	Dingell	Kelly (PA)	Perez	Watson Coleman	Williams (TX)	
Cole	Langworthy	Sykes	Doggett	Khanna	Perry		NAYS—6	
Curtis	Magaziner	Wild	Donalds	Kiggans (VA)	Peters	Biggs	Foxx	Lesko
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE								
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.								
□ 1222								
So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.								
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.								
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.								
<hr/>								
STUDENT VETERAN BENEFIT RESTORATION ACT								
The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1767) to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide that educational assistance paid under Department of Veterans Affairs educational assistance programs to an individual who pursued a program or course of education that was suspended or terminated for certain reasons shall not be charged against the entitlement of the individual, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.								
The Clerk read the title of the bill.								
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.								
This is a 2-minute vote.								
The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 406, nays 6, not voting 16, as follows:								
[Roll No. 161]								
YEAS—406								
Aderholt	Bonamici	Cherifilus-	Harshbarger	Miller-Meeks	Steube	Spanberger	Smith (MO)	
Aguilar	Bost	McCormick	Hayes	Mills	Stevens	Spartz	Smith (NJ)	
Alford	Bowman	Chu	Hern	Molinaro	Strickland	Stansbury	Smith (WA)	
Allen	Boyle (PA)	Ciscomani	Higgins (LA)	Moolenaar	Strong	Takano	Tenney	
Allred	Brecheen	Clark (MA)	Himes	Moore (AL)	Meng	Thanedar	Thompson (CA)	
Amo	Brown	Clarke (NY)	Hinson	Moore (UT)	Meuser	Stanton	Thompson (MS)	
Amodei	Brownley	Cleaver	Horsford	Moore (WI)	Mfume	Stauber	Thompson (PA)	
Armstrong	Buchanan	Cline	Houchin	Moran	Miller (IL)	Steel	Tiffany	
Arrington	Bucson	Cloud	Houlahan	Morelle	Miller (OH)	Stefanik	Timmons	
Auchincloss	Budzinski	Clyburn	Hoyle (OR)	Moskowitz	Miller (WV)	Steil	Titus	
Babin	Burchett	Cohen	Hoyer	Moulton	Morrison	Staub	Tlaib	
Bacon	Burlison	Collins	Hudson	Mrvan	Neal	Tokuda	Throne	
Baird	Bush	Comer	Huffman	Mullin	Napolitano	Tonko	Torres (CA)	
Balderson	Calvert	Connolly	Huizenga	Nickel	Neal	Torres (NY)	Torres (NY)	
Balint	Cammack	Correa	Hunt	Nadler	Napolitano	Underwood	Trahan	
Banks	Carbajal	Costa	Ivey	James	Neu	Valadao	Troney	
Barr	Cárdenas	Courtney	Jackson (IL)	Neguse	Obernolte	Van Drew	Van Orden	
Barragán	Carey	Craig	Jackson (NC)	Newhouse	Ocasio-Cortez	Van Duyne	Vargas	
Bean (FL)	Carl	Crane	Jackson (TX)	Nickel	Ogles	Van Orden	Vasquez	
Beatty	Carson	Crawford	Jackson Lee	Norcross	Pallone	Valadao	Veasey	
Bentz	Carter (GA)	Crenshaw	Jayapal	James	Pelosi	Watson	Watson	
Bera	Carter (LA)	Crockett	Jeffries	Nunn (IA)	Pelosi	Wexton	Yakym	
Bergman	Carter (TX)	Crow	Johnson (GA)	Omar	Pelosi	Wexton	Yakym	
Beyer	Cartwright	Cuelar	Johnson (SD)	Owens	Pelosi	Wexton	Yakym	
Bice	Castor	D'Esposito	Johnson (TX)	Jordan	Pelosi	Wexton	Yakym	
Bilirakis	Case	Davids (KS)	Johnson (IL)	Jordan	Pelosi	Wexton	Yakym	
Bishop (GA)	Casten	Davidson	Johnson (SD)	Jordan	Pelosi	Wexton	Yakym	
Bishop (NC)	Castor (FL)	Davis (IL)	Johnson (SD)	Jordan	Pelosi	Wexton	Yakym	
Blunt Rochester	Castro (TX)	Davis (NC)	Johnson (SD)	Jordan	Pelosi	Wexton	Yakym	
Boebert	Chavez-DeRemer	De La Cruz	Joyce (OH)	Jordan	Pelosi	Wexton	Yakym	

the Interior to reissue regulations removing the gray wolf from the list of endangered and threatened wildlife under the Endangered Species Act of 1973; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3397) to require the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to withdraw a rule of the Bureau of Land Management relating to conservation and landscape health; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6285) to ratify and approve all authorizations, permits, verifications, extensions, biological opinions, incidental take statements, and any other approvals or orders issued pursuant to Federal law necessary for the establishment and administration of the Coastal Plain oil and gas leasing program, and for other purposes; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6090) to provide for the consideration of a definition of antisemitism set forth by the International Holocaust Remembrance Alliance for the enforcement of Federal antidiscrimination laws concerning education programs or activities, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 209, nays 205, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 162]

YEAS—209

Miller-Meeks	Rose	Thompson (P)
Mills	Rosendale	Tiffany
Molinaro	Rouzer	Timmons
Moolenaar	Roy	Turner
Mooney	Rutherford	Valadado
Moore (AL)	Salazar	Van Drew
Moore (UT)	Scalise	Van Duyne
Moran	Schweikert	Van Orden
Newhouse	Scott, Austin	Wagner
Norman	Self	Walberg
Nunn (IA)	Sessions	Waltz
Oberholte	Simpson	Weber (TX)
Ogles	Smith (MO)	Webster (FL)
Owens	Smith (NJ)	Wenstrup
Palmer	Smucker	Westerman
Pence	Spartz	Williams (NY)
Perry	Stauber	Williams (TX)
Pfluger	Steel	Wilson (SC)
Posey	Stefanik	Wittman
Reschenthaler	Steil	Womack
Rodgers (WA)	Steube	Yakym
Rogers (AL)	Strong	Zinke
Rogers (KY)	Tenney	

Thompson (P)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao
Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

Grijalva Murphy Swalwell
Langworthy Nehls Sykes
Magaziner Smith (NE) Wild

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

1235

So the previous question was ordered.
The result of the vote was announced
as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZGERALD). The question is on the resolution.

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

NAYS—205

Aguilar	Golden (ME)	Panetta
Allred	Goldman (NY)	Pappas
Amo	Gomez	Pascrrell
Auchincloss	Gonzalez,	Pelosi
Balint	Vicente	Peltola
Barragán	Gottheimer	Perez
Beatty	Green, Al (TX)	Peters
Bera	Harder (CA)	Pettersen
Beyer	Hayes	Phillips
Bishop (GA)	Himes	Pingree
Blunt Rochester	Horsford	Pocan
Bonamici	Houlahan	Porter
Bowman	Hoyer	Pressley
Boyle (PA)	Hoyle (OR)	Quigley
Brown	Huffman	Ramirez
Brownley	Ivey	Raskin
Budzinski	Jackson (IL)	Ross
Bush	Jackson (NC)	Ruiz
Caraveo	Jackson Lee	Ruppersberge
Carbajal	Jacobs	Ryan
Cardenas	Jayapal	Salinas
Carson	Jeffries	Sánchez
Carter (LA)	Johnson (GA)	Barbanes
Cartwright	Kamlager-Dove	Serrano

Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Pelosi
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes

RECORDED VOTE

Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded Vote was ordered.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 209, noes 205, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 163]
AYES—209

Fitzgerald

Fitzpatrick

[Roll No. 162]	Casar	Kaptur	Scanlon	Smith	Alvarez, Marc	McClain
YEAS—209	Case	Keating	Schakowsky	Barr	Gomez	McClintock
	Casten	Kelly (IL)	Schiff	Bean (FL)	Gonzales, Tony	McCormick
Aderholt	Donalds	Castor (FL)	Khanna	Bergman	Good (VA)	McHenry
Alford	Duarte	Hunt	Kildee	Bice	Gosar	Meuser
Allen	Duncan	Issa	Kilmer	Schrier	Biggs	Graves (LA)
Amodei	Dunn (FL)	Jackson (TX)	McCormick	Scott (VA)	Bilirakis	Graves (MO)
Armstrong	Edwards	James	Chu	Scott, David	Bishop (NC)	Green (TN)
Arrington	Eilzey	Johnson (LA)	Clark (MA)	Sewell	Boebert	Greene (GA)
Babin	Emmer	Johnson (SD)	Clarke (NY)	Landsman	Sherman	Griffith
Bacon	Estes	Jordan	Cleaver	Larsen (WA)	Sherrill	Grothman
Baird	Ezell	Joyce (OH)	Clyburn	Larson (CT)	Slotkin	Mills
Balderson	Fallon	Joyce (PA)	Cohen	Lee (CA)	Buchanan	Molinaro
Banks	Feeenstra	Kean (NJ)	Connolly	Lee (NV)	Guest	Moolenaar
Barr	Ferguson	Kelly (MS)	Correa	Lee (PA)	Bucshon	Guthrie
Bean (FL)	Finstad	Kelly (PA)	Costa	Leger Fernandez	Burchett	Hageman
Bentz	Fischbach	Kiggans (VA)	Courtney	Levin	Burgess	Harris
Bergman	Fitzgerald	Kiley	Craig	Stansbury	Burlison	Harshbarger
Bice	Fitzpatrick	Kim (CA)	Crockett	Lieu	Calvert	Hern
Biggs	Fleischmann	Kustoff	Crow	Stanton	Cammack	Horn
Bilirakis	Flood	LaHood	Cuellar	Lofgren	Stevens	Higgins (LA)
Bishop (NC)	Foxz	LaLota	Manning	Strickland	Carey	Hill
Boebert	Franklin, Scott	LaMalfa	Matsui	Suoza	Hinson	Nunn (IA)
Bost	Fry	Lamborn	Davids (KS)	Takano	Ogles	Obernolte
Brecheen	Fulcher	Latta	McBath	Thanedar	Carter (GA)	Perry
Buchanan	Gaetz	DeGette	Thaneendar	Chavez-DeRemer	Carter (TX)	Pfluger
Bucshon	Garbarino	DeLauro	McClellan	Thompson (CA)	Huizenga	Posey
Burchett	Garcia, Mike	Lee (FL)	DelBene	Thompson (MS)	Ciscomani	Hunt
Burgess	Gimenez	Lesko	Meeks	Cline	Isa	Jackson (TX)
Burlison	Gonzales, Tony	Letlow	Menendez	Titus	Cloud	James
Calvert	Good (VA)	Loudermilk	Deluzio	Tlaib	Clyde	Posey
Cammack	Gooden (TX)	Lucas	DeSaulnier	Tokuda	Collins	Johnson (LA)
Carey	Gosar	Luetkemeyer	Meng	Comer	Johnson (SD)	Reschenthaler
Carl	Graves (LA)	Luna	McCollum	Tonko	Crane	Jordan
Carter (GA)	Graves (MO)	Luttrell	McGarvey	Torres (CA)	Jordan	Rogers (AL)
Carter (TX)	Green (TN)	Mace	DeGarde	Torres (NY)	Crawford	Rogers (KY)
Chavez-DeRemer	Greene (GA)	Malliotakis	Doggett	Trahan	Joyce (OH)	Rose
Ciscomani	Griffith	Maloy	Escobar	Trone	Trone	Rosendale
Cline	Grothman	Mann	Eshoo	Moskowitz	D'Esposito	Kean (NJ)
Cloud	Guest	Massie	Espailat	Moulton	Underwood	Davidson
Clyde	Guthrie	Mast	Frost	Mrvan	De La Cruz	Kelly (MS)
Collins	Hageman	McCaul	Fletcher	Evans	Vargas	Rouzer
Comer	Harris	McClain	Foster	Mullin	DesJarlais	Kelly (PA)
Crane	Harshbarger	McClintock	Foushee	Nadler	Vasquez	Roy
Crawford	Hern	McCormick	Frankel, Lois	Napoli	Donalds	Kiggans (VA)
Crenshaw	Higgins (LA)	McHenry	Frost	Velazquez	Velazquez	Rutherford
D'Esposito	Hill	Meuser	Gallego	Neal	Wasserman	Alvarez, Marc
Davidson	Hinson	Miller (IL)	Nickel	Nease	Waters	Scalise
De La Cruz	Houchin	Miller (OH)	Watson	Watson Coleman	Ellzey	Kiley
DesJarlais	Hudson	Miller (WV)	Garamendi	Norcross	Emmer	Salazar
			Garcia (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez	Wexton	Kim (CA)
			Garcia (TX)	Omar	Estes	Scalise
			Garcia, Robert	Pallone	Williams (GA)	Kustoff
					Wilson (FL)	Schweikert
					Fallon	De La Hood
					Feenstra	Scott, Austin
					Lee (FL)	Self
					Ferguson	Sessions
					Lesko	Simpson
					Lamborn	Smith (MO)
					Latta	Smith (NJ)
					Ezell	Smith (N.J.)
					LaTurner	Smucker
					Lawler	Spartz
					Feenstra	Stauber
					Finstad	Steel
					Letlow	Loudermilk
					Miller (IL)	Stefanik

Steil
Steube
Strong
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Tiffany
Timmons
Turner
Valadao

Van Drew
Van Duyne
Van Orden
Wagner
Walberg
Waltz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup

Westerman
Williams (NY)
Williams (TX)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Yakym
Zinke

NOES—205

Aguilar
Allred
Amo
Auchincloss
Balint
Barragán
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bowman
Boyle (PA)
Brown
Brownley
Budzinski
Bush
Caraveo
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson
Carter (LA)
Cartwright
Casar
Case
Casten
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cherfilus-
McCormick
Chu
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Craig
Crockett
Crow
Cuellar
Davids (KS)
Davis (IL)
Davis (NC)
Dean (PA)
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Deluzio
DeSaulnier
Doggett
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Fletcher
Foster
Foushee
Frankel, Lois
Frost
Gallego
Garamendi
Garcia (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Garcia, Robert

Golden (ME)
Goldman (NY)
Gomez
Gonzalez,
Vicente
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Harder (CA)
Hayes
Himes
Horsford
Houlihan
Hoyer
Hoyle (OR)
Huffman
Ivey
Jackson (IL)
Jackson (NC)
Jackson Lee
Jacobs
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Kamlager-Dove
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim (NJ)
Krisnamoorthi
Kuster
Landsman
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Lee (PA)
Leger Fernandez
Levin
Lieu
Lofgren
Lynch
Manning
Matsui
McBath
McClellan
McCollum
McGarvey
McGovern
McGovern
Meeks
Menendez
Meng
Mfume
Moore (WI)
Morelle
Moskowitz
Moulton
Mrvan
Mullin
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Nickel
Norcross
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone

Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Pelosi
Peltola
Perez
Peters
Pettersen
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Quigley
Ramirez
Raskin
Ross
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Ryan
Salinas
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Scholten
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell
Sherman
Sherrill
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Sorensen
Soto
Spanberger
Stansbury
Stanton
Stevens
Strickland
Suozzi
Takano
Thanedar
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tokuda
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres (NY)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Vargas
Vasquez
Veasey
Velazquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Wexton
Williams (GA)
Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—15

Adams
Blumenauer
Cole
Curtis
Diaz-Balart

Granger
Grijalva
Langworthy
Magaziner
Murphy

Nehls
Smith (NE)
Swalwell
Sykes
Wild

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1241

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.

SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST RESTORATION ACT

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1173, I call up the bill (H.R. 3195) to rescind Public Land Order 7917, to reinstate mineral leases and permits in the Superior National Forest, to ensure timely review of Mine Plans of Operations, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, the amendment in nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 3195

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Superior National Forest Restoration Act”.

SEC. 2. SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST SYSTEM LANDS IN MINNESOTA.

(a) RESCISSON.—*The order entitled “Public Land Order No. 7917 for Withdrawal of Federal Lands; Cook, Lake, and Saint Louis Counties, MN”, issued by the Bureau of Land Management and dated January 31, 2023, is hereby rescinded.*

(b) TIMELY REVIEW.—*The Secretary shall complete all necessary environmental and regulatory review, including processes subject to the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.), for all Mine Plans of Operations within the Superior National Forest lands in the State of Minnesota—*

(1) with respect to such Mine Plans of Operations submitted before the date of the enactment of this section, not later than 18 months after the date of enactment of this section; and

(2) with respect to a Mine Plan of Operations submitted or resubmitted in the 7 year period beginning on the date of the enactment of this section, not later than 18 months after the date on which such Mine Plan of Operations is submitted or resubmitted.

(c) REISSUANCE OF MINERAL LEASES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—*The Secretary shall issue each mineral lease, preference right lease, and prospecting permit canceled by the Secretary relating to lands within Superior National Forest during the period beginning on January 31, 2021, and ending on the date of the enactment of this section on the same terms as were in effect on the date of such cancellations.*

(2) JUDICIAL REVIEW.—*A lease or permit issued under paragraph (1) is not subject to judicial review.*

(d) SECRETARY DEFINED.—*For the purposes of this section, the term “Secretary” means—*

(1) the Secretary of the Interior; or
(2) when used with respect to any unit of the National Forest System, the Secretary of Agriculture.

SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER) and the gentlewoman from

California (Ms. PORTER) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3195.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3195, the Superior National Forest Restoration Act of 2024.

The district I am proud to represent, Minnesota’s Eighth Congressional District, is blessed with an abundance of mineral wealth that would allow America to lead in the 21st century.

We are home to the Duluth Complex, one of the largest undeveloped mineral deposits in the world, which includes an estimated 8 billion tons of copper, nickel, cobalt, and other platinum group metals. In fact, this deposit is the world’s second largest copper deposit, with 34 percent of the United States’ total reserves and the world’s third largest nickel deposit with 95 percent of United States’ total reserves.

These minerals are experiencing large upswings in demand due to their use in battery storage, electric vehicles, and other rapidly expanding sectors. Domestic production of these minerals is critical to our national security and our supply chain security.

The deposits in northern Minnesota could provide enough copper for over 70 million electric vehicles and nickel for 3.5 million battery packs.

The Duluth Complex and its abundant resources lies under the Superior National Forest and throughout the iron range. The Superior National Forest is a working industrial forest where timber harvesting and mining are desirable activities.

Regrettably, in January of 2022, the Biden administration caved to radical antijobs, antimining activists by canceling two-decade-old mineral leases held by Twin Metals Minnesota in the Superior National Forest.

At the same time, the Biden administration began the withdrawal process on nearly a quarter million acres of land in the region. The finalized withdrawal of 225,504 acres went into effect in January of 2023 and prohibits the extraction of any mineral, including copper, nickel, cobalt, platinum, and iron ore for the next 20 years.

Northern Minnesota, home to the historic iron range, has been mining iron ore, a critical component in steelmaking, for over 140 years. This is the iron ore that provided the military might to the United States and our Allies to fight and win World War II. The iron ore mined in the region accounts for over 80 percent of America’s domestically produced steel. Now, the Biden

administration even wants to restrict iron ore mining in northern Minnesota. They have gone too far, Mr. Chair.

These two actions taken by the Biden administration are in immediate opposition to its stated campaign goals to increase domestic mining to meet rising global mineral demand. They are disregarding years of environmental review, a pending mine plan of operation, and an abundance of support from union workers, local residents, schools, builders, and miners.

In doing this, President Biden has made his real position on mining known. He would rather rely on foreign adversaries like Communist China instead of union workers who stand ready to deliver Minnesota's mineral wealth under the strongest environmental and labor standards in the world.

This is morally irresponsible, as China is the world's top polluter and relies on child slave labor in their mines in the Democratic Republic of the Congo. That is a fact. They use child slave labor.

Imagine the national security crisis we would face should China suddenly decide to withhold these resources.

If the Biden administration's actions are allowed to stand, their direct opposition to the domestic mining industry will not only make our Nation less safe, but it will also cripple a sector that provides incredible economic benefit to northern Minnesota.

The national importance of the Duluth Complex is only matched by its significance to our local community. Twin Metals signed a project labor agreement with the local Iron Range Building and Construction Trades association, guaranteeing local union jobs during the mine's construction. The economic benefits would be felt throughout our State as mineral development provides funding to every single school district in Minnesota through the permanent school trust fund.

The Superior National Forest Restoration Act would revitalize an essential pillar of northern Minnesota's economy, provide for the production of critical minerals, secure our supply chain, strengthen our national security, and bolster the entire domestic mining industry.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to join me in support of H.R. 3195, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, welcome back to the show, unlimited drilling and extinction of wildlife brought to you by the GOP, a subsidiary of Big Oil.

This week's target: The Boundary Waters in northeastern Minnesota, a pristine wilderness that is, in fact, the most visited designated wilderness area in our country. It is the most visited for a good reason. Its beautiful landscapes, crystal clear waters, and abundant wildlife make it a haven for outdoor recreation.

The Boundary Waters support a thriving outdoor recreation economy with hundreds of thousands of annual visitors and tens of thousands of jobs across northeastern Minnesota. In fact, the Boundary Waters is so popular that an overwhelming majority of Minnesota voters oppose building new mines near this federally protected wilderness.

This region and its resources, our resources, have been under threat for years and are being threatened again today.

In 1966, the Bureau of Land Management issued two mineral leases covering 5,000 acres of the Superior National Forest just outside of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. There was never mining on either lease, never mining, yet they were renewed in 1989 and again in 2004.

In 2012, Twin Metals Minnesota, a wholly owned subsidiary of a Chilean mining company, requested another extension of those two expired leases on Forest Service land in the Boundary Waters watershed to build a sulfide-ore copper mine.

In 2016, after an extensive environmental review process, which included public input and scientific analysis, the Forest Service concluded sulfide-ore copper mining, which is significantly different from the taconite mining that the region is used to, could result in "extreme" and "serious and irreparable harm" in the watershed of this wilderness area.

The watershed there flows north, meaning it would flow past the mine and into our protected wilderness. The Forest Service found that any spills, leaks, or pollution would be all but impossible to contain, putting the entire ecosystem and watershed at risk.

This should have been the answer: "No" to this sulfide-ore copper mine because that is what the scientists say, that is what the community wants, and that is what the law means, that a wilderness area is protected from severe harm. However, foreign companies wanting to mine and the politicians who answer to them were too enticed.

□ 1300

As soon as President Trump came into office, his administration ignored the science and community input and reinstated Twin Metals' leases.

The Department of the Interior solicitor under the current administration found that President Trump improperly renewed those leases. Thankfully, after another thorough review and rounds of community input and Tribal consultation, the Biden administration finalized 20-year protections for 225,000 acres around the wilderness area, making that area ineligible for mining, but this bill seeks to undo all of that.

This bill would mandate the withdrawal be overturned and the leases be reinstated with no judicial review allowed. This means that it will not matter if the water and air become poisoned and the surrounding Tribes

and communities become severely ill. No one will be able to take those concerns to a judge and ask that they revisit the decision to mine the Boundary Waters.

Mr. Speaker, you will hear today that Americans have to choose between mining for minerals to secure our clean energy future over protecting the health of our families and vulnerable ecosystems. That is simply not the case.

We all understand the need for mining as part of our clean energy future, but America is already a top producer of copper and is already invested in a circular economy with our trusted trading partners for cobalt and nickel.

If we are going to build a sustainable, enduring, modern mining industry, then we have to do that while respecting sound science and community input, including Tribal consultation.

Mr. Speaker, I deeply respect the workers who mine and their families and the way that that tradition has contributed to the backbone of industrial America, but they live and work in locations where mining is appropriate and where there is minimal to no harm to the environment or human health. Unfortunately, this bill disregards all of that and seeks to destroy now and deal with the ramifications not later but not at all.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I will just share with you that Congressman James Oberstar, a Democrat for 36 years for Minnesota's Eighth Congressional District, supports mining and timber harvesting. In fact, in 1978, when the wilderness legislation was enacted, he didn't originally support it, but he said if you are going to do it, then do not take away our opportunity to mine outside the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and outside the buffer zone. He was right then because he knew that we would be here today.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GIMENEZ), my good friend.

Mr. GIMENEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my friend Representative STAUBER's bill, H.R. 3195, the Superior National Forest Restoration Act.

Throughout this Congress, the work of the Select Committee on the Strategic Competition Between the United States and the Chinese Communist Party has shown what many of us already believed: that the threat of Communist China looms larger than ever before, casting a shadow over our Nation's security and prosperity.

As an exile who was forced to leave my native Cuba after the Communist takeover, I understand this threat firsthand. That is why I am urging my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 3195, which would reverse the Biden administration's plan to cut off Minnesota's mineral deposits containing 88 percent of America's cobalt and 95 percent of America's nickel.

Right now, Congo accounts for 75 percent of the world's cobalt supply. These mines are CCP-owned, Chinese Communist Party-owned, and massive perpetrators of illegal child labor. These minerals are then shipped to Communist China for refining.

President Biden is putting America at risk by failing to combat Communist China's subversive tactics, including undermining America's defense industrial base.

We must obliterate the CCP's monopoly over rare earth minerals critical to the development of batteries and 21st century technology.

H.R. 3195 is an amazing step in reasserting America's industrial might. We work more efficiently, guarantee fairer wages, and extract these minerals cleaner than any other nation in the world.

What the Biden administration is doing makes absolutely no sense. We cannot afford to turn a blind eye to the CCP's cynical vision and their relentless pursuit of dominance in the global arena.

H.R. 3195 is the epitome of Made in America, and I urge its passage on the House floor.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM).

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, you probably don't know this, but Minnesota stands and represents the land of sky blue waters, so I rise to oppose this unnecessary and harmful piece of legislation.

Before I talk about the legislation directly, I want to take a minute to loop back to the discussion that is taking place on the floor about national security.

Mr. Speaker, I am the ranking member and former chair of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, and I take a back seat to no one in making sure that our industrial base and this Nation have the minerals and capability to reshore and to make things happen here at home so that we have an efficient supply chain. This piece of legislation doesn't do that.

One of the things that I want to clear up is this misnomer about how mining this copper through Antofagasta, which is a foreign-owned Chilean company, means somehow this copper magically all stays right here in the United States. It doesn't, Mr. Speaker. In fact, when this ore is mined, Antofagasta has most of its contracts shipping their mined copper to China for smelting, and then it is sold on the open market.

This is not circular where these particular minerals are going to be mined in Minnesota, let alone smelted in Minnesota or here in the United States. They will be sold on the open market.

The other thing this bill does is it talks about restoring the Superior National Forest. I served with Congressman Oberstar. I knew him well. I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that at the

time Congressman Oberstar was talking about mining and forestry, we were talking about iron ore mining. I support iron ore mining in Minnesota.

In fact, when I have introduced pieces of legislation to protect the Boundary Waters, in my legislation, I made sure that we do nothing to harm iron ore mining because that is the backbone, that is something that is mined and the steel is produced here in the United States and does go, if we want to talk about defense, back to our industrial base here.

Mr. Oberstar is not here to discuss copper sulfide-ore mining or these particular leases and what we know now about Antofagasta's mining record.

This piece of legislation would revoke key protections for a watershed that contains some of the purest and freshest water in the Nation and, in fact, in the world. This is water that when you are in a canoe, Mr. Speaker, you can dip your hand into it and drink from it and not worry about anything happening to you. It is that pure.

In fact, the Superior National Forest contains 20 percent of all the freshwater in the entire region in the U.S. National Forest System.

Being from Minnesota and having served on the committee that has the bill before us today, the Natural Resources Committee, I often hear colleagues joke that they want our water. Why? Wars will be fought over water. Water is a precious resource.

What this bill does is reinstates two mineral leases for which the Forest Service denied their consent because these mines pose an unacceptable risk to this precious preserve of clean water that we enjoy as a wilderness for not only today but will be there for future generations.

This bill would also rescind a mineral withdrawal that the Biden administration finalized last year, which prohibited mining for 20 years in the watershed of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. It is not permanent. It is 20 years. Maybe technology does change, but right now, these mines fail. They will fail to protect the waters.

The Federal action that was supported by a robust environmental assessment had 19 accompanying resource reports. When the Trump administration undid what the Obama administration had done in protecting this water, I was chair of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee.

Mr. Speaker, they said they were going to do and promised they would do a study. I asked for the study repeatedly. When I finally did get the study, which was never completed, Mr. Speaker, every single page was redacted. Every single page was blank.

I have enough of a security clearance, being on the Defense Subcommittee, that they could have shown me. I could have gone in the SCIF to read it. It was blank because it was a bogus study.

This bill ignores documented scientific consensus that is proven now.

This bill to support a mineral withdrawal would overturn all the public input, the overwhelming public input, in protecting this unique watershed.

To make matters worse, it also strips away the judicial review, as Representative PORTER mentioned, in favor of pro-mining policies, further silencing the voices of those who want this watershed protected by stripping away their rights to challenge these actions in court.

For these reasons alone, we should not support this bill.

I want to make sure that instead of undermining a 20-year mineral withdrawal, this amendment that I will offer later in the form of an MTR would protect the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. It would ensure that public lands and waters, not only the BWCA, but the Voyageurs National Park, will never be polluted by toxic drainage from sulfide-ore mining.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of the amendment that I will be offering.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GUEST). Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will support and join me in my amendment that was not allowed in committee, but as an MTR, I will offer it to substitute the language of the Boundary Waters Wilderness Protection and Pollution Prevention Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the Representative for yielding me the time.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, just to underscore this, when the Under Secretaries of Defense and Energy were asked what it would do to the United States if China stops selling us their critical minerals today, they said that it would be devastating and dangerous.

We cannot allow China to continue to dominate the critical minerals space when we have this opportunity right here.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, I live, work, and play in northern Minnesota. As I said, this is the district that I am privileged to represent. I know clean water. Do you know why, Mr. Speaker? It is because the cleanest water is in the heart of mining country in the great State of Minnesota.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Mrs. FISCHBACH), my good friend.

Mrs. FISCHBACH. Mr. Speaker, let us be very clear about what this bill actually does. This bill does not reduce any environmental protections. It simply tells the Secretary of the Interior to do her job and complete the necessary environmental and regulatory reviews.

Apparently, President Biden and congressional Democrats are so opposed to mining here in America that they won't even allow a company to prove that they can mine in an environmentally safe way.

By opposing this bill, Democrats are allowing mines with unregulated labor practices and environmental standards to control the critical minerals market.

Republicans are for American jobs, economic security, supply chain security, and protecting the environment by mining here in the United States, where we have more environmental protections than anywhere else in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Mr. STAUBER, for his enduring work on this important issue. I look forward to voting to reestablish mining for vital minerals in Minnesota's Superior National Forest.

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

Mr. Speaker, we are hearing a lot about America and America's mineral supplies, but what we are not hearing about is the truth about Antofagasta, the Chilean mining company that is pursuing these leases. In Antofagasta's mines in South America, the minerals are shipped to China for refining and smelting and then sold on the global market.

I have seen no evidence because there is no evidence that Antofagasta won't do the exact same thing here: extracting our publicly owned minerals from pristine wilderness, paying no royalty for them, and then selling them abroad, leaving Americans with all the mess and no benefit.

□ 1315

So much for America first.

I also want to talk about the environmental effects of this mining. Sulfide-ore copper mining is what we are talking about—not iron mining, not taconite iron mining—sulfide-ore copper mining. That is what is being proposed outside of the Boundary Waters Wilderness Area, and that sulfide-ore copper mining poses a unique threat. It is different than taconite iron ore mining.

What happens in sulfide-ore copper mining is the ore that is extracted contains metals that are bound together with sulfur. When exposed to air and water, this sulfide-bearing ore discharges acid mine drainage into the ground and surface water. The waste rocks and the tailings from this mine would generate acid mine drainage for hundreds of years, at least.

Just so everyone knows, these facts aren't hyperbole. This is available information, studied and reported by scientists, with some who have published their findings on the dangers of sulfide-ore copper mining at universities, including the University of Minnesota.

Proponents of this mine say that their tailing facilities would be safe from leakage. We hear that every time about every environmental extraction proposal. However, the facts are clear here. The Forest Service found that 100 percent of sulfide-ore copper mines in the United States experienced pipeline spills or accidental releases.

It is a near certainty that that is what will happen, that we will have a pipeline spill, we will have an accidental release. We will have irreparable, severe environmental damage if this sulfide-ore copper mine is allowed to occur on this Forest Service land. It would infect and pollute the Boundary Waters, and we would be unable to reclaim our beautiful, pristine wilderness.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, just so my colleagues understand, in the United States, we have the strongest environmental labor standards. Any mine that mines in Minnesota or other States must follow those standards.

Additionally, I will say, for Twin Metals in particular, the mine's unique underground construction, as well as the mine's planned use of "dry stack tailings" means there is no potential for acid rock drainage, and dry stack tailings was recommended for this mine plan of operation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY).

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this legislation today because we have a very simple question that lies before us: Is the 21st century going to be an American century or a Chinese century?

We all know the history of the 20th century. As we left the 20th century, America stood ascendant, that shining city on the hill. Now, as we go into the 21st century, the question needs to be asked again: Whose century will this be, because the Chinese seek hegemony. One of the ways in which they do it is to control the minerals that are traded around the world.

We stand here today, and this is one of the small decision points that we are going to make. It is no different than, right across from northern Minnesota, there is a natural gas plant that is being held up by the Biden administration and a few small, select group of local people to prevent a natural gas-fired plant from being built. Making one of those small decisions, are we going to be dependent on other countries because, if we are dependent, then we will not be that shining city on a hill.

I think about the goals that this administration has stated. They have talked about American manufacturing, and I hear it from both sides. We must have American manufacturing. How are we going to have American manufacturing if we don't produce some of the minerals and the metals that come out of the ground? How are we going to have American manufacturing if we don't produce some of that in America?

I hear that this administration wants to make sure that there is union labor. There is a project labor agreement that is in place to be able to build this mine. This is going to create union jobs, one of the goals of this administration.

Certainly, my colleagues have talked about electrification. We want to elec-

trify our vehicle fleet as well as getting rid of natural gas, natural gas-fired stoves. How are we going to get there if we don't have the minerals that produce those devices that are going to be able to provide that? Remember, in every Toyota Prius, there is 60 pounds of copper. How are we going to electrify the vehicle fleet without producing minerals right here in America?

I think back to January 20, 2021, and the very first action that this administration took saying that they are going to shut down Keystone XL, and making it very clear we are going to be energy dependent once again. What immediately happened to the price of oil? It went from \$60 a barrel. Within a couple of months, it was up to \$100 a barrel, enriching the despot Vladimir Putin, who has used it to wage war in eastern Europe.

That is what happens when we do not utilize our natural resources, whether it is our forest resources, our mineral resources, or our oil and natural gas resources. We end up being dependent on other countries.

I hear consistently from the other side that the minority is all for mining, but then I pose the question to my colleagues: Where? Where do minority Members support new mines? It is easy to say: Well, a mine has been there for a hundred years and to be able to support it and the union jobs that often-times come with it, but where do Democratic Members support new mining in America?

The opposing side's witness could not answer that question at our hearing, and I still haven't heard an answer from the minority yet. Where do my colleagues support mining in America if Democrats support mining?

Twin Metals has gone through an exhaustive process, and they have been proving that they can do this. Let them finish the process here of the rigorous environmental permitting that we have, not just at the Federal level, but at the State level because, living in Minnesota's neighboring State, Wisconsin, I know how rigorous the State of Minnesota's mining regulations are.

We have a choice before us today. Are we going to allow dirty mining around the world to be able to provide our natural resources in America, or are we going to respect the health of people, which we have the best health standards of anyone in the world? We have the best safety standards. Go to Congo and see the safety standards that are there with 8-year-olds mining in Congo.

We have the highest and best environmental standards. If we want workers to be safe, if we want them to be healthy, if we want to have the highest environmental standards, then we will support American mining.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, I will just close with this: In 1960, John F.

Kennedy went to my district in Hurley, Wisconsin, to the Montreal Mine, thousands of feet down into that mine.

He said to those miners: You did as much to win World War II as I did on PT-109.

Are we going to have a 21st century that is an American century or a Chinese century?

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

Mr. Speaker, I just heard that Republicans now support a clean energy transition. I hope we can clip that because that is wonderful, wonderful news.

Let me be the first to welcome the majority to the clean energy transition club, where we are going to support investments for States, municipalities, and Tribal governments to purchase clean energy technology, like solar panels, electric vehicle charging infrastructure, wind turbines, all of which, until today apparently, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle opposed.

As the newest members of the clean energy transition club, let me give my colleagues on the other side of the aisle a brief lesson on where the U.S. stands with mineral production and trade, which is needed for the construction of clean energy technology, as my colleagues have correctly pointed out.

First, the United States is among the top five producers of copper in the world and, according to the U.S. Geological Survey, has a low disruption potential.

Second, while we do not, in the United States, have a significant amount of nickel or cobalt, we do have close trading relationships with our allies who do. Those allies are Canada—which is a leading supplier of nickel—Norway, Japan, and Finland.

However, let's talk about what the Twin Metals mine would produce. If this project by this Chilean-owned mining company was allowed to go forward, mine, and pollute our wilderness, ship the ore and the jobs to China, and sell it anywhere in the world, what would it complete? Even if they were to sell all of it to us—and there is no guarantee they would choose to sell any of it here in the United States—it would produce about 1.5 percent of cobalt, about 2.3 percent of copper, about 3.6 percent of nickel, according to 2019 annual consumption, the most recent figures I could find.

I emphasize there is no guarantee that the minerals produced at this proposed Twin Metals mine would wind up back here in the United States, but we are absolutely guaranteed to end up with pollution, contamination, and the destruction of beloved wilderness lands. That is what is at stake here.

I also emphasize that the bill, H.R. 3195, would undo the withdrawal of 225,000 acres in the Superior National Forest. Removing these lands from the protection from mining would violate the will of indigenous communities.

In this case, the Boundary Waters and Superior National Forest are traditionally known as the Anishinaabe

land. The Ojibwe, or Chippewa people, have occupied this area since 1000 C.E.

The region's interconnected waterways have been used as critical trade routes for thousands of years. By the 1830s, the United States Government began forcibly removing indigenous people from their lands in the upper Midwest. In exchange for millions of acres of land, the government promised to pay the Ojibwe people \$35,000 each year for 20 years, and the Tribes were also granted the right to hunt, fish, and gather on those ceded lands.

In 1848, copper was discovered along the north shore of Lake Superior. Mining companies pressured the government to open the land to mining, which required another land cession, including what would become the Boundary Waters Wilderness Area.

The Tribes had to sue. In 1985 and 1989, they won confirmation of the Tribe's right to hunt, fish, and gather on those ceded lands, something that had been previously denied.

To further protect these treaty rights, the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe supported the administration's withdrawal, and they support my colleague Representative McCOLLUM's bill to permanently protect this region from mining.

Because of their support for permanent protections, the Tribe has faced boycotts from mining-aligned interest groups, who have boycotted their casinos, event venues, and restaurants. That is a ridiculous and cruel response to a Tribe that is simply trying to protect its ancestral lands and waters from toxic pollution.

To add insult to injury, this bill restricts judicial review of the reinstatement of leases, a blatant attack on treaty rights. The U.S. Government deciding on permits without allowing the Tribes to address their concerns in court is an egregious overreach of legislation in general, but also of particular concern to Tribal governments, who would be directly affected but unable to address their concerns in the only legal means that they currently have.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe in support of permanent protection of their Boundary Waters.

THE MINNESOTA CHIPPEWA TRIBE,
January 31, 2020.

Hon. RAÚL GRIJALVA,
*Longworth House Office Building,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. BETTY McCOLLUM,
*Rayburn House Office Building,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. ALAN LOWENTHAL,
*Cannon House Office Building,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES GRIJALVA, McCOLLUM, AND LOWENTHAL: The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe is a federally recognized Indian tribe that is comprised of the following six Bands' Bois Forte; Fond du Lac; Grand Portage; Leech Lake; Mille Lacs; and White Earth. The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe has approximately 41,000 members. The duly elected governing body of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe is the Tribal Executive Com-

mittee which is comprised of the Chairpersons and Secretary/Treasurers from the six constituent Bands.

The United States has government-to-government relationships with both the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe and each of the six Bands of the Minnesota Chippewa Tribe. Three MCT Bands, Fond Du Lac, Grand Portage, and Bois Forte, retain hunting, fishing, and other usufructuary rights that extend throughout the entire northeast portion of the state of Minnesota under the 1854 Treaty of LaPointe (the "Ceded Territory"). In the Ceded Territory, all the Bands have a legal interest in protecting natural resources and all federal agencies share in the federal government's trust responsibility to the Bands to maintain those treaty resources.

The Minnesota Chippewa Tribe is concerned with the prospect of a series of sulfide-ore mines being developed in the headwaters of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area ("BWCA") watershed. The BWCA watershed is located on the Minnesota/Ontario border and is entirely within the 1854 Ceded Territory. The BWCA watershed is comprised of a vast area of pristine interconnected waterways that have been used by the Chippewa for centuries. Low buffering capacity of water and soil and the interconnection of lakes and streams, make the BWCA watershed particularly vulnerable to the impacts of mining.

We are very supportive of HR5598, the Boundary Waters Wilderness Protection and Pollution Prevention Act. This bill would permanently withdraw federal minerals from potential leasing for sulfide-ore copper mining in the Rainy River Headwaters, which directly drain into the BWCAW. As former US Forest Service Chief Tom Tidwell stated, sulfide-ore copper mining has the potential to permanently destroy the pure waters and intact forests in the area of the proposed Twin Metals mine. The fish in adjacent waters—Birch Lake, the South Kawishiwi River, and downstream water bodies—are subject to consumption advisories designated by the Minnesota Department of Health because of mercury in their flesh. Sulfide-ore copper mining will increase the amount of mercury in fish, a toxin of great concern to our members who depend on wild caught fish for their sustenance. Wild rice and terrestrial species will also be at risk, as pollution and habitat destruction will have wide reaching impacts.

We are currently blessed with a healthy environment, a healthy economy, and a public resource that offers sustenance and solace. All of this is at risk if any mining proposal in the watershed moves forward. It is unacceptable to trade this precious landscape and our way of life to enrich foreign mining companies that will leave a legacy of degradation that will last forever. We encourage you, in the strongest terms, to move this legislation forward. We need this protection before it is too late, and the future of this area is now in your hands.

Sincerely,

CATHERINE J. CHAVERS,
President.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I remind my friends on the other side of the aisle that the United States imports 46 percent of the copper we consume every year from foreign nations ourselves. The first step to reshoring and securing our mineral supply chain must be to allow and support domestic mining. H.R. 3195 does just that.

□ 1330

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN), my good friend.

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Superior National Forest Restoration Act presented by my good friend and colleague, Mr. STAUBER.

Northern Minnesota has a long, proud legacy of responsible mining that was pivotal in our Nation's victory in World War II. As we enter into greater strategic competition with China, we are presented with a similar challenge: We can either source American critical minerals such as those contained in the Superior National Forest ourselves or become even more dependent on our chief adversary for our mineral and energy needs.

America has the most stringent environmental standards in the world, and we are being forced to source minerals from dictators and despots who use child labor and who are without concern for the ecological impacts.

We have abundant resources here at home, including the abundant Duluth Complex. Despite the environmental and economic benefits of these minerals, the Obama and Biden administrations have consistently worked to block exploration and development of these lands.

This bill will reinstate the mining leases for the world's largest untapped copper-nickel deposit and help our Nation dominate the critical mineral sector while providing hundreds of reliable, well-paying jobs.

This is an economic issue and a national security issue. We can either be beholden and reliant on a foreign nation that seeks to supplant us, or we can be a global leader in the critical mineral industry.

I support the Twin Metals project, I support this bill, and I encourage all of my colleagues to do the same.

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

I will be talking about what is good for our economy. There have been studies showing that what is best for the economy, including this area, is to continue to protect these public lands.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD an abstract on a study by James Stock and Jacob Bradt, Harvard economists, outlining the regional economic impacts of two scenarios, the first being the now-finalized withdrawal, and the second being if this mine is allowed to proceed.

Mr. Speaker, the link to the full study can be found here: <https://scholar.harvard.edu/files/stock/files/snf-withdrawal—stock-bradt—updated—june—2019.pdf>

ANALYSIS OF PROPOSED 20-YEAR MINERAL LEASING WITHDRAWAL IN SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST

(By James H. Stock, Department of Economics and Harvard Kennedy School, Harvard University)

(By Jacob T. Bradt, Harvard Kennedy School, Harvard University, June 24, 2019)

ABSTRACT

The Rainy River Watershed on the Superior National Forest is home to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness (BWCAW). It also contains deposits of copper, nickel, and trace metals, and copper-nickel mining has been proposed adjacent to and upstream of the BWCAW. This sets up a potential tradeoff between economic benefits from mining and concerns about negative economic consequences of that mining on the local recreational and amenity-based economy. Existing studies of mining in the Superior National Forest focus on static effects on a single industry (e.g. mining) at some unspecified point over a medium-run horizon. We draw on these studies and the economics literature to provide a unified analysis of the effect of the proposed mining development on income and employment over time. Our results suggest that the proposed development would lead to a boom-bust cycle that is typical of resource extraction economies, exacerbated by the likely negative effect on the recreation industry.

Keywords: Economic impact analysis, resource extraction, recreation economy, mining economy

Declaration of interest: None.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, if mining were permitted, these economists find that there would be an initial but temporary net growth in employment.

But over time, any economic benefits of mining would be outweighed by the negative impacts of mining on the existing recreational industry and on folks moving to this area.

Under any scenario where sulfide-ore copper mining is allowed, it leads to a boom-and-bust cycle where the local economy is left worse off than before.

Look, these leases sat for decades and decades with no mining used. Now, when it is economically convenient, they want to mine. That illustrates that this is a boom-bust economy and what will be destroyed, though, is of enduring, lasting, economic value.

By protecting this region and the land this will help preserve and grow the 22,000 jobs and \$1.4 billion in annual visitor spending, including its small businesses, which are essential for a strong and robust diversified economy.

The other choice, the alternative, is to allow a Chilean mining company to pollute our land, take our minerals without paying a royalty, ship them overseas to China, smelt them, and sell them on the global market, including to our competitors.

What is best for our American economy is to protect the strong recreational economy we have now in this area and continue to protect these public lands.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from California is right. The United States does produce a lot of copper, but it uses even more. In 2016,

the United States was only 29 percent import reliant on copper. Eight years later that number has risen to 46 percent.

This trend cannot continue. We must support our new domestic mines to meet our own demand.

Mr. Speaker, I will also say that my colleague just referenced a Harvard study that was not peer-reviewed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS).

Mr. COLLINS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also thank the gentleman for his commitment not just for his district, not just for the communities in his district and the industry, but the communities and industries across this whole country.

Mr. Speaker, we had the opportunity last year to visit his district and hold a field hearing.

As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, there was not a single colleague from the other side of the aisle that attended that field hearing. If they did, they would have learned a few things.

Number one, that it is one of the largest deposits of critical minerals in the world. That Federal land sits beside State land that does have permits for mining the same thing, but the Federal land is being held up.

As a matter of fact, 80 percent of all critical minerals that are mined in this country are sent over to China to be processed because we have shut down smelters in this country. We are down to three.

My colleagues would have also seen the look on the faces up there, the face of people in a community that is being devastated. They are worried not just about themselves, but for the generations that are to come. These are people that set the standard for mining around the world.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is one more step in overturning and untangling this web these out-of-control Federal agencies have placed on a good industry, a great industry in our country.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all of my colleagues to please vote for this bill.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a 2022 poll citing a 2-1 margin of Minnesotans opposing sulfide-ore copper mining on the edge of the Boundary Waters.

[From Impact Research, May 10, 2022]

MINNESOTANS SUPPORT PERMANENT PROTECTIONS FOR THE BOUNDARY WATERS FROM THE RISKS OF SULFIDE-ORE COPPER MINING

(By: Zac McCrary, Luke Martin)

Minnesotans are deeply connected to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and it remains a uniquely popular and loved resource in an age of polarization. Since 2015, polling has consistently shown that due to this deep connection, voters in Minnesota are strongly opposed to sulfide-ore copper mining on the edge of the Boundary Waters and in its watershed. Voters support taconite mining and sulfide-ore copper mining in areas of the state that don't pose a risk to the pristine Boundary Waters. Voters readily reject mining industry arguments that the watershed of the Boundary Waters is specifically needed to fulfill the nation's critical

mineral needs. As a result, Minnesotans support several legislative and administrative actions that would increase protections for the Boundary Waters, including permanent protection.

The Boundary Waters is uniquely popular and well-regarded in Minnesota. Favorability for the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is near unanimous across the state with 86 percent statewide who are favorable, including 70 percent who are very favorable. More than 2-in-3 Minnesotans (67 percent) say they have personally been to the Boundary Waters including 9 percent who visit every year.

By a 2-1 margin, Minnesotans oppose sulfide-ore copper mining on the edge of the Boundary Waters (60 percent oppose vs. 31 percent support). A strong majority of voters have been consistently opposed to sulfide-ore copper mining in the watershed of the Boundary Waters since pollsters began asking this question in 2015. Even among the 31 percent who would currently support sulfide-ore copper mining on the edge of the Boundary Waters, their support is soft—just 12 percent strongly support it, and nearly 2-in-3 supporters (63 percent) say their support is contingent on an environmental analysis that finds that sulfide-ore copper mining in the Boundary Water's watershed could be done without risk to the Boundary Waters.

Minnesotans overwhelmingly support a broad array of legislative and administrative actions to protect the Boundary Waters from sulfide-ore copper mining, including legislation to permanently protect the Boundary Waters:

Minnesotans support legislation to permanently protect the Boundary Waters from the risks associated with sulfide-ore copper mining by a 35-point margin (63 percent support vs 28 percent oppose). Permanent protections are also a winning issue with undecided voters (58 percent support). Independents who support them by a 7-point margin, and in the new 8th Congressional District (56 percent support). After hearing arguments from both sides of the issue, support for permanent protections increases to 67 percent among all likely Minnesota voters.

By a 19-point margin (45 percent support vs 26 percent oppose), Minnesotans agree that the state should update its nonferrous mining rules have not been updated in 30 years, and currently allow for levels of pollution that would contaminate the Boundary Waters. Updating the state's rules would allow for the application of modern science to protect the Boundary Waters.

Minnesota voters reject the false choice between mining in the watershed of the Boundary Waters for critical minerals needed for national security or clean energy purposes and protecting the Boundary Waters. In testing responses to statements about mining for critical minerals in the watershed of the Boundary Waters for national security or a green economy, voters agree by double-digit margins that we don't have to choose between critical minerals and protecting the Boundary Waters. By working with our allies such as Canada, Norway, and Australia and increasing recycling in our own country, we can have both critical minerals the nation needs and preserve the legacy of the Boundary Waters.

Minnesotans are not anti-mining in general. A majority of voters support taconite mining (61 percent) and sulfide-ore copper mining in areas where it would not pose any danger to the Boundary Waters or its watershed (53 percent). However, there is overwhelming opposition to sulfide-ore copper mining in the watershed of the Boundary Waters due to pollution and contamination risks. Opposition to mining in the Boundary Waters cuts through demographic, geo-

graphic, and ideological lines, making their protection a clear political winner for elected leaders in Minnesota.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I also include in the RECORD a letter from the Wilderness Society in opposition to this legislation.

THE WILDERNESS SOCIETY,

May 11, 2023.

Dear Chairman Pete Stauber, Ranking Member Ocasio-Cortez, and Members of the House Natural Resources Energy and Minerals Subcommittee:

On behalf of our more than one million members and supporters, The Wilderness Society (TWS) writes to urge you to oppose House Congressional Resolution 34 and the so-called Superior National Forest Restoration Act. We respectfully request that this letter be submitted to the hearing record.

TWS supports Public Land Order 7917, which in early 2023 withdrew 225,504 acres of public lands and minerals located in the headwaters of the Boundary Waters in the Superior National Forest from the federal mineral leasing program for twenty years. House Congressional Resolution 34 and the Superior National Forest Restoration Act would reverse the goals of that Public Land Order.

The two pieces of legislation being heard by the Subcommittee today represent a wholesale attack on both the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness's unique character and ecological values, as well as an attack on executive agency authority to protect our federal public lands and waters, particularly under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act.

Protecting the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness from Copper Mining. The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness in the Superior National Forest of northeastern Minnesota is made up of 1.1 million acres of interconnected lakes and rivers and is located adjacent to and downstream of Voyageurs National Park and Canada's Quetico Provincial Park. The Boundary Waters not only provides habitat for wildlife, but it is also a refuge for people from every state in the U.S. who visit the Boundary Waters to fish, canoe, hike, recreate, and enjoy its forests, tranquil lakes, trails, and more than 1,200 miles of canoe routes.

The Boundary Waters is core to the region's booming outdoor recreation industry, which generates \$913 million in revenue and supports more than 17,000 local jobs annually. A 2019 economic study by Harvard Professor James H. Stock, Ph.D., former chair of Harvard's economics department, found that protecting this watershed from copper mining would result in 1,500 to 4,600 additional jobs and \$100 million to \$900 million in additional income over a 20-year period in an already thriving outdoor recreation-based economy.

In October 2021, the Biden administration announced they were re-initiating the process for a 20-year mineral withdrawal, reversing a misguided move by the former Trump administration to prevent a withdrawal and advance the destructive Twin Metals Mine. In early 2023, the Biden administration issued an environmental analysis and decision that found the impacts of sulfide-ore copper mining at the headwaters of the Boundary Waters could harm the area's abundant freshwater, deemed "immaculate" by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency. Secretary Debra Haaland then issued Public Land Order 7917 withdrawing the area from new mining leases and permits, protecting America's most visited Wilderness area as well as Voyageurs National Park from toxic sulfide-ore copper mining in its headwaters. H. Con. Res. 34 and H.R. ____ needlessly cancel the science-based mineral withdrawal

of the Boundary Waters, reinstate the cancelled mineral leases, and limit scientific and community input on the future of the Boundary Waters. The science is clear about the pollution and destruction that sulfide-ore copper mining on upstream land and waters would do: that pollution would flow directly into the Boundary Waters and into Voyageurs National Park and Canadian lands and waters as well.

We urge your committee to reject this legislation and instead permanently protect the Boundary Waters by passing H.R. 5598, Rep. McCollum's Boundary Waters Wilderness Protection and Pollution Prevention Act.

Mineral Withdrawals under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. The Federal Land Policy & Management Act (FLPMA) explicitly grants the Secretary of the Interior the authority to make large-tract withdrawals of 5,000 acres or more of public lands from mineral extraction for up to 20 years. Republican and Democratic administrations have used this authority approximately 90 times over more than four decades, and Congress has never overturned one of those withdrawals.

Both H. Con. Res. 34 and the Superior National Forest Restoration Act seek to undermine this key provision of FLPMA, threatening the ability of future presidential administrations to set aside tracts of land from mineral development. FLPMA withdrawals are used to protect a wide range of public land resources for conservation, cultural resource protection and even research. In fact, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) recently withdrew 22,684 acres of Public Land in Nevada's Railroad Valley upon request of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA)'s to preserve the area's land surface which is used to calibrate NASA's Earth-observing satellites.

Finally, H. Con. Res. 34 relies on a provision of FLPMA that is widely understood to be an unconstitutional legislative veto. Section 1130 of the House of Representatives Manual lists the provision as among several dozen unconstitutional legislative veto provisions. Additionally, a federal appeals court in 2017 definitively found the unconstitutional legislative veto provision severable from the Secretary of the Interior's withdrawal authority, which remains fully operative.

Conclusion. TWS strongly opposes H. Con. Res. 23 and Superior National Forest Restoration Act and we urge all members of the Energy and Mineral Resources Subcommittee to oppose both pieces of legislation being considered by the Subcommittee today.

Sincerely,

LYDIA WEISS,
Senior Director, Government Relations,
The Wilderness Society.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, lastly I include testimony in opposition to the legislation from Becky Rom, national chair of The Campaign to Save the Boundary Waters, a coalition of businesses, conservation groups, and outdoor recreation organizations.

Mr. Speaker, the link to Becky Rom's testimony can be found here: [Https://docs.house.gov/meetings/II/II06/20230511/115888/HHRG-118-II06-Wstate-RomR-20230511.pdf](https://docs.house.gov/meetings/II/II06/20230511/115888/HHRG-118-II06-Wstate-RomR-20230511.pdf).

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, my colleague from California just mentioned temporary jobs.

When we first started mining iron ore 145 years ago, the American Rockefeller family thought they were going to be just temporary jobs as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN).

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and colleague from northern Minnesota for yielding. We share a lot of commonalities, and one is our love of the outdoors and of our national treasures.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in favor today of H.R. 3195, the Superior National Forest Restoration Act. For those of us in the North Woods of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin, mining is a core part of our history, economies, and way of life. From the long heritage of copper country in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan to the millions of tons of iron ore that come from Minnesota each year, it is a treasure.

The abundant resources in our region are now more important than ever with sources of nickel, cobalt, titanium, and now even helium being discovered and poised to play a huge role in the growth of renewable energy technologies and mineral independence.

At the same time, those of us in the Great Lakes region are fiercely protective of our forests, waters, and wilderness, which is why I am a proud supporter of programs like the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative and the North American Wetlands Conservation Act.

It is the job of the Bureau of Land Management and the Forest Service to properly balance responsible resource extraction with the protection of our natural treasures.

Instead of balance, the Biden administration pushed a 20-year ban on mining on more than 200,000 acres of land entirely outside the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness. This decision ignored a very simple truth: Environmental conservation and utilization of our natural resources are not mutually exclusive.

Projects should be approved or disapproved based on their individual merits and risks after proper environmental reviews are completed, not just banned wholesale. This abrupt cancellation also goes directly against the Biden administration's efforts to secure domestic supply lines for critical minerals that go into solar panels, batteries, and other renewable energy infrastructure.

The United States cannot lead the world in clean energy while at the same time being reliant on the minerals produced by countries with absolutely no regard for environmental standards like China and Russia.

This reliance on foreign adversaries for our domestic mineral manufacturing and energy supply lines also poses significant risk to our national security. We are blessed to have abundant natural resources within our borders, and we have the responsibility to protect the environment while we secure America's mineral and energy independence into the future.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support the bill.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California has 6½ minutes remaining.

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

I will start by noting that the Harvard study was, in fact, peer-reviewed. As a former professor, I am very familiar with the peer-review process. It is a reliable study, and what it shows is what is best for the economy of this region and that is to protect these public lands and waters.

Let me ask, what is the value of clean water? Water is also a valuable resource. It is also a resource in scarce supply around the country.

If this bill moves forward, it will allow for the irreversible pollution of this pristine and incredibly valuable landscape. Remember, the Forest Service concluded after scientific study that there is a virtual certainty of severe and irreparable economic harm. All 100 percent of the sulfide-ore copper mines in this country have had leakages and environmental contamination. That is what will happen here.

This will mean the decimation of local economies that depend on visitation. This is the most visited wilderness area in our country. It belongs to the people of the United States. It does not belong and should not belong to a Chilean mining company which, under our outdated mining laws, will pay no royalty at all to the American people.

If the U.S. wants to reduce our demand for copper, which is increasing, then we should invest in recycling, in reuse, in manufacturing improvements. That would create jobs domestically and not risk special places like the Boundary Waters.

If this mine proceeds, and if this water is contaminated and destroyed, there is no known remediation strategy. It cannot be undone. The U.S. Forest Service has conducted an environmental review. They have consulted with communities, they have consulted with Tribal members, and they have relied on cutting-edge science, and they have concluded that these mines should not go forward.

The science is done here. It just doesn't line up with the answer of my colleagues' donors.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, first off, they have never completed an environmental review. I will be very clear: There will never be mining in the Boundary Waters or the buffer zone around it. That was decided in 1978. This bill will not circumvent or short-change environmental review in any way. We are not requiring any permits or mine plants be approved. We are simply requiring that they go through the review process the way any other project would move forward.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. EMMER), the majority whip.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the Superior National Forest Restoration Act.

For the last 3 years, the domestic mining industry in Minnesota and around the country has been under assault. Mining supports good-paying jobs, and it is critical to our economy and national security. However, rather than putting Minnesota miners to work, those opposing this legislation would rather rely on China and Russia to supply our critical materials making us less secure and causing greater environmental harm.

This bill strengthens Minnesota's economy while promoting a safe and clean energy supply. I thank Congressman STAUBER for his relentless work on this issue, and I urge all of my colleagues to support his bill.

□ 1345

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 5½ minutes remaining.

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

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chair, I want to reiterate the fact to the American people, there will be no mining in the Boundary Waters, and there will be no mining in the buffer zone around the Boundary Waters. That was settled in 1978.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), the Chair of the full Natural Resources Committee.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3195, the Superior National Forest Restoration Act of 2024.

First of all, I thank the chairman of the Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER), my good friend, for his leadership in this area.

Since his first day in Congress, Mr. STAUBER has fought tirelessly for his district and has done an excellent job representing the people and the interests of the Iron Range through his work here in Washington.

This bill is the culmination of years of meetings, hearings, and hard work to ensure that the voices of those living in northern Minnesota are heard in Congress and the White House.

I have been to northern Minnesota many times, even with Mr. STAUBER's predecessor, Democrat Congressman Rick Nolan, and I have seen how important the mining industry is to the region, as it has been for over a century.

I have also seen American mining companies' dedication to producing essential minerals with exemplary regard for their employees, the environment, and the communities in which they operate. In doing so, U.S. domestic mines set the global gold standard for responsible resource procurement.

The Duluth Complex in northern Minnesota contains one of the largest deposits of minerals in the world, including the world's second largest deposit of copper. According to S&P Global Market Intelligence, global copper demand is expected to be double current production in the next decade, driven primarily by the push to electrification.

In fact, annual copper output from the Twin Metals project alone would support the production of 13,000 megawatts of wind turbine power or 10,000 megawatts of solar power per year. Yet, from 2022 to 2023, U.S. copper production dropped by 11 percent, even as our net import reliance—meaning the amount of copper we have to buy from foreign sources—rose 46 percent. The Duluth Complex also contains world-class reserves of critical minerals such as cobalt and nickel.

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

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WESTERMAN. The Biden administration's recent actions to restrict access to this treasure trove of vital and increasingly scarce minerals simply does not make sense for our national security, for the people of northern Minnesota, or even for President Biden's own mineral-intensive goals to build out renewable energy production and achieve net-zero emissions.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3195 and reinstate Minnesotans' rights to access their abundant resources.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time and am prepared to close. I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. PORTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, the Boundary Waters is not a bathtub. The water flows from one place into the other, and in this case the watershed flows north, meaning it would flow past the mine and into the protected wilderness.

My colleague on the other side of the aisle says there would be no mining in the Boundary Waters, but there would be waste. There would be pollution in those waters because of the watershed.

This is exactly why we should rely on the scientific process and the conclusion of the Forest Service that this mining would cause severe and irreparable harm. I have heard no rebuttal from the other side of the aisle to the fact that 100 percent of every sulfide-copper mine in our country has had leakages and environmental harm.

Mr. Speaker, we have been having hearings, markups, and floor votes on this issue for years. Administrations have canceled and reinstated these leases, and then canceled them again.

The Biden administration, unlike the previous administration, took the time and effort to do the process right. They came to the considered decision, based on science, to cancel the wrongly reinstated leases and to protect the Boundary Waters region for the next 20 years.

That decision is not just based on sound science. It also is based on community input, robust Tribal consultation, and at the end of the day on the best interests of the American people because that is who these public lands belong to. That is who should benefit from these public lands.

However, a foreign company and politicians who bend to their interests don't like it. As I have made clear in this Congress, their priority is not putting science first or protecting communities. Their priority is putting corporate polluters' profits above all else by any means necessary.

My Republican colleagues say that the toxic mining industry needs certainty. Well, this is certainty. The Boundary Waters watershed is off limits.

I welcome the opportunity to work across the aisle to reform the mining law; for example, to require royalty payments. That way we can build a sustainable future for the industry. Part of that conversation—support of mining—needs to be recognition that some places are too special and too risky, and some types of mining are too risky to do.

At the end of the day, what would you choose: your child's health, our lands, wilderness, endangered species, tourism jobs, our local economy, or would you choose a foreign company who wants to mine in a location that would hurt the environment, our economy, and our health? I know what I would choose.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Chair, I yield my self the balance of my time to close.

The Biden administration's mining policy is: anywhere but America, any worker but the American worker.

The Republicans refuse to allow child slave labor to happen. We refuse to allow this great country to purchase minerals mined by child slave labor in Congo. We will not turn a blind eye to the atrocities and the slave labor happening in Congo where this administration wants to purchase its minerals.

Mr. Speaker, I again urge my colleagues to support H.R. 3195. The bottom line is you can't be a proponent of national security, a proponent of reducing global emissions, and a proponent of fair labor, and yet be against domestic mining at the same time.

Congress voted to spend billions of dollars on building out transmission and increasing renewable energy development, all of which require enormous amounts of copper, nickel, cobalt, and other minerals that can be sourced right here in the United States of America in my home State of Minnesota.

Issuing directives to pursue renewable energy development while at the same time denying access to the minerals needed to domestically manufacture the products simply does not make sense.

The International Energy Agency estimates that achieving net zero by 2050 would require six times more mines than are currently operating today. While the U.S. is blessed with abundant mineral resources within our borders, domestic, primary mine production of critical minerals—those defined by USGS as essential for our economic and national security—decreased by almost 25 percent from 2022 to 2023, forcing the U.S. to look elsewhere to source these materials.

We cannot totally rely on our allies to access these vital resources. China currently dominates global production for over half the materials on the critical minerals list. Biden's mining policy of anywhere but America, any worker but American must be stopped.

We can mine these minerals domestically under the best labor and environmental standards in the world. We know this all too well in northern Minnesota, where mining is our past, our present, and our future. If we get the politics out of the way, our mining future will be bright. Minnesotans know how to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters of support for this bill from the National Mining Association, Jobs for Minnesotans, Mining Minnesota, Up North Jobs, Range Association of Municipalities and Schools. I also include the project labor agreement between Twin Metals Minnesota and Iron Range Building and Construction Trades Council.

Washington, DC, April 29, 2024.

Hon. MIKE JOHNSON,
*Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

Hon. HAKEEM JEFFRIES,
*Democratic Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER JOHNSON AND MINORITY LEADER JEFFRIES: On behalf of the National Mining Association (NMA), I am writing to express our strong support for the Superior National Forest Restoration Act (H.R. 3195). Ensuring access to our federal lands for responsible mineral exploration and development is critical to securing the essential materials necessary for nearly every sector of our economy.

Northern Minnesota is a place of tremendous natural beauty and is also blessed with worldclass mineral deposits including copper, nickel and essential metals that are vital for U.S. economic and national security priorities. In fact, this area contains the largest undeveloped deposits of nickel, copper and platinum metals in the world. Despite these abundant resources, the U.S. continues to be increasingly reliant on foreign sources of metals and minerals, including from geopolitical adversaries that do not share our values when it comes to environmental, labor and safety standards.

The Biden administration's self-sabotage of domestic mineral supply chains through mineral withdrawals, restrictions and duplicative permitting processes is completely out of step with the dramatic increase in minerals production that is needed in the coming decades to keep up with new technologies, infrastructure and manufacturing needs, let alone the administration's energy transition goals. Instead of ceding our nation's mineral supply chain security to other countries, the U.S. should utilize its world-class environmental standards to produce

needed minerals while protecting our environment.

H.R. 3195 supports responsible mineral exploration and development in an area specifically designated and set aside by Congress and the U.S. Forest Service for such activities. The administration's anti-mining actions continue a dangerous trend of politicizing domestic mineral supply chains first initiated in the waning days of the Obama administration. Continuing to pursue dangerous policies that lock up federal lands with high mineral potential will both kill future mineral development in this region and deny the hard-working men and women of Northern Minnesota the opportunity of high-paying jobs—all, while eliminating significant revenues for Minnesota's rural communities that come from these projects in the form of taxes and royalties. These revenues support local schools and important regional development projects.

Currently, less than half of the mineral needs of U.S. manufacturing are met by domestically mined minerals. H.R. 3195 will help change this alarming trajectory by ensuring access to one of our nation's important mineral deposits.

The NMA urges passage of this important legislation and continued trust of our nation's strong environmental regulations and system of due process to strengthen a reliable and stable domestic mineral supply chain for the future.

Sincerely,

RICH NOLAN.

Jobs for Minnesotans,
St. Paul, MN, April 29, 2024.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: I am writing today on behalf of Jobs for Minnesotans, a nonpartisan coalition co-founded by the Minnesota Building and Construction Trades Council and the Minnesota Chamber of Commerce and strengthened by labor unions, community leaders and business members from across the state. We represent 70,000 union workers, 6,300 companies and 500,000 employees in Minnesota.

In May 2023, the Superior National Forest Restoration Act—H.R. 3195 was introduced by House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources Chairman Pete Stauber (R-MN) to re-establish the ability for safe, sustainable mining in northeast Minnesota. Our coalition is in strong support of H.R. 3195. We have consistently advocated for a fair regulatory process—fair to the public, the government agencies and investors alike.

The Duluth Complex in Minnesota is home to significant domestic reserves of nickel, cobalt, and copper. Unlocking this domestic supply of critical minerals is crucial for bolstering US national security by reducing our nation's reliance on foreign resources, strengthening a secure supply chain, and fostering a timely energy transition.

H.R. 3195 is essential for preserving the 140-year historical legacy of mining in northeast Minnesota, which has been an economic cornerstone for the region. By re-establishing safe, responsible mining, H.R. 3195 aims to secure and create jobs in the region, allowing Minnesota to live up to its full potential in leading the responsible production of critical minerals that are essential to our nation's clean energy goals.

To ensure the continued prosperity of mining in the region, H.R. 3195 includes provisions that give companies a chance to undergo the rigorous, scientifically based regulatory processes under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) that are needed to start new mining projects. These processes ensure mining activities are conducted responsibly and with minimal environmental impact.

Passing the Superior National Forest Restoration Act is not only an issue of economic importance but also one of securing domestic mineral production for the long run. We hope you will join us in supporting this critical legislation.

Thank you for your consideration,

DAVID CHURA,
Board Chair.

MINING MINNESOTA,

April 26, 2024.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: Last May, House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources Chairman Pete Stauber (R-MN) introduced the Superior National Forest Restoration Act—H.R. 3195 to reestablish the ability for safe, sustainable mining in Northeastern Minnesota. On behalf of Mining Minnesota and our members, we are writing to urge you to support this vital piece of legislation.

The recent withdrawal of federal land use for over 225,000 acres by the Biden Administration has put essential mining projects, including Twin Metals Minnesota, at risk. This decision undermines American mineral independence. The Duluth Complex in Minnesota is home to significant domestic reserves of nickel, cobalt, and copper. Unlocking this domestic supply of critical minerals is crucial for bolstering US national security by reducing our nation's reliance on foreign resources, strengthening a secure supply chain, and fostering a timely energy transition.

Furthermore, H.R. 3195 is essential for preserving the 140-year historical legacy of mining in Northeastern Minnesota, which has been an economic cornerstone for countless cities and towns in the region. By re-establishing safe, sustainable mining, H.R. 3195 aims to secure the jobs that the withdrawal aims to threaten, thereby restoring the economic livelihood of those in Northeastern Minnesota.

To ensure the continued prosperity of mining in the region, H.R. 3195 includes provisions that give companies a chance to undergo the rigorous, scientifically-based regulatory processes under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) that are needed to start new mining projects. These processes make certain that mining activities are conducted responsibly and with minimal environmental impact.

Passing the Superior National Forest Restoration Act is not only an issue of economic importance but also one of securing domestic mineral production for the long-run. We hope you will join us in supporting this critical legislation.

Thank you for your consideration,

JULIE C. LUCAS,
Executive Director.

UP NORTH JOBS,

April 26, 2024.

DEAR MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: Last May, House Natural Resources Subcommittee on Energy and Mineral Resources Chairman Pete Stauber (R-MN) introduced the Superior National Forest Restoration Act, H.R. 3195, to establish safe, sustainable mining in Northeastern Minnesota. On behalf of Up North Jobs Inc., a Minnesota based nonprofit and our almost 3,500 individual and corporate members, we are writing to urge you to support this vital piece of proposed legislation.

The recent withdrawal of federal land use for over 225,000 acres by the Biden Administration has put essential mining projects, including Twin Metals Minnesota, at risk. This decision undermines American mineral independence. The Duluth Complex in Minnesota is home to significant domestic reserves of nickel, cobalt, and copper. Unlocking this

domestic supply of critical minerals is crucial for bolstering United States national security by reducing our nation's reliance on foreign resources, strengthening a secure supply chain, and fostering a timely energy transition.

Furthermore, H.R. 3195 is essential for preserving our 140-year historical legacy of mining in Northeastern Minnesota, which has been an economic cornerstone for countless cities and towns in the region. By re-establishing safe, sustainable mining, H.R. 3195 aims to secure the jobs that the withdrawal threatens, thereby restoring the economic livelihood of those in Northeastern Minnesota.

To ensure the continued prosperity of mining in the region, H.R. 3195 includes provisions that give companies a chance to undergo the rigorous, scientifically-based regulatory processes under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) that are needed to start new mining projects. These processes make certain that mining activities are conducted responsibly and with minimal environmental impact.

Passing the Superior National Forest Restoration Act is not only an issue of economic importance but also one of securing domestic mineral production for the long-run. We hope you will join us in supporting this critical legislation.

Thank you for your consideration,

GERALD M. TYLER,
President and CEO.

RANGE ASSOCIATION OF
MUNICIPALITIES AND SCHOOLS,

Mt. Iron, MN, April 30, 2024.

Re RAMS Letter of Support—Superior National Forest Restoration Act (H.R. 3195)

CONGRESSMAN STAUBER AND MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES: On behalf of the Range Association of Municipalities and Schools (RAMS), I would like to indicate our support for the Superior National Forest Restoration Act (H.R. 3195).

This legislation recinds Public Land Order no. 7917 and allows for the reissuance of mineral leases for safe and sustainable sourcing of materials needed for Minnesota and the nation to meet green new deal goals and the 2035 energy transition. Without a domestic source of these minerals, we are at the mercy of unethical foreign governments. Minnesota operations have long been a leader in ethical and sustainable mining practices. The materials needed to meet these goals and an opportunity to do so are within our reach.

Our choices matter. The need for the minerals in the Duluth Complex and surrounding areas is clear. We support the clean energy transition and we must allow companies like Twin Metals and others be able to act on previously issued leases and move their projects forward to be a part of it.

Sincerely,

PAUL PELTIER,
Executive Director.

PROJECT LABOR AGREEMENT,

August 21, 2019.

Whereas, Twin Metals Minnesota and Iron Range Building and Construction Trades Council recognize skilled employees from construction and supporting crafts are vital to quality and timely completion of an underground copper, nickel, platinum group metals and cobalt mine; and

Whereas, Both parties are committed to working together in a spirit of harmony and stability; and

Whereas, Both sides are committed to building a 21st century underground mine operation that is safe for workers and environmentally friendly; and

Whereas, the legacy of quality represented by the people of the Building and Construction Trades continues a long tradition that built Northeastern Minnesota; and

Whereas, Work and completion of the Twin Metals Minnesota construction project will help Iron Range communities to prosper and grow;

Now, therefore both parties agree to enter into this comprehensive Project Labor Agreement, which shall be signed by Project Contractors selected for construction related to the mining, processing of precious metals in the Maturi Deposit, and tailings storage.

KELLY OSBORNE,
CEO, Twin Metals
Minnesota.

MIKE SYVERSUND,
President, Iron Range
Building & Con-
struction Trades
Council.

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this piece of legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. McCollum of Minnesota moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3195 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

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

Ms. McCollum moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3195 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Strike all after the enacting clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Boundary Waters Wilderness Protection and Pollution Prevention Act”.

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds the following:

(1) The Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness is a 1,090,000-acre Federal wilderness area, located within the Superior National Forest, that was originally designated in the Wilderness Act of 1964 (Public Law 88-577).

(2) The Forest Service manages the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, which includes—

(A) nearly 2,000 pristine lakes ranging in size from 10 acres to 10,000 acres, and more than 1,200 miles of canoe routes;

(B) 1,500 cultural resource sites including historic Ojibwe village sites and Native American pictograph panel sites; and

(C) 150 miles of land and water on the international border with the Government of Canada.

(3) In 1978, Congress passed the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness Act (Public Law 95-495) to remove incompatible uses, prohibit mining within the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and on 220,000 acres of the Superior National Forest, and to provide management guidance to protect, preserve, and enhance the lakes, waterways, and forested areas of the Boundary Waters Canoe

Area Wilderness to enhance public enjoyment of the unique landscape and wildlife.

(4) The federally recognized Grand Portage Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, the Fond du Lac Band of Lake Superior Chippewa, and the Bois Forte Band of Chippewa retain hunting, fishing, and other usufructuary rights throughout the entire northeast portion of Minnesota, including the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness, under the 1854 Treaty of LaPointe. All Bands have a legal interest in protecting natural resources and the Forest Service shares in the Federal trust responsibility to maintain treaty resources.

(5) The Rainy River Watershed lies within the Superior National Forest, which contains 20 percent of the fresh water supply in the entire National Forest System.

(6) The Rainy River Watershed headwaters begin in northeastern Minnesota and flow north through the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Voyageurs National Park and into Canada along the shared international border. These international waters are governed by the 1909 Boundary Waters Treaty, which states that “boundary waters and the waters flowing across the boundary shall not be polluted on either side to the injury of health or property on the other”.

(7) The waters of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Voyageurs National Park are classified as Outstanding Resource Value Waters under Federal and State law, and degradation of water quality is prohibited. A risk of mining development is acid mine drainage which generally occurs when sulfide minerals are exposed to air and water creating sulfuric acid, which decreases water pH and leaches harmful metals such as copper, zinc, lead, cadmium, iron, and nickel.

(8) Acid mine runoff from sulfide-ore copper mining entering groundwater, rivers, streams, and lakes harms aquatic life, degrades water quality, and results in potential severe environmental impacts.

(9) A peer-reviewed study of water quality impacts from 14 operating United States copper sulfide mines found 100 percent of the mines experienced pipeline spills or accidental releases; 13 mines experienced failures of water collection and treatment systems to control contaminated mine seepage resulting in significant negative water quality impacts.

(10) The mining of copper and other metals in sulfide bearing ore on Federal lands in the Superior National Forest, within the Rainy River Watershed, poses a direct and long-term threat from sulfide-ore mining contamination to the pristine water and air quality and healthy forested habitat of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Voyageurs National Park.

(11) The likely contamination of the air, water, and forested habitat of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and Voyageurs National Park from the mining of copper, nickel, platinum, palladium, gold, and silver on Federal lands within the Rainy River Watershed puts at risk—

(A) the nationally recognized natural resources of the area; and

(B) the region’s amenity-based and tourism industry, which if protected by a mineral withdrawal, would grow by 1,500 to 4,600 more jobs and \$100,000,000 to \$900,000,000 more income over the next 20 years than if such mining were not banned.

(12) In 2016, the Forest Service issued a Record of Decision which found “unacceptable the inherent potential risk that development of a regionally untested copper-nickel sulfide ore mine within the same watershed as the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness might cause serious and irreplaceable harm to this unique, iconic, and irreplaceable wilderness area”. The Forest

Service subsequently proposed a 20-year mineral withdrawal of 234,328 acres of Federal lands and waters in the Rainy River Watershed.

(13) In 2018, approximately 20 months into a 24-month review period of the Rainy River Watershed mineral withdrawal proposal, the Department of Agriculture abruptly canceled the withdrawal application and abandoned the Environmental Assessment.

SEC. 3. WITHDRAWAL OF CERTAIN FEDERAL LANDS AND WATERS IN THE STATE OF MINNESOTA.

(a) DEFINITION OF MAP.—In this Act, the term “Map” means the map prepared by the Forest Service entitled “Superior National Forest Mineral Withdrawal Application Map” and dated December 5, 2016.

(b) WITHDRAWAL.—Except as provided in subsection (d) and subject to valid existing rights, the approximately 234,328 acres of Federal land and waters in the Rainy River Watershed of the Superior National Forest in the State of Minnesota, as located on the Map and described in the Federal Register Notice of Application for Withdrawal, dated January 19, 2017 (82 Fed. Reg. 6639), are hereby withdrawn from—

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

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

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

(c) ACQUIRED LAND.—Any land or interest in land within the area depicted on the Map that is acquired by the United States after the date of enactment of this Act shall, on acquisition, be immediately withdrawn in accordance with this section.

(d) REMOVAL OF SAND, GRAVEL, GRANITE, IRON ORE, AND TACONITE.—The Chief of the Forest Service is authorized to permit the removal of sand, gravel, granite, iron ore, and taconite from national forest system lands within the area depicted on the Map if the Chief determines that the removal is not detrimental to the water quality, air quality, and health of the forest habitat within the Rainy River Watershed.

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

Amend the title so as to read: “A bill to provide for the protection of the Boundary Waters Canoe Area Wilderness and interconnected Federal lands and waters, including Voyageurs National Park, within the Rainy River Watershed in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes.”

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

TRUST THE SCIENCE ACT

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1173, I call up the bill (H.R. 764) to require the Secretary of the Interior to reissue regulations removing the gray wolf from the

list of endangered and threatened wildlife under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 764

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Trust the Science Act”.

SEC. 2. REMOVING THE GRAY WOLF FROM THE LIST OF ENDANGERED AND THREATENED WILDLIFE.

Not later than 60 days after the date of enactment of this section, the Secretary of the Interior shall reissue the final rule entitled “Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Removing the Gray Wolf (*Canis lupus*) From the List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife” and published on November 3, 2020 (85 Fed. Reg. 69778).

SEC. 3. NO JUDICIAL REVIEW.

Reissuance of the final rule under section 2 shall not be subject to judicial review.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources, or their respective designees.

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

The chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 764.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 764, sponsored by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. BOEBERT). This bill instructs the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to reissue its 2020 final rule delisting the gray wolf from the endangered species list in the lower 48 States.

Defining success under the Endangered Species Act is crucial not only for species but also for landowners. Understanding recovery goals and accurately measuring progress informs management actions needed to improve a species’ health and habitat. When a species is recovered and is a candidate to be delisted, the achievement should be celebrated.

Mr. Speaker, by every definition, the gray wolf is a recovered species and should be celebrated as an ESA success story.

Gray wolf populations are healthy and thriving in every region where

they are currently found. The Great Lakes region has the largest concentration of gray wolves in the lower 48 States, with approximately 4,200 wolves that inhabit the States of Michigan, Minnesota, and Wisconsin. The recovery plan and criteria for delisting the gray wolf in the Great Lakes is clear. The region must have a stable or increasing population of wolves in Minnesota and at least 200 wolves outside of the Minnesota population.

According to former wildlife biologist at the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Nathan Roberts: “These goals have been met since at least 1994.” He went on to say: “It is remarkable to note that given the natural lifespan of wolves, every wolf on the landscape in the Great Lakes region was born long after recovery goals were met.”

□ 1400

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

Backing up this record of success, in February, the Service announced it had denied two petitions related to the gray wolf, one calling for wolves to be relisted in the Northern Rocky Mountains ecosystem and another calling for wolves to be relisted in the entire Western United States. In denying these petitions, the Service stated wolves are “not at risk of extinction in the Western United States now or in the foreseeable future.”

The Service also stated that wolf populations in the Western United States had a healthy abundance, retained genetic diversity, had the ability to respond to high mortality events, and maintained adaptive capacity.

This announcement, coupled with the fact that most wolves in the Western United States are in States where they have already been delisted, shows that States are responsibly managing their wolf populations.

Mr. Speaker, this is not the first time the House of Representatives debated wolf management. In 2011, Congress directed the Service to reinstate a 2009 rule that delisted wolves in Idaho and Montana and prohibited judicial review.

In fact, delisting the gray wolf in the lower 48 States has bipartisan support. In 2013, the Obama administration proposed delisting the gray wolf in the lower 48 States. The Biden administration is currently appealing the Federal court orders that are preventing the 2020 delisting rule from taking effect. This is a rare occurrence where the Biden administration is actually defending an action taken by the Trump administration.

In 2018, the House of Representatives passed language similar to the bill before us today with the support of nine Democrats, some of whom are still in Congress. Yet, we are here again, pursuing a delisting that should have been accomplished long ago.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to celebrate the recovery of the gray wolf and support its delisting and the legislation that is before us today. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), one of the most passionate and knowledgeable champions for wolf preservation in the Congress.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to H.R. 764.

Rather than celebrate the 50th anniversary of the Endangered Species Act and the many species our Nation’s most successful conservation legislation has saved, House Republicans have relentlessly targeted the ESA and the wildlife it has protected.

As co-chair of the Endangered Species Act Caucus, I am deeply concerned about how House Republicans have proposed to weaken this popular bipartisan framework that preserves our Nation’s rich biodiversity.

Today’s scheme, a bill comically and ironically named Trust the Science Act, ignores what scientists are actually recommending to preserve the iconic gray wolf species and allow them to reach adequate recovery.

The protections of ESA have allowed gray wolf populations across the country to stabilize and regain strength, but if delisted nationally, gray wolves will once again be hunted and trapped to extinction.

Some of the things that my friend across the aisle has mentioned, where they have been delisted in States, 90 percent of the wolves have been killed already. We have seen proof of this in Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming. Trophy hunting of these beautiful wolves has recently been reintroduced in Wisconsin with States such as Michigan and Minnesota ready to follow suit.

Just last week, The Washington Post reported that photos of muzzled, injured wolves have gone viral worldwide, inundating the Wisconsin game and fish department with complaints.

If we actually wanted to trust the science, we would see the gray wolf has made progress in their recovery but also that wolves in the Northern Rocky Mountains are being killed in dramatic numbers, even the celebrated Yellowstone National Park’s gray wolves.

Why? To protect livestock? Wolves kill 9 out of every 100,000 cows in America. Wolves overwhelmingly feed on deer and elk, not farm animals, and prefer habitats with high forest coverage. Dogs kill twice as many cattle as wolves and 13 times more sheep. In Colorado, where wolves were recently reintroduced, they have killed one cat so far. Yet, we don’t say that all good dogs should go to the gravel pit when dogs kill twice as many cows as wolves.

Premature listing not only hinders wolf research, but in this environment, it puts a nationwide target on gray wolf packs.

I love my dog. I have seen the emotional complexity of canine consciousness, which they inherited from their

ancestors. If you love your dog, thank a wolf.

Wolf families are more like human families than almost any other species. They mate for the life of their partner. They keep their children in the pack until they are old enough to look for a mate. Please read Farley Mowat's "Never Cry Wolf" to see just how intelligent and charismatic these animals are.

We are in the midst of a biodiversity crisis. Rather than weakening regulations that safeguard important carnivores that strengthen our ecosystems, we should be supporting all current scientific efforts by fully funding the agencies that carry out ESA extinction prevention work.

I know appropriations deadlines are quickly approaching. If my colleagues don't like species being delisted, I have a letter they can join.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reflect on the success of the Endangered Species Act so far—a 99 percent success rate, one of the most effective pieces of legislation in our history—and why allocating adequate resources is essential to promoting species recovery and monitoring. Instead of mocking science, we should embrace it.

Here is a scientific fact for the fearful among us: Not a single human being in the lower 48 States has been killed by a wolf in the last 100 years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose H.R. 746.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for his eloquence and thoughtfulness, which stands in such contrast to the Kristi Noem school of animal welfare that we see reflected in the legislation before us.

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

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

I want to point out that although the accusations have been made that hunting would adversely affect the populations of wolves, that is contrary to proven data that we have from all species that are hunted.

In particular, in each State where wolves have been delisted, there is a State management plan in place that has been proven to be effective in managing wolf populations. Each State recovery plan calls for wolf populations to remain well above recovery goals, and science from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service proves that wolf populations remain healthy post-delisting.

While States may vary on population and size management, they all plan for and set policies to have a sustainable and secure population. To be clear, a reduction in population size is not the same as eliminating a population. Each State recovery plan calls for wolf populations to remain well above recovery goals.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. Boebert), the sponsor of the legislation.

Ms. BOEBERT. Mr. Speaker, I, too, stand here today celebrating the suc-

cess story of the Endangered Species Act, seeing that the gray wolf has been fully recovered.

I also stand today, Mr. Speaker, in defense of our farmers and ranchers, just like the Farrell family in Grand County, Colorado, who has lost up to five of their cattle in a 10-day span from wolves attacking their ranch in Grand County.

In my home State of Colorado, out-of-touch Denver and Boulder leftists voted to reintroduce gray wolves. Since 10 wolves were reintroduced in December, there have been eight confirmed wolf livestock depredations and six separate incidents involving wolf attacks in Colorado just this month. My Trust the Science Act delists the gray wolf from the Federal Endangered Species List and returns the issue of wolf management to States and Tribal wildlife agencies. Again, this is a success story that we should be celebrating here today.

Specifically, my bill requires the Secretary of the Interior to reissue the 2020 Department of the Interior final rule that delisted gray wolves in the lower 48 United States and ensures that the reassurance of the file rule will not be subject to judicial review.

Gray wolves were first listed under the Endangered Species Preservation Act in 1967. That was 57 years ago.

In 2009, the Obama administration upheld the decision to delist gray wolves when their Interior Secretary, Ken Salazar, a Democrat from Colorado, announced the decision at a press conference that the Fish and Wildlife Service decision to delist gray wolves was "a supportable one. . . . Scientists have concluded that recovery has occurred."

In 2011, Congress directed USFWS to reinstate a rule to delist the gray wolf in the Northern Rockies ecosystem.

In 2013, the Obama administration proposed delisting gray wolves in the lower 48 states.

In November 2020, scientists and non-partisan career employees at the Department of the Interior once again found gray wolves were fully recovered and once again issued a rule that returned management of gray wolf populations to State and Tribal wildlife agencies.

Unfortunately, frivolous litigation was filed by the Defenders of Wildlife, WildEarth Guardians, and other extremist groups, and an activist California judge subsequently pandered to these groups by vacating the 2020 rule and ultimately relisting the gray wolf by judicial fiat.

In April 2022, the Biden administration appealed the ruling of this California activist judge and supported the 2020 rule that delisted gray wolves in the lower 48 United States.

In February of this year, the Biden administration announced a "not warranted" finding for two frivolous petitions that tried to list gray wolves under the ESA in the Northern Rocky Mountains and the Western United States.

In the 115th Congress, the House of Representatives passed legislation similar to my bill in a vote of 196–180, with 9 Democrats voting in favor of passage.

State and Tribal wildlife agencies have a proven record of successfully managing gray wolves. In fact, Montana's successful State management resulted in gray wolves being 500 percent above Fish and Wildlife Service recovery goals. Idaho's successful State management resulted in gray wolves being 700 percent above recovery goals. Now, there are an estimated up to 6,000 wolves in the lower 48. Furthermore, there are an estimated 7,000 to 11,000 gray wolves in Alaska, and there are an estimated 30,000 gray wolves in Canada. Again, this is an endangered list success story.

Let's do as my bill says: Trust the bipartisan science and pass this bill so we can finally delist the fully recovered gray wolf and focus scarce taxpayer funding on endangered species that actually need help being recovered.

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

Throughout this Congress, my Republican colleagues have tried at every turn to weaken our bedrock environmental laws. The Endangered Species Act has, of course, been one of their favorites to attack.

Once again, Republican leadership has taken an opportunity to vilify an endangered species today, here on this floor, to sacrifice it to their precious industry groups. Guns, oil, and polluters has come to be what this GOP stands for, at least in this Congress.

Last summer, they rushed to the House floor with bills to increase the extinction risk of the lesser prairie-chicken and northern long-eared bat. Today, it is the iconic gray wolf.

Do my Republican friends truly have nothing better to do with their time, with the time of this body? We should be working on issues that make a difference to everyday life in America, but this Congress has been mostly about Republicans fighting with each other in a circular firing squad. The only time they seem to take a break from that is when they want to do something to enrich the wealthiest Americans, harm the environment, or, now, to kill wolves.

This bill is falsely named. It is called the Trust the Science Act. It would legislatively delist the gray wolf in the Endangered Species Act in the lower 48. That is not something that is done based on science. It is something this bill would do by political fiat.

The gray wolf is one of America's most iconic species. While it is making a comeback, the science and the facts on the ground tell us that it still needs help.

This bill would make it so that not a single gray wolf in the United States, in the entire country, would be protected by the Endangered Species Act.

□ 1415

Yes, it is true that the Yellowstone National Park wolf reintroduction is one of the great success stories of the ESA.

We saw that as apex predators, wolves help to rebalance and revitalize vibrant ecosystems and flourishing wildlife populations in one of the crown jewels of our National Park System.

The ESA has kept the wolf from going extinct. We have gone from several hundred wild wolves in America, and these were inhabiting the northern parts of Michigan and Minnesota, to approximately 7,500 wolves today with populations in at least 11 States.

That is the ESA in action. It is a great success story, but that doesn't mean that we can just unfurl a banner and declare, "mission accomplished." We certainly cannot do that when the folks who took wolves to the brink of extinction are ready to rev up the wolf-killing machine once again and put us right back on that path to extinction.

Wolf numbers have grown in the Western United States, but the ESA rightly requires more than just population counts for delisting. Otherwise, we can quickly devolve right back to where we started.

There are still a lot of factors that go into species recovery; habitat destruction, disease, the regulatory and recovery efforts by States that would have to take over management of the species if it is delisted, and a lot more.

The ESA requires that the Fish and Wildlife Service use the best available science to assess all of this, not just population numbers, before they make any delisting decisions. Importantly, the Fish and Wildlife Service must consult with Tribes.

Right now, the service is following these processes and developing a recovery plan, but if this bill was signed into law, all of that would be skipped. They would have to ignore any scientific evidence of remaining threats to the wolf. This is the danger of legislatively delisting a species.

While I believe my colleagues are capable of going on to Google and pulling up some population numbers on gray wolves, it is pretty brazen to suggest that they, as Members of Congress, are more qualified than the scientists and experts with years of training to determine if a species is actually recovered.

The ultimate goal of the ESA is to recover species and then set them up for success post-recovery. We need durable, not temporary outcomes.

Passing this bill would simply call wolves recovered, but that does not make it so. The bill ignores science, and it sends a species back down the path to extinction by reinstating a Trump-era delisting rule that the courts have overturned because it violated the Endangered Species Act, as well as the Administrative Procedure Act.

This bill ignores the careful analysis of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service over the past year. It ignores the fact

that although wolf populations are doing well in some places, they haven't met recovery goals in others.

It does nothing to require Federal consultation with Tribes, and on top of that, there is nothing in the bill to push States to improve their conservation measures for wolves.

When wolves were delisted in 2011 and 2021, some States raced to approve the killing of significant portions of their wolf populations, even using harvest quotas.

States in the Northern Rockies actually incentivized hunting. They paid hunters to kill wolves. This does not demonstrate a commitment to conserving the species once it is delisted.

All of these State policies would simply further villainize wolves and reward the type of killing that caused the population to crash in the first place. So no, a simple head count is not a scientifically sound basis for declaring open season on the gray wolf.

My Republican colleagues know that what they are trying to do will never stand up to scrutiny in the courts.

It would never stand up to consideration of the best available scientific and commercial data, and that is why this bill prohibits judicial review. That really gives the game away. If you really trust the science then you shouldn't be afraid of a little scrutiny.

Based on the talking points that we have heard throughout this legislative process, this is all just so people can shoot more wolves.

Why would Congress invest millions of taxpayer dollars in recovering this iconic species just to turn around and let States start killing them all over again?

We will hear a lot in debate today about how these apex predators, which are vital to our ecosystems, are scary, cold killers. That is ancient ignorance, not science.

If we are lucky, we may even hear some of the wild conspiracy theories that we have heard in previous debates about larger, faster, more aggressive Canadian gray wolves. We have heard practically everything except the claim that these Canadian wolves have laser eyes.

Congress shouldn't be overriding conservation decisions made by scientists. Fortunately, when we saw this type of extreme and baseless language a few years ago, a dozen Republicans trusted the science and voted against it.

I urge my colleagues and fellow conservationists to actually trust the science and to vote "no" on this trust the ignorance act.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the only rule or the only science that this bill would maybe not hold up to is the political science that is being pushed back and forth in this Chamber today.

If you look at real wildlife management, we know that maintaining

healthy populations of wolves also affects other species.

I would say if you could talk to an elk or a deer, you might ask them if a wolf is a violent killer or talk to somebody's cattle because they do kill. They are apex predators.

We need them in the ecosystem, but we have to manage those numbers. Just because a species hasn't been recovered in its native range doesn't mean that that species should be on the endangered species list. If that were so, we would have black bear and elk on the endangered species list.

The real science data shows that delisting the wolf and letting States manage the wolf population, and we are not talking about wiping out the wolf population, we are talking about maintaining it at healthy levels, that is what would be best for the wolf and for all others concerned.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. HAGEMAN).

Ms. HAGEMAN. Mr. Speaker, delisting the gray wolf does not mean we no longer monitor or manage the population. In fact, the exact opposite is true.

This bill allows State agencies who know their land and wildlife best and who already have management plans in place to manage wolves in a way that protects life and property and allows all species in the ecosystem to thrive.

Minnesota has the largest population of wolves in the lower 48. There are over 6,000 wolves in Minnesota, and they refer to the northern part of the State as the dead zone because wolves have largely wiped out all other wildlife: the deer, the muskrats, the beavers, et cetera.

It is our States, not the Federal Government, who supply the vast majority of time, money, and expertise to manage wildlife, and their record of success demonstrates clearly that species management is more effective when carried out by State and local agencies.

It is State management agencies, not the Federal Government, that recovered and delisted the gray wolf in 2020, only to have radical enviro-activists sue to keep them listed.

For years, populations throughout the West have been well above the recovery thresholds prescribed in the Endangered Species Act.

Yet, officials in the Department of the Interior, beholden to radical environmental NGOs, continually shift the recovery goalpost to keep species like the gray wolf and Greater Yellowstone Ecosystem grizzly bear listed as endangered, preserving their budget and control over Western lands.

Instead of wasting taxpayer dollars on a recovered species, the Fish and Wildlife Service should focus its time and efforts on species that are actually at risk of becoming extinct.

The science demonstrates how successful State management plans for the gray wolf have been, and the Fish and Wildlife Service's own research has

stated that: “. . . wolves are likely to retain a healthy level of abundance. . . .” And they also said: “. . . do not meet the definition of an endangered species or threatened species.”

Mr. Speaker, I believe it is our State management officials, those who are on the ground and in the community, who are best equipped to manage our wildlife and can serve our environment, not unelected officials working from concrete buildings in Washington, D.C.

Wyoming, Montana, and Idaho are classic examples of this fact. All three have maintained a recovered wolf population for well over 20 years.

Contrary to what my colleagues on the other side would say, that the plans that have been passed by the States would never pass judicial muster, the facts are the opposite.

In fact, it was the Circuit Court of Appeals right here in D.C. that ordered the Fish and Wildlife Service to delist the gray wolf in the State of Wyoming.

I thank Ms. BOEBERT for introducing this commonsense bill and encourage my colleagues to vote for its passage.

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

Mr. Speaker, when you call a bill the Trust the Science Act, you probably shouldn't rely so heavily on narratives that seem like a mix of Little Red Riding Hood and YouTube conspiracies about the chupacabra.

You should actually listen to wildlife managers and scientists, and you should also be thoughtful about lessons that we have learned in the past when Federal delisting led to State management that adopted many of those stubborn anti-predator myths.

We know what happens in many of these States when Federal delisting occurs. In 2021, Idaho passed legislation allowing for 90 percent of their gray wolf population to be culled by nearly any means, including killing pups.

In Wisconsin, one hunting season alone wiped out over 30 percent of that State's gray wolf population. In Montana, they allowed increased bag limits and hunting of wolves just outside of national parks, a quota of 40 percent of the State's wolves.

These States in the Northern Rockies pay hunters up to \$2,500 per gray wolf, and they have authorized expanding killing methods including traps, snares, night-vision equipment, bait, and motorized vehicles and dogs to track and kill wolves.

States have legalized the hunting of wolves under the guise of predator control, and with this designation, malice toward wolves is actually precluded from animal cruelty laws.

This has led to some disgusting acts of torture and abuse. Just last month, we saw that a man in Wyoming hunted down a wolf, struck the animal with a snow machine, muzzled the maimed wolf with duct tape, and brought it in to show his buddies in a bar while it was suffering.

This is the kind of tender mercy that apparently my colleagues across the

aisle suggest for thoughtful management of the gray wolf.

The punishment of this individual, by the way, a \$250 fine; not for the gruesome abuse of an animal but for wrongful possession of live wildlife. If he had simply killed it, there probably would have been no punishment at all.

Wolves in Wyoming can be hunted year-round without a license. The identity of the hunter who kills the wolf is protected by State law.

Hunting down the wolf and purposefully hitting it with a vehicle, that is also considered just hunting in Wyoming.

House Republicans love to point to State management as the solution to our biodiversity crisis. I think we all can agree that we should celebrate when species are successfully recovered and management is returned to States.

However, this bill would turn over management to States that have proven an unwillingness, a stubborn unwillingness to conserve the species further, and that would put wolves at risk in the lower 48 States.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, running down any kind of animal and running over it with a vehicle is not considered hunting in any jurisdiction that I know of.

That is illegal, it should not be tolerated, and it shouldn't be used as an example of why wolves shouldn't be managed using traditional hunting methods and letting States manage those populations.

I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. STAUBER).

Mr. STAUBER. Mr. Speaker, I want to just rebut my colleague from California. He put up a picture, a devastating picture, alleging that Republicans would do that to an animal. I utterly reject that type of behavior on the House floor, and he knows better.

I thank my colleague from Colorado for bringing H.R. 764, the Trust the Science Act, to the House floor for consideration.

This legislation would have an enormously positive impact on my State of Minnesota where the gray wolf population has more than recovered.

The Minnesota Department of Natural Resources estimates Minnesota's gray wolf population to be roughly around 2,700, which greatly exceeds the Endangered Species Act recovery goal for the State.

□ 1430

However, many experts, hunters, and farmers with boots on the ground estimate the real number to be anywhere from 5,000 to 6,000.

The majority of Minnesota's gray wolf population resides in the district I represent in northern Minnesota, placing the burden directly on the people I represent.

In the meetings I have held throughout my district, I am constantly hearing from my constituents who are fed

up with the dramatic rise in the wolf population. Whether it is the hunters who have been reporting low deer numbers, farmers and ranchers who have lost hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of livestock, or grief-stricken families whose pets have been killed by a gray wolf, the overall consensus is that something needs to change.

Administration after administration have attempted to delist this species, only to have well-funded activist groups come out of the woodwork to challenge these efforts with litigation.

Most recently, an activist judge in California, living hundreds of miles away from gray wolf country, ordered the Biden administration to relist the gray wolf.

The Trust the Science Act would delist the gray wolf in the lower 48 States and ensure this action is not subject to judicial review, eliminating the constant back-and-forth that we have seen play out in the courts over the years.

Contrary to what some may argue, this bill does not throw out protections for the gray wolf. It simply turns management of the species over to wildlife managers in each of the individual States. States then will be able to enact fit-for-purpose protections for the specific needs of the species in each respective State.

As the title of this bill appropriately conveys, we need to trust the best available science, which considers the gray wolf to be an Endangered Species Act success story.

We cannot continue to allow activist judges and radical environmentalists to weaponize the Endangered Species Act at the expense of other species and the communities we represent.

Mr. Speaker, Minnesotans treasure wildlife. While we celebrate the recovery of the gray wolf, we also believe it should be our right to responsibly manage our State's population.

It is time to remove the gray wolf from the endangered species list once and for all.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting the Trust the Science Act so we can get Federal bureaucracy out of the way and finally allow State agencies to create wolf management plans that meet the unique circumstances and conditions in each State. The people we represent think that we should also do that.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman from Colorado brought up Tribes in her opening remarks, and I am glad, because we should be talking about and thinking about Tribes on this subject.

Tribes are not interested in scaring people into killing wolves. For many Tribes, wolves are sacred. They are an integral part of the land-based identity that shapes their communities, beliefs, and customs. Like bears, wolves are considered closely related to humans by many North American Tribes, and the origin stories of some Northwest Coastal Tribes tell of their first ancestors being transformed from wolves into men.

In Shoshone mythology, the wolf plays the role of the noble creator god, while in Anishinaabe mythology, a wolf character is the brother and true best friend of the culture hero. Among the Pueblo Tribes, wolves are considered one of the six directional guardians associated with the east and the color white and associated with protection, ascribing to them both healing and hunting powers.

Wolves are also one of the most common clan animals in Native American cultures. Tribes with wolf clans include the Creek, Cherokee, Chickasaw, Chippewa, Algonquian Tribes like the Shawnee and Osage, the Pueblo Tribes of New Mexico, and Northwest Coastal Tribes.

It is essential that the United States Government uphold its trust responsibilities to engage in meaningful, good-faith consultation with all affected Indian Tribes.

Unfortunately, but not surprisingly, Tribes were not consulted as the treaty and trust responsibilities required when the Trump administration delisted the gray wolf. That is unacceptable. Ignoring Tribal voices erodes Tribal sovereignty.

After the wolf was delisted, Tribes sued the State of Wisconsin for violating Tribal treaty rights by authorizing the hunting of hundreds of wolves in 2021. No wonder this bill attempts to bar judicial review.

Tribes should be allowed to lead in identifying conservation measures for the wolf populations that are culturally sensitive. If this legislation is enacted, Tribes will have been left out of the process yet again and will face further violations of their treaty rights by State actions.

During the hearing on this bill, the Fish and Wildlife Service reaffirmed its commitment to consulting with Tribes during the species status review. I was glad to hear this commitment. I believe the United States Government's relationship with Tribes, and the conservation of wolves, will both be better for it.

This bill, which reinstates the Trump rule, which Tribes opposed and were not consulted on, would further erode our government's trust responsibilities to Tribes while putting the gray wolf at risk. We should reject this political attempt to sidestep science and Federal trust responsibilities and instead let the Fish and Wildlife Service do its job, go through the species status review in meaningful consultation with Tribes, and follow the best available science.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BENTZ), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water, Wildlife and Fisheries.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I don't think I have encountered such an amazing display of ignorance regarding the nature of a wolf until this after-

noon. A wolf is not a pet dog. It is not some schnauzer, golden retriever, or dachshund. It is, truth of the matter, a natural-born killer. That is what it does for a living. That is how it stays alive. It kills things. It eats them. It does not kill them in a kind and humane fashion. It is a wolf. We would be led to believe otherwise by what we have been hearing from the other side of the aisle.

It is obvious to me, from those who have suggested, ranchers are apparently not to be concerned about. Having not grown up on a ranch, as did I, they don't have a clue about what it is like to have to get up in the middle of the night to try to go out and protect your livelihood from nocturnal killers like wolves. They don't get it. They don't want to get it. They don't want to understand it because they don't have to.

The people I represent do have to deal with wolves back in Oregon. It is some of the most awkward situations. Highway 395 cuts my district basically in half. My district, by the way, Congressional District Two in Oregon, is bigger than the State of Washington. It is bisected by this highway. On one side the wolves are listed, and on the other side they are not. In some places, this highway runs right through the middle of a single-ownership ranch. Hence, you can imagine when the wolf kills an animal on one side where it is protected and runs to the other where it is not or vice versa. That is hardly a situation that benefits folks trying to make a living.

To suggest that there is a balance in Yellowstone, you haven't read the most recent report about Yellowstone apparently. You should. There is some argument that the wolf brought some sort of natural balance back to Yellowstone. Not true. Read the report.

Mr. Speaker, I have a question: How many wolves is enough? We have about 250, something like that, wolves in Oregon, 25 packs. That has been determined to be adequate for the survival of the wolf. That is enough under the ESA. We have 2,500 to 3,500 in Minnesota. That is a few more than I think is necessary, don't you, Mr. Speaker?

We have 60,000 wolves in Canada, and the number is growing because it is almost impossible to slow the growth down. We have 5,000 to 6,000 wolves in Alaska.

Mr. Speaker, how many wolves is enough? That is really the question we should be asking, because the Endangered Species Act doesn't require an abundance of these natural-born killers. It requires enough that we still have them around. No one is disputing that.

To suggest that 90 percent of the wolves were killed in Idaho, not true. There are over 1,000 wolves still in Idaho to this day. The exact count is difficult.

Wolves are smart. They are intelligent creatures. They learn, and it becomes more and more difficult to con-

trol them. The reason they need to be delisted is so that we have some means of controlling an apex predator. An apex predator is one of these things that once you have them, they are very hard to control. Being listed makes it almost impossible.

It is odd when we have language in the report from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service that states unequivocally—I will read you page 15 of the report dated February 1 of 2024: "Specifically now and into the foreseeable future, wolves are likely to retain a healthy level of abundance. Given the assumptions in our model, our analysis of our model projections indicates that there is no risk of quasi-extinction in the next 100 years under any of our future scenarios."

This is U.S. Fish and Wildlife talking: "More specifically, according to the population protections for the forecasting model, which incorporates Idaho, Montana, and Wyoming's minimum management commitments since delisting, we project there would be at least 739 wolves throughout Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington, and Wyoming for the next 100 years."

Mr. Speaker, of course we need the delisting. It is the way that we are going to be able to protect, if at all, and control the number of wolves that now inhabit the United States.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, my friends across the aisle have a pretty selective interest in numbers. They seem to want to take a single aggregate number for the wolf population in the United States and legislatively delist that population in a way that contravenes science, contravenes the way the Endangered Species Act is supposed to work, but they ignore a lot of other numbers.

Let's talk about some numbers. First of all, when we try to scare people about wolves, we should probably acknowledge that you are far more likely to die falling out of bed than from a gray wolf attack. My colleague, Mr. BEYER, explained that not once in the last 100 years has someone died from a wolf attack in the United States.

Wolves rarely attack people, and in the majority of documented cases, which are very few, humans ended up provoking the wolf or feeding it to cause that encounter. Further, wolves are a minimal threat to livestock, despite the hue and cry that we hear about this. Wolves are responsible for the loss of fewer than two-hundredths of a single percent of livestock every year.

Dogs and coyotes are responsible for far greater numbers of livestock losses, and even those losses fall well behind losses due to illness or weather. While there is inherent risk in raising livestock in wolf habitat, the losses are small. Importantly, ranchers are compensated for any financial loss due to wolf predation.

We need to base listing, delisting, and all other wildlife management decisions on science, not conspiracy theories, not unfounded fears, not myths, not political whims.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. TIFFANY).

Mr. TIFFANY. Mr. Speaker, what a success we are celebrating here today: The Endangered Species Act and how it worked with the wolf. It worked. It has recovered. We should be celebrating that here today.

Don't take our word for it. Take these 26 scientists' names right behind me. We have heard repeatedly today about how we should be trusting science. Scientists are not saying that. I will put these scientists, these wildlife biologists, up against any scientist here in America who is in the upper Great Lakes States. They sent a letter to the Fish and Wildlife Service 10 years ago saying: Delist the wolf. It is recovered. You are going to endanger the Endangered Species Act if you don't delist a recovered species.

The fine State of Wisconsin, which I represent the Seventh Congressional District, was impugned, in particular, the hunters of the State of Wisconsin. We have had three successful wolf hunts: 2011, 2012, 2013, and once again in 2021. Each time, the numbers rebounded right back to where they were before or grew even more. That is a sign of having a successful hunt, that you are managing the population in an appropriate manner.

One of the most eminent predator biologists appeared before our committee last year and spoke about that, how up to 30 percent—29 percent being the exact number—but up to about 30 percent of take can happen of a particular species and it still will recover. That is peer-reviewed science, and that is why you see these 26 eminent wildlife biologists saying that the wolf should be delisted.

I want to talk a little bit about dead animals and killing cattle. It is not the cattle that they kill that causes the harm to a rancher or a farmer. It is the reduction in production.

□ 1445

It is the reduction in the amount of milk that a dairy cow produces when they are stirred up by wolves tracking them. It is the reduced rate of gain for a beef farmer. That is what puts farmers out of business in wolf country. It is not the actual killing of the animal.

The gentleman can cite these arcane statistics like this. That does not get at the heart of the harm that it does to farmers.

It is time to let the States manage the wolf population because there are other species, as was said in our hearing, that perhaps we should be dedicating time to. If you have a recovered species, and additional time and effort by the Fish and Wildlife Service is

being put into a species that has already recovered like the wolf, we are not able to deal with other species.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. D'ESPOSITO). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. TIFFANY. It requires additional resources for species that may be headed in that direction.

As these 26 wildlife biologists said in their letter that they sent 10 years ago, the ultimate danger in not delisting the wolf, a recovered species, is that you are going to endanger the Endangered Species Act and diminish its value.

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

Mr. Speaker, the legislation before us today would take a significant step backward in protecting gray wolves from extinction by legislatively delisting the species across its entire range without any scientific analysis.

As I said before, every one of us in this room probably has an opinion on whether wolves should be delisted, but in many ways, that shouldn't matter. Congress has no business listing and delisting species. We aren't the scientific experts tasked with assessing population numbers, recovery goals, and continued threats to those species.

Unfortunately, if Congress delists the species, States that have so far demonstrated a stubborn unwillingness to conserve the species will be left responsible for leading recovery and management efforts.

The gray wolf was nearly eliminated from the landscape because these types of anti-predator laws decimated the population, leading to the listing of the species under the Endangered Species Act in the 1970s.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee.

If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill to provide a necessary backstop if Congress legislatively delists the gray wolf. At the very least, the infrastructure needs to be in place to stop excessive killings or any other threats to wolves if they start decimating the population and sending it back toward extinction.

My language would create that backstop. It is simple. If the population declines too much, then emergency list the species, providing 240 days of protection, while the Service conducts a status review.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject H.R. 764. As we have heard today, this is a bill based on fear, ignorance, and conspiracy theories that condone the inhumane killing of wolves.

Our Republican colleagues have made it clear that they intend to convince the Nation that wolves are just cold killers. Maybe that is good politics in some places to vilify wolves, to stoke the inhumane killing of wolves—running them over with snowmobiles and trucks, trapping, torturing, and finally shooting them, maybe after you put duct tape around their mouth and brought them in as a trophy to show your buddies at a bar.

All of that might work in some places, but most Americans understand the value of wolves. They understand that these creatures are foundational to ecosystem functions. They keep prey in check. Most Americans admire the intricate social structures of the wolf pack. They want to live in balance with nature, including predators.

This bill ignores the science, turns a blind eye to Tribal treaty rights, and removes judicial oversight of the delisting process to reinstate a faulty Trump-era rule. The gray wolf was listed as endangered because the predator control methods of the past had nearly eliminated the wolf from the landscape. Reinstating the Trump-era delisting rule will bring those anti-predator laws and policies right back into action and put us right back on the path to extinction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on this sham legislation, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the facts are clear. The gray wolf is a recovered species. The administration is ignoring the facts. They are derelict in their duties, and it is time for Congress to act.

As we have heard from Members today, the impacts of an unmanaged wolf population are growing and will continue to grow as long as the administration doesn't take action. That is why Congress must take action.

I want to emphasize that passing this bill does not declare open season on wolves, as some would have you believe. Rather, it puts the management of wolves where it should be, with State game and fish departments. They are the ones who are best able to manage the wildlife in their State.

My colleagues across the aisle talk a big game about supporting State fish and wildlife agencies, but as we see here today, when the rubber meets the road, really talk is all that it is.

Today, by passing this bill, Congress would celebrate an ESA success story and confirm what three successive Presidential administrations of both political parties have tried to do. It is time for every Member of this Chamber to reject the political science, examine the facts, trust the facts, and delist the gray wolf.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman BOEBERT for her leadership on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Huffman of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 764 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HUFFMAN is as follows:

Mr. Huffman moves to recommit the bill H.R. 764 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 4. EXCESSIVE WOLF LOSSES.

If, at any time, the Secretary of the Interior finds the unsustainable harvest of gray wolves or another factor has reduced the gray wolf population below recovery thresholds, the Secretary shall, not later than 7 days after the date on which the Secretary makes such finding, with respect to the gray wolf—

(1) issue an emergency regulation under section 4(b)(7) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1533(b)(7)) to temporarily restore Federal protections; and

(2) initiate a species status review.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

PROTECTING ACCESS FOR HUNTERS AND ANGLERS ACT OF 2023

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1173, I call up the bill (H.R. 615) to prohibit the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture from prohibiting the use of lead ammunition or tackle on certain Federal land or water under the jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, the

amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

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

H.R. 615

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Protecting Access for Hunters and Anglers Act of 2023”.

SEC. 2. PROTECTING ACCESS FOR HUNTERS AND ANGLERS ON FEDERAL LAND AND WATER.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in section 20.21 or 20.108 of title 50, Code of Federal Regulations (as in effect on the date of enactment of this Act), and subsection (b), the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service or the Director of the Bureau of Land Management, and the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service (referred to in this section as the “applicable Secretary”), may not—

(1) prohibit the use of lead ammunition or tackle on Federal land or water that is—

(A) under the jurisdiction of the applicable Secretary; and

(B) made available for hunting or fishing activities; or

(2) issue regulations relating to the level of lead in ammunition or tackle to be used on Federal land or water described in paragraph (1).

(b) EXCEPTION.—Subsection (a) shall not apply to a prohibition or regulations described in that subsection that are limited to a specific unit of Federal land or water, if the applicable Secretary determines that—

(1) a decline in wildlife population at the specific unit of Federal land or water is primarily caused by the use of lead in ammunition or tackle, based on the field data from the specific unit of Federal land or water; and

(2) the prohibition or regulations, as applicable, are—

(A) consistent with the law of the State in which the specific Federal land or water is located;

(B) consistent with an applicable policy of the fish and wildlife department of the State in which the specific Federal land or water is located; or

(C) approved by the applicable fish and wildlife department of the State in which the specific Federal land or water is located.

(c) FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICE.—The applicable Secretary shall include in a Federal Register notice with respect to any prohibition or regulations that meet the requirements of paragraphs (1) and (2) of subsection (b) an explanation of how the prohibition or regulations, as applicable, meet those requirements.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources, or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentleman from California (Mr. HUFFMAN) each will control 30 minutes. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in

which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 615.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 615, sponsored by my colleague, Congressman WITTMAN of Virginia.

This commonsense bill protects hunters' and anglers' ability to continue using cost-effective lead ammunition and fishing equipment in our National Wildlife Refuge System. At the same time, this legislation gives the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service the flexibility to make targeted decisions on lead use in refuges based on sound, site-specific science and in coordination with State fish and wildlife agencies.

In the United States, sportsmen's and women's participation is crucial to the success of wildlife conservation. The North American model of wildlife conservation operates on seven interdependent principles. Embedded in these principles are sound science, active management, and access to hunting and fishing. This model is a success story that is best characterized by the millions of dollars paid by hunters and anglers for wildlife conservation each year through excise taxes on the equipment that they use.

In fiscal year 2024, the Service apportioned nearly \$1 billion in receipts from excise taxes on firearms manufacturers. Of that, about \$800 million was targeted to wildlife restoration. Similarly, \$381 million was generated from excise taxes on fishing equipment for fish conservation.

Last year, after significant pushback from stakeholders and Members of Congress, the Fish and Wildlife Service denied a petition from far-left environmental groups to ban the use of lead ammunition and tackle throughout the system. However, the Fish and Wildlife Service is still pressing ahead with refuge-specific lead bans.

In its 2023–2024 hunting and sports fishing regulations for the system, the Service is banning the use of lead ammunition and tackle in eight refuges. It tries to lessen the blow by expanding access to hunting and fishing in three other refuges, but this expansion also includes a lead ban.

Why does any of this matter? It is about access and how the Service's actions are limiting access.

In 2021, the National Shooting Sports Foundation concluded that lead-free hunting ammunition is, on average, almost 25 percent more expensive than lead. Not only are alternative materials such as copper more expensive, but this administration also continues to push policies that prohibit mining such resources here in America.

Their lead bans will result in decreased hunting and fishing participation for all but the wealthy and a reduction in wildlife conservation and restoration funding.

Instead of regulating hunters and anglers off of our Federal lands, the Service should be working with State managers, conservation organizations, and sportsmen and -women. Where lead is shown to cause harm to wildlife populations, it should be addressed accordingly, but a systemwide ban or refuge-by-refugee bans where no scientific link can be made is the wrong approach and ultimately undermines wildlife conservation.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE,
Washington, DC, September 15, 2023.

Hon. BRUCE WESTERMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources,
Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This letter confirms our mutual understanding regarding H.R. 615, the “Protecting Access for Hunters and Anglers Act of 2023”. Thank you for collaborating with the Committee on Agriculture on the matters within our jurisdiction.

The Committee on Agriculture will forego any further consideration of this bill. However, by foregoing consideration at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over any subject matter contained in this or similar legislation. The Committee on Agriculture also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees should it become necessary and ask that you support such a request.

We would appreciate a response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 615 and request a copy of our letters on this matter be published in the Congressional Record during Floor consideration.

Sincerely,
GLENN “GT” THOMPSON,
Chairman.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES,
Washington, DC, September 18, 2023.

Hon. GLENN “GT” THOMPSON,
Chairman, Committee on Agriculture, Longworth House Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: I write regarding H.R. 615, the “Protecting Access for Hunters and Anglers Act of 2023,” which was ordered reported by the Committee on Natural Resources on June 21, 2023.

I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Agriculture and appreciate your willingness to forgo any further consideration of the bill. I acknowledge that the Committee on Agriculture will not formally consider H.R. 615 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained therein.

I am pleased to support your request to name members of the Committee on Agriculture to any conference committee to consider such provisions. I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation.

Sincerely,
BRUCE WESTERMAN,
Chairman, Committee on Natural Resources.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 615, a bill that incorrectly claims

in its title that recreation access is threatened by efforts to protect wildlife from lead poisoning. Instead, this legislation could actually reduce the areas open to our sportsmen and -women because it is a wrongheaded attempt to take away a commonsense tool for allowing sustainable hunting and fishing.

Specifically, this bill would ban the Fish and Wildlife Service, the BLM, and the Forest Service from prohibiting or regulating the use of lead ammunition or tackle on Federal lands that are made available for hunting and fishing.

Lead regulations and bans actually make sense. When wildlife forage for food, they inadvertently consume spent shot or tackle that is left in the environment. This lead accumulates in animal tissue, where it causes neurological and immune system impairments and anemia, slowly poisoning these animals until they die. When one animal dies of lead poisoning, the lead accumulated in its tissue then becomes a hazard to scavenging animals.

We see this in species like the bald eagle and the California condor. In fact, scientific evidence shows that over 130 animal species, including humans, have been exposed to or killed by lead shot or ammunition, whether directly or by ingesting prey poisoned with lead.

Twenty million birds and other animals die each year from lead poisoning. We know lead is a neurotoxin, and the science is clear that many species are negatively impacted. In a study from the USGS, almost half of all examined bald eagles exhibited symptoms of lead toxicity. The California condor was nearly driven to extinction by lead poisoning, leading the Republican Governor of my State, California, at the time to implement lead ammunition restrictions in condor habitat.

Some States, such as Maine, Vermont, and California, have instituted restrictions on lead ammunition in fishing tackle. This bill could make it extremely difficult for Federal land managers in those States to simply carry out those same logical, beneficial restrictions on Federal lands.

□ 1500

Banning lead products when we know they pose harm is not a radical idea. We have banned lead in paint, pipes, and household items because we know lead poisoning is a serious problem. Scientists are continuing to discover further evidence of its harm to people and wildlife.

There are ample alternatives to lead-based tackle and ammo at virtually the same price. People already can and do use these alternatives in areas where lead is banned. No one is losing access due to lead bans, but our wildlife and habitats are safer because of them. It is a win-win.

Why are Republicans pushing this bill? Well, I can’t say for sure, but I can say that at the hearing on this bill,

Republican Members and witnesses didn’t have much to say about lead bans causing problems for hunters and fishers. What my colleagues aired was their ideological opposition to anything that regulates firearms in any context for any reason, including ammunition.

Let’s not pretend that this bill is about solving a problem for sportsmen and -women. This bill would likely result in closures of hunting and fishing areas.

The National Wildlife Refuge System’s mission is to conserve, manage, and restore wildlife and their habitats for future generations. In the face of a changing climate, habitat loss, disease, and other pressures, our wildlife increasingly rely on the protections and resources of the refuge network. That is why, by law, refuges cannot be open for hunting or fishing if doing so is incompatible with the purpose of the refuge. Additionally, many of these refuges were established to recover and conserve endangered species.

Guess what happens if refuge managers can no longer restrict lead ammo and tackle? They are going to face a dilemma. What happens when they are faced with a decision to open an area to hunting and fishing or not open it? If they are concerned that lead-based gear could jeopardize endangered or threatened species, then the most likely outcome will be to not allow any hunting. They will have no choice but to close off these habitats to hunting and fishing.

My colleagues have to think through the consequences of poorly written legislation like this. Committee Democrats have been pointing this out for months, but House Republicans are forging ahead at full speed.

Preventing the Federal management of pollutants does nothing to protect or even maintain access, and it is in direct opposition to the conservation goals shared by sportsmen and -women and Federal land managers.

The hearing on this bill shed a lot of light for me on the thinking behind it. When it comes to guns, and now ammo, any type of restriction is too much for Republican ideology, even if it means closing off hunting areas for actual gun users.

That is where we are, and that is why Republicans refuse to move forward on commonsense gun safety regulations, assault weapon bans, and other things that the American people overwhelmingly support.

That is the problem. House Republicans need to listen to the people instead of pushing an ideological agenda that Americans are not asking for. The entire House schedule this week misses the mark. It elevates rightwing ideology over the actual needs of the American people. It tells us once again what the GOP has devolved to. Unfortunately, it stands for guns, oil, and polluters.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, let's be clear. The rule this administration put out has absolutely nothing to do with protecting wildlife, wildlife conservation, or protecting human health. As the gentleman alluded to, I believe this bill probably is more aimed at restricting the sale of ammunition and any kind of attack Democrats can take on our Second Amendment rights.

This bill will hurt conservation. It is senseless. It is based on no facts. The Fish and Wildlife Service can't produce a document to show why they should ban lead ammunition or lead fishing tackle. It is simply another move by an administration that wants to write the law instead of letting Congress write the laws and them enforce the laws.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as a lifelong hunter and recreational fisherman in support of my bill, H.R. 615, the Protecting Access for Hunters and Anglers Act.

Mr. Speaker, our hunters and anglers are really the backbone of this Nation. They are the contributors that put a tremendous amount of resources into protecting the resources that we all enjoy. Why would we want to restrict their access?

America is blessed with an abundance of natural resources. These refuges belong to the American people. Why wouldn't we want them to use them to the maximum utility for everybody, not just for a small group that decides that they want to go to court?

The Trump administration opened up 2.3 million acres of the refuge system for the owners of the system. That makes some sense, doesn't it? In response, anti-fishing and hunting groups sued, claiming lead ammunition and tackle would negatively impact endangered species in the National Wildlife Refuge System. Certainly, there are limited instances where one can show an association there, but not carte blanche. We wouldn't just say we are going to close the whole thing down because of some isolated incidents.

In 2022, the Biden administration reached a settlement and pretty much said they were going to go forward with the lead ban for fishing tackle and ammunition.

For those who said it is not a big deal because other materials can be substituted at kind of the same price, they are people who have never gone to hunt and fish before and don't know what the heck they are talking about. If you take a lead sinker that you are going to now replace with tungsten, you have to know by common sense tungsten is going to cost significantly more than lead.

Additionally, you have families suffering through Bidenomics, suffering from higher fuel prices when they go to

the pump today and are paying almost \$4 a gallon, when they are paying more for a loaf of bread and a dozen eggs. Now, you say, by the way, we are going to have government charge you more for something that can be avoided.

Then, my colleagues say Members are making it difficult for the Feds to regulate. Isn't that our job? Shouldn't we make sure our Federal Government is doing its due diligence in regulating? No, we want to have a side that says: We want more costs to the American people. We don't even want them to enjoy their pastimes. We want them to suffer at the pump. We want them to suffer at the grocery store. Also, now we want to make them suffer by not being able to enjoy the lands that belong to them.

How ironic is that? Add more suffering on more suffering on more suffering. Lord forbid, we don't want to make it difficult for government to regulate.

Where are we? This is an alternate universe.

We want to make sure that we are ensuring that these lands are accessible to the people who own them. These are sportsmen that put a tremendous amount of money into the system. The Duck Stamp Act, the Pittman-Robertson Act, and the Dingell-Johnson Act put millions and millions of dollars into the system every year. Hundreds of anglers help protect these assets. They protect the natural resources on these public lands.

I want to make sure that we are able to support them, make sure that we don't add to the cost of them being able to enjoy those lands. This bill ensures that Federal agencies have to do their due diligence.

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

Mr. WITTMAN. It doesn't stop them from limiting lead use on these properties, but it ensures that they have to use the science. They have to demonstrate, in these instances, in these specific situations, that they have the science behind limiting lead use, not just carte blanche bans.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. WITTMAN).

Mr. WITTMAN. I want to make sure the Secretary of the Interior and the Secretary of Agriculture have to do their due diligence to show that there is indeed a scientific purpose behind these lead restrictions. We want to make sure we are effectively managing our lands and our natural resources in ways that keep in mind the American citizen.

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, just a reality check. No one has lost hunting or angling access because of lead ammunition or tackle restrictions. That has not happened, but if this management tool is taken away from fish and

wildlife managers, and lead pollution and lead poisoning is allowed to continue to build up, my colleagues will start to see the loss of that access.

This ready-shoot-aim approach to wildlife management is actually going to hurt the people who the gentleman says he wants to protect.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. DINGELL).

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I am a proud member of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus. In fact, I am a past co-chair. I am dedicated to protecting and expanding access to hunting and fishing opportunities throughout the United States.

Sportsmen and -women are some of the country's leading conservationists, and I applaud their work to protect lands and wildlife for current and future generations. However, this bill before us today is not a conservation bill. In fact, it drives a wedge in the deep partnerships between sportsmen and -women and Federal land managers who have worked together for decades to identify strategies to allow hunting and fishing in ethical ways that help fish and wildlife populations thrive.

Federal land managers have the authority and the mission to manage their lands in a way that contributes to the conservation of wildlife, and they must ensure that any actions that occur on the lands that they manage do not cause jeopardy to endangered or threatened species.

This bill conflicts with the Endangered Species Act, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act, and other land management laws by prohibiting any regulation of lead ammunition or tackle, even when scientific analysis conducted under those laws determines that lead is causing a decline in a population of animals or is not compatible with the uses of the wildlife refuge.

Particularly for the national wildlife refuges, this bill is based on a fundamental misunderstanding of how hunting and fishing are managed on wildlife refuges. Under the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act, the refuges are closed to hunting and fishing until they are opened by the annual hunt-fish regulations the Fish and Wildlife Service publishes. In those regulations, the Fish and Wildlife Service identifies the places; the types of hunting and fishing available; the restrictions, such as no hunting or fishing at night, no motorized boats, et cetera; and the times those opportunities are available.

This regulation is published after careful analysis of whether such actions are compatible with the goals and the purposes of each refuge. The Fish and Wildlife Service also assesses if the regulation has any impacts under the Endangered Species Act, the National Environmental Policy Act, and other laws.

If we play out this bill before us today, one can easily imagine scenarios

where the best-available science under the Endangered Species Act shows that hunting or fishing with lead ammunition or tackle will lead to a decline in the listed species. At that point, the Fish and Wildlife Service has a choice to make: Do they allow hunting or fishing with lead ammunition or tackle in violation of the Endangered Species Act, or do they close off that area to hunting and fishing?

They have already been sued for allowing the use of lead in violation of the ESA. They would simply avoid lawsuits by keeping that area closed to future hunting and fishing.

This bill is going to be counterproductive to the goals of the sponsors. It is likely that it will result in less lands available for hunting and fishing, limiting access to sportsmen and -women.

Mr. Speaker, for this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House Rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill. This amendment would ensure that sportsmen and -women won't be harmed by reduced access to hunting and fishing if this bill is enacted by tasking the Fish and Wildlife Service and its partners with analyzing the likely outcomes of this legislation and assessing whether they would have to close areas to hunting and fishing to comply with this bill and other laws, such as the Endangered Species Act and the National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act.

It is common sense to assess the possible outcomes of legislation before it takes effect. In this case, Democrats have been asking these difficult questions with little response from the Republicans.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of this amendment into the RECORD immediately prior to the vote on the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I serve as the co-chair of the Congressional Sportsmen's Caucus, and I would like to point out that not only does the Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation endorse this legislation, but so do organizations such as the Mule Deer Foundation, the American Sportfishing Association, Ducks Unlimited, and Delta Waterfowl. The who's who of sportsmen and -women organizations support this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD this list of endorsements.

OCTOBER 27, 2022.

COSPONSOR REQUEST: PROTECTING ACCESS FOR HUNTERS AND ANGLERS ACT

DEAR CONGRESSIONAL SPORTSMEN'S CAUCUS MEMBER: The undersigned organizations, representing millions of hunters, anglers, wild-

life professionals, and outdoor enthusiasts are writing to express our support for the *Protecting Access for Hunters and Anglers Act* (S. 4940/H.R. 9088). Introduced by Senator Steve Daines with a companion bill from Representatives Rob Wittman and Bruce Westerman, this legislation would prohibit the Secretaries of Agriculture and the Interior from prohibiting the use of lead ammunition or tackle on certain Federal lands and waters absent field data delineating a science-based nexus to a wildlife species population decline. Overly broad and arbitrary ammunition and tackle bans have severe and unnecessary detrimental impacts on the economy while also serving as a hinderance to fish and wildlife conservation programs and projects. *To that end, we are united in respectfully requesting that you join as a cosponsor of this important legislation.*

At the outset, it is important to note that with few exceptions, fish and wildlife are successfully managed at the population level. Additionally, with the exception of Federal Trust Species and certain other species, fish and wildlife management decisions are primarily driven by state fish and wildlife agencies. With those considerations in mind, in the very rare occurrences that science-based field-data clearly delineates a causal nexus between traditional ammunition or tackle and changes in fish or wildlife population health, state fish and wildlife agencies already have the ability to regulate the use of those to both achieve conservation objectives and minimize impacts to anglers and hunters.

That said, we do not believe wildlife management decisions should be driven or decided by political motivations, litigation, at the ballot box or by anyone other than the applicable fish and wildlife department of the State in which the specific Federal land or water is located. Furthermore, we maintain that any restrictions on the use of lead ammunition and tackle on federal lands and waters by a federal agency must have the support of the respective state fish and wildlife agency, which is required by the *Protecting Access for Hunters and Anglers Act*. Simply put, this legislation reaffirms state fish and wildlife management authority.

In many cases, alternatives to lead ammunition and tackle that deliver similar performance at a comparable cost simply do not exist. Therefore, overly broad and arbitrary bans on traditional ammunition and tackle serve as a disincentive to the recruitment, retention and reactivation of hunters and anglers and, as a result, have significant negative economic consequences for sportsmen and women and local and regional economies. In addition, these bans result in decreases to the excise taxes that hunters and anglers voluntarily imposed on ammunition and fishing tackle as part of the Pittman-Robertson and Dingell-Johnson Acts, both of which provide the lion's share of funding for state fish and wildlife conservation, research, public access to natural resources and other important programs that promote hunting and fishing and sustainable populations of fish and wildlife species.

Recently, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) published a final rule that, while expanding access to hunting and fishing opportunities at certain wildlife refuges, also seeks to phase out the use of traditional lead ammunition and fishing tackle. We are disappointed to see the lack of a science-based justification for the arbitrary limitation on the use of lead ammunition and tackle. This rule does not recognize state fish and wildlife as the primary managers of our nation's fish and wildlife. Concurrently, litigation initiated by animal rights interests is pending against a similar, previous rule to expand hunting and fishing

access on national wildlife refuges alleging that the additional use of lead ammunition and tackle will harm wildlife species at those refuges. However, those allegations are not substantiated by science.

The litigation not only lacks scientific justification, but it is entirely without legal merit. In light of the timing of this litigation, we are concerned the USFWS has engaged in settlement negotiations with the litigants. Despite strong opposition from many of the undersigned, we believe the USFWS continues conversations with the plaintiff. Furthermore, we are concerned that an overly broad, onerous and unnecessary ban on the use of traditional ammunition and tackle in the National Wildlife Refuge System could be forthcoming.

For these reasons, we strongly support the *Protecting Access for Hunters and Anglers Act* (S. 4940/H.R. 9088) and encourage you to serve as a cosponsor of this vital legislation.

Thank you for your leadership and continued service on behalf of America's outdoor heritage.

Sincerely,

American Catfishing Association, American Sportfishing Association, Bass Anglers Sportsman Society (B.A.S.S.), BoatU.S., Boone and Crockett Club, California Waterfowl Association, Coastal Conservation Association, Congressional Sportsmen's Foundation, Council to Advance Hunting and the Shooting Sports, Delta Waterfowl, Ducks Unlimited, International Game Fish Association, Major League Fishing, Marine Retailers Association of the Americas, Mule Deer Foundation, National Professional Anglers Association, National Rifle Association, National Shooting Sports Foundation, Northwest Sportfishing Industry Association, Pope & Young Club, Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation, Safari Club International, The Bass Federation, Inc., The Walleye Federation, LLC, Whitetails Unlimited, Wildlife Mississippi.

□ 1515

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of H.R. 615, the *Protecting Access For Hunters and Anglers Act* of 2023 led by my friend, Mr. WITTMAN of Virginia.

In 2022, the National Fish and Wildlife Service proposed to ban lead ammunition and tackle in seven National Wildlife Refuges by 2027.

To put it plainly, this rule makes no sense whatsoever.

It is simply another example of the Biden administration giving in to radical environmentalists who do not hunt nor fish in our national refuges.

America's hunters and anglers contribute over a billion dollars a year in conservation funding via taxes on outdoor equipment like ammunition and tackle.

On top of that, lead products are significantly cheaper than their lead-free counterparts, often costing 25 percent more.

With prices rising on everything—thanks to Bidenomics—from gasoline to fishing tackle, why is it that this administration tries to limit access to wildlife refuges and jeopardize critical wildlife funding dollars? Hunters and anglers are the original conservationists, and without regulation based on

science, this rule does nothing but hurt the environment it is attempting to protect.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this measure.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD).

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas for yielding and I thank my colleague from Virginia for introducing this bill, the Protecting Access for Hunters and Anglers Act of 2023.

This is a poorly decided agreement on a court case where the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, as you just heard, was actually sued by the Center for Biological Diversity. They sued the Department of the Interior, and the agreement was: We will just throw them seven of our national wildlife refuges to get them to go away. That is not the best science. It is not based on science at all. In fact, it is best regulated by the States.

Our colleague across the aisle even said some States have actually shut down areas because of lead issues. That is what all of these States should be doing—managing these resources themselves. It should not be from some bureaucrat in Washington, D.C., trying to settle a lawsuit and throwing away people's rights to enjoy the land.

Millions of Americans, including myself, are avid outdoorsmen and -women who greatly enjoy hunting and fishing, and we depend on reliable access to these public lands and waters. That is why a ban on the cost-effective traditional lead ammo and tackle is so concerning. It will affect hunters, it will affect recreational and commercial anglers, and it will simply increase the cost which will reduce the participation by those who enjoy these two American pastimes.

As you heard earlier from my good friend from Georgia, it is a 25 percent higher cost for the nonleaded ammo versus the traditional lead ammo. When you start cutting that, you are going to cut the excise tax that actually provides money for wildlife conservation here in America.

States already have the ability, as I mentioned earlier, to regulate lands for conservation purposes. Instead of these Federal mandates we should be leaning on the States that know an area's conservation needs better than anyone else.

State-driven, public-private partnerships are much better than top-down Federal mandates that do not take into consideration site-specific science necessary to make these decisions.

In fact, the Center for Biological Diversity in their suit said that lead hunting and fishing on these lands might or could create lead issues. They used words like "could" or "might." There is no science there, Mr. Speaker. This is strictly a top-down land grab.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on this important bill. We

must protect our hunting and fishing in our national wildlife refuges. Let's leave it to the States and local authorities to decide what can and can't be used on public lands and keep the Biden administration's Green New Deal agenda out of these great American pastimes.

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

I appreciate the gentleman pointing out some important facts about how this rule came to be from this administration that is anything but transparent. It is an administration that rejects any kind of oversight. I couldn't even start to tell you how much information they are behind on sending to the committee that we have requested just so we can do oversight, but I can imagine how this meeting probably went down.

The radical environmental groups go over to the administration to have a meeting and the administration says, well, there are no facts, no science, nothing that supports what you are wanting to do. However, wink, wink, if you were to sue us and we went to court, then we could settle that and maybe we will give you a half dozen to a dozen refuges that we will ban lead on and that will make their friends happy. I think that is exactly what happened, and that is why we are here today with a bill in Congress to say you can't do that.

Enough is enough. Manage these lands for the public, not for your special interest radical environmental groups. I think Congress has to take the lead on this.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I am continually puzzled by the things that my friends across the aisle embrace and seem to hold sacred from toilets that require five gallons for every flush, to inefficient incandescent lightbulbs that even the market and consumers want nothing to do with, and, of course, today, we hear this love affair with lead.

I think it is really important to remember that the science is really clear. Lead is harmful to both humans and wildlife. It causes neurological, behavioral, muscular, and cognitive impairment. The Center for Disease Control states there is no acceptable amount of lead exposure. None.

In my home State of California and many other places, we have almost lost iconic species, the California condor in our case, because of lead ammunition and the way it bioaccumulates in the environment, especially for scavengers like the condor.

We cannot save the condor, even though we have had a very successful reintroduction. There are signs we could recover this species, but we can't do it if we have this stubborn rule that restrictions on lead ammunition are off the table because of Republican ideology.

Look, we have hundreds of studies documenting that lead ammo and tackle cause both acute and chronic lead poisoning. Its impact on hundreds of species and millions of individuals is not even debatable. Yet this bill requires a completely unworkable standard for fish and wildlife managers to even consider restricting lead.

It would require the Secretary to determine that: a decline in wildlife population at the specific unit of Federal land or water, they would have to determine that lead is the primary cause of that decline, and they would have to use field data from that specific unit of Federal land or water.

This is a completely unworkable standard. That is why the National Wildlife Refuge Association has pointed out that it is functionally impossible.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, a lot of points have been made about this bill, but I think the one that needs discussion in my closing remarks is the fact that this bill seems to have achieved the unthinkable: It is bad for literally everyone.

It is bad for wildlife as it restricts land managers' ability to limit harmful lead pollution in the environment. It conflicts with the Endangered Species Act, Migratory Bird Treaty Act, and land management laws, such as the National Wildlife Refuge Administration Act.

It is bad for States. It is unclear whether Federal land managers could even carry out State laws that ban the use of certain types of lead ammunition or tackle on neighboring Federal lands.

It is even bad for hunters and anglers who will be left with less land and water available for hunting and fishing because of this wrongheaded legislation.

You might think that this bill would be a boon for the gun industry, but even there, it is hard to see how less land available for hunting would somehow lead to greater gun and ammunition sales.

Most hunters and anglers want to contribute to improving wildlife conservation in this country, but this bill makes their efforts more difficult.

At the end of the day, the only thing that this bill does is score a few cheap political points by yet again villainizing the big bad government for doing its job—in this case, for carrying out key wildlife conservation laws and keeping hunting areas open.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to reject H.R. 615, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, hunters and anglers are the backbone of American wildlife conservation efforts and are invested in the long-term health of wildlife.

It is important that Congress comes to their defense against ideologically driven and unscientific decisions that limit access to our public lands.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the big bad government was really basing their actions on science, why did they randomly pick seven wildlife refuges? Why didn't they propose this across the Nation?

Again, this is a classic sue and settle. They got sued by their friends in the radical environmental groups, and they decided to settle and give them a little consolation prize of a few wildlife refuges, thinking we might just turn our backs and say it was just a few refuges. They are just giving a little gift to their friends in the radical environmental movement. Let's go on and work on something else, but you have to stop these actions where they start.

To be clear, this bill doesn't prevent the Federal Government from banning the use of lead ammunition and tackle, but it does say that any ban must be supported by site-specific science showing that the use of lead is harming wildlife in that refuge.

It also requires that States be properly consulted when the Federal Government proposes to ban the use of lead. If some of my colleagues have an issue with that, they must ask themselves if they consider States to be partners in conserving wildlife or stakeholders who they can ignore.

I believe that a true partnership between States and Federal Government and wildlife conservation is the best path forward, and this bill is a step in that direction.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman WITTMAN for his leadership on this legislation. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

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

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Dingell of Michigan moves to recommit the bill H.R. 615 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. DINGELL is as follows:

Mrs. Dingell moves to recommit the bill H.R. 615 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. DETERMINATION.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 2 may not take effect until the Secretary of the Interior, acting through the Director of the United States Fish and Wildlife Service, and the Secretary of Agriculture, acting through the Chief of the Forest Service, jointly determine, in consultation with Indian Tribes, in coordination with State wildlife agencies, and informed by the Hunting and Wildlife Conservation Council, that the implementation of such section will not result in a decrease in public lands made available for hunting and fishing.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question are postponed.

□ 1530

WESTERN ECONOMIC SECURITY TODAY ACT OF 2023

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 1173, I call up the bill (H.R. 3397) to require the Director of the Bureau of Land Management to withdraw a rule of the Bureau of Land Management relating to conservation and landscape health, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Natural Resources, printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 118-32 shall be considered as adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3397

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Western Economic Security Today Act of 2024” or the “WEST Act of 2024”.

SEC. 2. WITHDRAWAL OF BLM RULE.

The final rule based on the proposed rule of the Bureau of Land Management entitled “Conservation and Landscape Health” (88 Fed. Reg. 19583 (April 3, 2023)) shall have no force or effect.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Natural Resources or their respective designees.

The gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN) and the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material on H.R. 3397.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Representative CURTIS' bill, H.R. 3397, the Western Economic Security Today Act, or WEST Act of 2024.

The WEST Act withdraws the flawed and illegal Conservation and Landscape Health Rule, which was finalized earlier this month by the Bureau of Land Management, or the BLM.

You may be asking, why is a rule focused on conservation and landscape health so bad. Well, it wouldn't be bad if that was what it was really focused on, but the name is very misleading.

This rule is a poorly concealed effort to lock up more lands to advance the Biden administration's radical 30x30 agenda. It has absolutely nothing to do with true conservation or improving the health of our landscapes.

Responsible uses of BLM lands are central to the Western way of life. This rule would fundamentally upend more than 50 years of land management practices across the West that rural communities have relied on for their livelihoods.

Under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, or FLPMA, the BLM is mandated to manage lands in accordance with multiple use and sustained yield. If responsible use and development of public lands are prohibited, family and small businesses, multi-generation ranches, local communities, and schools will suffer from a lack of economic development, access, and tax revenue.

This is more than just a Western issue. If you ate a hamburger this week or filled your car with gas, this rule affects you. This rule will severely impact the lives and wallets of every single American. Haven't we had enough of that already? Haven't we had enough of inflation and rising prices?

The finalized rule will broadly allow the BLM to lease lands under new and vaguely defined “restoration and mitigation leases” and change standards around land use decisions. The rule will elevate conservation as a use of our public lands. This is clearly contradictory with both the plain reading of FLPMA and Congress' intent.

Congress very clearly defined the principal or major uses of BLM lands to “include, and be limited to, domestic livestock grazing, fish and wildlife development and utilization, mineral exploration and production, rights-of-way, outdoor recreation, and timber

production.” Nowhere in the act do the words “conservation,” “restoration,” or “mitigation” appear as a use.

Conservation is not a use. It is a value and an outcome that can be generated by the uses that I just mentioned.

If the administration determines that uses such as grazing, timber production, energy production, mining, or recreation are incompatible with the lease, they would not be allowed and could be prohibited indefinitely from those lands.

At best, the rule is duplicative, unnecessary, and burdensome. Meaningful conservation work is already being done on the 245 million acres of BLM land with multiple stakeholders. Often uses overlap on BLM land and coexist with each other. Meaningful conservation occurs simultaneously with and often for the mutual benefit of other uses, like grazing and recreation.

At worst, restoration and mitigation leases are a guise to restrict any meaningful activity on Federal land, including energy and mineral production, and timber management.

The final rule allows the BLM to issue mitigation leases indefinitely and waives fees on restoration leases. That would take land that could otherwise be creating a return for the American taxpayer and give it away for free to environmental extremists.

What will this rule look like on the ground and mean for Westerners? Specifically, the Biden administration can kick off the multigenerational rancher who has been grazing on the land since before the Bureau of Land Management existed. They can restrict the mining of the minerals we need for phones, computers, cars, and batteries to sustain life. They can limit oil and gas development, creating dependence on hostile foreign nations and threatening our economic prosperity.

In addition to this new convoluted leasing system, the rule would also expedite the designation of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern by removing public comment periods and allowing the BLM to “temporarily” restrict land use without public input. This provides the BLM with virtually unlimited authority to lock up millions of acres without any input from the public or support.

The rule sorely favors types of energy development the administration likes and hurts other responsible energy development they have deemed unworthy.

The rule chooses winners and losers. Wealthy elites who want to protect views from their mansions or extreme environmental groups who want to kick locals off of public lands are the winners.

Guides and outfitters who bring young and old alike to our public lands or the ranching family who works every day to put food on millions of American tables are the losers.

In finalizing this rule, the Biden administration has jeopardized the ac-

tivities and land used to feed and fuel our country. Make no mistake: This affects every American. This impacts every acre, every user, every lease, and every American.

The finalized rule comes after a year-long effort by Western Governors, communities, stakeholders, and Members of Congress calling for the abandonment of this flawed rule. The concerns fell on deaf ears within the Biden administration. This prompted us to bring this bill to the floor this week, forcing the withdrawal of the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I again thank Representative CURTIS for his work on the bill, and I urge all my colleagues to support H.R. 3397, the WEST Act of 2024. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this bill, the so-called WEST Act.

I have great respect for the chairman and the Member who has authored this particular piece of legislation, but we strongly disagree about this particular bill, and I want to tell you why.

First and foremost, just by way of context, we have been on the House floor all day today, the better part of a few hours, debating proposals that the majority has submitted that would roll back environmental protections.

House Republicans want to remove protections for pristine Boundary Waters watershed in Minnesota. They want to eliminate protections for endangered species. As we heard during the last debate, apparently now they want to increase the use of poisonous lead ammunition. This is not what this august body should be spending its time focused on.

Unfortunately, H.R. 3397 is just more of the same. Now, I heard during the presentation by my distinguished colleague on the other side of the aisle reference to hamburgers, the cost of gasoline, and mansions, I believe, none of which have anything to do with this particular bill, Mr. Speaker.

I want to try to explain to the American people what this bill is all about. The Biden administration, in short, has taken steps to enhance public land stewardship. House Republicans are standing in the way.

What do I mean by that? Two weeks ago, on April 18, the Biden administration released the Bureau of Land Management’s Conservation and Landscape Health Final Rule, or what has been referred to as the public lands rule.

The rule is a necessary and long overdue update to the agency’s framework for public lands management. In particular, the rule will protect clean water, clean air, and wildlife habitat. It will promote the restoration of degraded landscapes. It will ensure that decisions are based on the best available science in collaboration with Tribal, local, and rural communities. That, Mr. Speaker, is progress.

Here is what the bill does not do: It does not disallow or preclude any one of the multiple uses that the chairman

referenced during the opening of this particular debate. As my colleagues on the other side have described the rule, I think I heard the word duplicative. The rule is either duplicative or, in the view of the majority, as they have said, it ends all uses of all land in all of the country. It can’t be both.

Clearly, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle take issue with this particular rule and its protection of wildlife and its inclusion of conservation. I understand that disagreement, but the American people do not agree with that position.

The Bureau of Land Management, or BLM, just by way of background, manages more than 245 million acres of Federal public land, which is roughly one-tenth of America’s land base. In my home State of Colorado, the BLM manages more than 8.3 million acres of land.

Many of those acres are near my district; just by way of example, the Yampa Valley Trail in Moffat County.

This includes, by the way, national conservation lands, a collection of revered, treasured landscapes, recreation destinations, other special places that are managed to protect resources to us as Americans. These lands stretch across the Rocky Mountain West. Our citizens, our constituents, rely on these lands, and that is why this rule is such a critical development.

It is also why this rule is so popular. Mr. Speaker, over 90 percent of the comments received during the extensive public comment period were positive. Those comments came from local community leaders, outdoor recreation industry, scientists, small businesses, Tribal communities, many others, citizens in my State and States across the West. They want to see our public lands managed in a balanced and sustainable manner that will promote access and resilience, and that is exactly what the Biden administration has achieved with this new rule and why I am proud to support it.

Now, again, I don’t want to belabor this point, but it bears repeating. Despite the claims from my Republican colleagues, the plain language of this rule does not prioritize one use over another. It does not do that. I encourage any American who wishes to learn more to look at the plain language of the rule. It simply puts conservation on equal footing with livestock grazing, mining, and oil and gas development. It doesn’t block or stifle development. It achieves a critical balance, and that balance is important; a reasonable balance, a prudent balance.

I support this rule because it will enable us to make science-based and informed decisions about the management of our Nation’s public lands. I would encourage all of my colleagues to support the rule for the same reason. If they do, I would encourage my colleagues to oppose this bill, which seeks to undermine those efforts, and to oppose the legislation.

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

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

As I was listening to my friend from Colorado's comments, I was reminded of a saying that a graduate school professor who taught statistics used to say: Numbers and people are a lot alike. If you torture them long enough, they will tell you anything you want to know.

This study that my colleagues talk about references a cherry-picked 10,000 comments that were analyzed, and according to the BLM just over 8,000 were actually unique comments. That means that 2,000 of the comments were identical comments. These are comments that get submitted when you put clickbait out there and say, "Send this comment in," and you just hit the button from your favorite radical environmental group, and it goes into the BLM or to the other Federal agency.

Also, you know, I would expect the results to actually be even higher because it is kind of like asking: "Do you like ice cream?" or "Do you like chocolate?" or "Do you like candy?" When you say, are you for conservation and protecting the land, yeah, most people I think are for that. However, when you look at what this rule does, it is anything but that. It locks up land and takes it away from the multiple uses that Congress has designated that this BLM land is for.

□ 1545

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS), the sponsor of the legislation.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of my bill, the Western Economic Security Today Act of 2023, or the WEST Act.

My bill, as has been discussed, would require the Bureau of Land Management to withdraw their proposal regulating conservation of landscape health.

Utah's farmers and ranchers for generations have worked on this land, leaving it better than they found it. They understand how to live in a way that strengthens the landscape but allows for them to provide for their family and their community. I like to tease them that they are the original environmentalists. They don't always like that term.

Ironically, this rule also undermines the work of these individuals who keep the land in good health and help prevent the risk of wildfires to instead lock the public out of Utah's lands.

Let me be clear: I have immense respect for Utah's local land managers who do their best with the resources they have. I appreciate their commitment to integrating into each unique community and working hard to find consensus. They are not the problem. The problem is Washington politicians who think they know better than the generations of families who actually live in Utah.

The question isn't whether or not we want to protect these lands but who gets to make the decisions.

Since coming to Congress, one of my favorite experiences has been connecting with Utah's rural communities. They give so much and ask for so little. They work hard to feed our families, protect American energy, and lead in manufacturing. We should be making it easier for them.

Instead, the Biden administration is pushing this rule to allow environmental groups funded by Swiss billionaires who pretend to be representing Utahns to lock up public lands. This is completely backward.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD two stories about how this foreign dark money is funding environmental groups in Utah.

ADVENTURE . . . WHAT'S IN A NAME?

Recently I Googled "Moab" and "adventure" on my computer and came up with 480,000 hits. Apparently there are adventures enough to be found in Moab to keep tourists entertained and spending their money until the next Millennium. Just to mention a handful, I found the Moab Adventure Center, Moab Adventure Xstream, Moab Adventure Headquarters, Moab Adventure Inn, Moab Adventure Package, Moab Adventure Guide, Moab Desert Adventures, Adventure Xscapes, Adventure Racing Retreats, Moab Resort Adventure Package and a link to the Moab Adventure Park, from WWTI Newswatch50 in, of all places, Watertown, New York. They reported the following:

MOAB, Utah—Riding down the ski lift from the highest point on the red-rock rim overlooking the Moab Valley in Utah, our feet dangled some 800 feet in the air as Scott McFarland talked about the latest project for his Moab Adventure Park. "We're applying for permits for a zip-line, a 2,500-foot-long cable that goes from the top of the hill to the bottom," McFarland said. "You get into a harness on the top and cruise to the bottom, kind of like you're flying.

"Without a braking system, you'd hit about 145 miles per hour. With the system, you'll go 50 or 60. That's on the computer, anyway. We'll see." One of the city's concerns in considering the permits is its noise ordinance. Nearby residents are worried about screams coming from riders zipping down the cliff."

Sad to say that's one adventure we'll never have to embrace, thanks to one of my favorite environmental groups, The Nature Conservancy, who bought the tram and removed it from the face of the earth.

By comparison, if you travel just 55 miles south to the sleepy Mormon/cowboy hamlet of Monticello, the "adventure" falls off dramatically, to just 759. What do you expect from a town without a brew pub? I kept searching for an adventure-free town and the best I could hope for was Benkelman, Nebraska that could only muster 154 hits and Gnaw Bone, Indiana with a paltry 64.

At the other end of the adventure scale, nearby Aspen, Colorado kicks Moab's relatively passive as with 1,890,000 adventure hits and New York City, the Gotham of all Thrills, generates an incredible 8,370,000 hits. But if you can believe this, according to Google, you can find four times as many adventures in New York as you can in Baghdad, which produced less than 2 million hits. That is a telling piece of information. Just what kinds of adventures are we talking about?

And what exactly is an "adventure?" According to one internet dictionary, an adventure is "an undertaking or enterprise of a hazardous nature," or "an undertaking of a questionable nature (both sound like Bagh-

dad to me as well as certain areas of the Big Apple)."

Or . . . "an unusual or exciting experience."

This is the definition I was looking for. This is the kind of adventure that tourists are in search of when they come to places like Moab. Most if not all of the "Moab Adventure" Google hits are commercial enterprises, anxious and eager to provide an "exciting and unusual experience" for the paying public. Their businesses certainly CAN-NOT be, to even a modest degree, "hazardous in nature." I doubt if any adventure tour company could survive if its owners faced their first customers of the day and announced, "Listen up people . . . we want all of you to understand that there's a real good chance only half of you will survive this hike to the Fiery Furnace . . . the rest of you will probably die in free falls or rock collapses. So call your friends and family now and tell them how much you love 'em."

And forget about experiences of a "questionable nature." Add to the previous warning this addendum: "And don't forget our climbing equipment is as old as my granny and she passed on in 1965, so don't be surprised if that ol' rotten frayed rope we use snaps like a dry twig."

No . . . none of this would pass muster. Instead, the adventure tour companies must endure all kinds of inspections, meet various federal standards, and pay substantial insurance premiums, to insure that the "adventure" is as free of hazards as humanly possible. It's okay for the customer to get excited, and compared to the workaday/cubicle life he or she leaves behind to come on this adventure vacation, how could it be anything but? But is it really an adventure?

I have my own adventure definition—I would call it a "spontaneously sought, poorly planned, even stupidly conceived exploration of a mystery." Spontaneity is critical to an adventure. How can an adventure be planned and scheduled? And a real adventure should have an unknown component to it . . . maybe there will be hazards ahead . . . maybe not. Who knows? It's a Mystery!!

But this is what it's become:

"Now let's see Kimberly . . . I'm thinking . . . an adventure that starts around 10am would be perfect because I want to have a leisurely breakfast at the Jailhouse Café. Love the eggs benedict! Then maybe a rappel somewhere? Or would you rather do a boat thing? No more than \$100 . . . \$150 tops. And back here by four for drinks at McStiff's . . . does that sound perfect or what?"

I know . . . I know! Once again, I'm out of touch with Mainstream Adventure America and how can I argue with 480,000 Google hits and a booming adventure economy? (I think even a couple of my advertisers have "adventure" in there somewhere). But like so many other words—wilderness—for instance, an adventure just isn't what it used to be, or even mean, I'll take my adventures as they come, unplanned, unscheduled, free, and if it kills me, I just hope I don't die with a cell phone clutched in my hand, frantically punching 911 as I hurtle toward the greatest adventure of them all.

DYNAMO JIM STILES

If this doesn't give me some credence as an adventurous type, I don't know what will. Someone told me that the first issue of The Zephyr was being auctioned on eBay and while searching for it, I discovered this out-of-print book. This is from the book description:

"James Stiles was a banker and educator. Most notably, he was the publisher of the Nassau (County, NY) Post, Daily Review and Review-Star. His newspapers, and other local work like his stints as director of Roosevelt Raceway and trustee and chairman of

Adelphi College, were key in the growth of this New York City bedroom community.

Strange. Here's the cover.

SUWA, CAN YOU SPARE A DIME?

When I made southeast Utah my home, almost 30 years ago, I came for one reason—I came for the rocks—for the most stunning display of intricately carved, brilliantly hued red rocks imaginable. It's the kind of place one can believe only exists in Dreams. I've lived here ever since.

I was very young when I arrived in Moab and like so many other wide-eyed idealists of the time, viewed the battle to save the canyon country's dwindling wilderness lands in very black and white terms. And with good reason. Then, southeast Utah was still a vast, mostly unpopulated expanse of deserts and mountains, dotted with tiny communities that had changed little in a century, which depended mostly on the extractive industries for survival and which might, at best, get a small boost from tourism during the summer. And so environmentalists devoted their time and energy and resources to fight the threats to wildlands they thought were most persistent and enduring—mining, timber, and cattle.

Naturally I went searching for kindred spirits, those individuals and groups that shared my love for the red rocks, hoping together we could save some of it. Among those Quixotic spirits was the Southern Utah Wilderness Alliance. When SUWA was created, in the early 1980s, it was a small grass roots organization dedicated to preserving wilderness, with its headquarters in “the heart of the storm,” Boulder, Utah. SUWA's founders were burned in effigy in nearby Escalante, and the group gained a reputation early-on for being the little guys who weren't afraid of a fight.

In the late-80s, under the leadership of Brant Calkin, SUWA expanded its membership base dramatically, made Utah wilderness a national issue and pushed forward with a 5.7 million acres wilderness bill. Brant is almost regarded as a patron saint among environmentalists. A few years ago, Scott Groene, SUWA's current Executive Director wrote, “Brant Calkin is the best damn environmentalist that ever worked on the Colorado Plateau, and he's done more to protect southern Utah wilderness than anyone alive or dead.” Groene noted Calkin's ascetic approach to environmentalism. “Brant offered his staff low pay but lots of autonomy to ‘do good and fight evil.’ . . . He offered as rationale both that environmentalists have an obligation to spend their members' money wisely . . .” Through it all, Brant did his job, “with a quiet humility, integrity, and basic decency towards both his opponents and friends.”

And he shared the Executive Director's 20,000 a year with the Associate Director until his retirement in 1998.

“Brant never stopped working,” Groene noted, “whether it was leading the Utah Wilderness Coalition out of shaky consensus efforts, hustling money, or fixing a fleet a beater SUWA cars (he was renown for resurrecting aging office equipment and trucks). And when it seemed everything was done, he'd start cleaning the office.”

Brant also believed the key to success was to “build the membership,” and by the mid-90s SUWA was financially secure and its membership had grown nationwide to more than 20,000.

But if it's true that most good deeds go unrewarded, SUWA is a notable exception. In the late-90s SUWA suddenly found itself flush with money. A million dollar grant from the Pew Charitable Trusts and a \$524,000 contribution from the Wyss Foundation put the once struggling Utah wilderness

group into a different financial realm. The Wyss donation was particularly fortuitous. Its founder, Swiss-born Hansjorg Wyss, became a member of SUWA's Board of Directors in 1996 and is its current chairman. Wyss is a multi-billionaire who is the president of Synthes, an international company that manufactures biotech and surgical implants. In 2004, Forbes Global called Wyss the 26th wealthiest person in Europe with almost \$6 billion; by 2005 he rose to 18th place with an accumulated wealth of almost \$8 billion. That's right . . . billion.

Hansjorg Wyss's contributions to SUWA include a \$900,000 building in downtown Salt Lake City and another \$500,000 in renovations. The old three-story home is now SUWA's very comfortably appointed headquarters (memories of Brant fixing aging office equipment almost seem quaint) and contributions from Wyss and others have swelled SUWA's financials. According to its 2004 tax return, SUWA has almost \$5 million in “net assets and fund balances,” including \$2.5 million in “savings and temporary cash investments” and nearly \$300,000 in “non-interest bearing cash (imagine keeping that kind of cash reserve in an account that draws zero interest).” It has mutual funds and stock investments and a Charles Schwaab account worth almost \$1 million and another \$1 million in land, buildings and equipment.

With all those assets, plans are now being finalized to hold a gala party in late May as a tribute to Hansjorg Wyss. The event, to be held at a posh hotel in New York City, will cost about \$100,000. But according to SUWA, “it's a fund raising event . . . (it) will raise us money.”

I have to ask How much more money does SUWA need?

No one can fault SUWA for its good fortune but Utah's most prominent environmental organization is starting to look more like a bank. And while its coffers have grown, its membership, according to a SUWA source, has fallen by almost 30 percent to less than 14,000.

Meanwhile, threats to Utah's wildlands are becoming more complicated and more diverse. The explosion of growth in “New West” towns like Moab and St. George, to name just a couple, are creating environmental impacts unheard of 20 years ago. Urban sprawl isn't confined to Salt Lake City anymore. Wildlife habitat in rural parts of Utah is being threatened by residential and commercial development. Nonmotorized recreation and the commercial exploitation of national parks and proposed wilderness areas are affecting a key component of wilderness—solitude. And a proposed dam on the Bear River and a pipeline from Lake Powell to St. George will surely create another thorny bundle of environmental nightmares.

And yet, while SUWA remains Utah's most vigilant watchdog in areas of ORV abuse, oil and gas exploration and public lands grazing, it steadfastly refuses to involve itself in any of these “New West” issues. SUWA insists it is a wilderness organization, with the very specific goal of establishing a 9.3 million acre BLM wilderness bill. It is reluctant to spend a penny on worthy causes that fall outside that self-imposed restriction. “Our top priority,” says Executive Director Groene, “is protecting our wilderness proposal. Until we have protected the lands that qualify as wilderness, the issues outside our boundaries will be lower priorities.” He calls the SUWA surplus its “war chest, for use in emergencies or when extraordinary opportunities arise, and with board approval.” SUWA's rainy day fund.

In case they haven't noticed . . . it's raining buckets.

So, if SUWA isn't willing to become involved in some of these other pressing issues that fall outside the realm of BLM wilderness, perhaps SUWA can part with some of its surplus and give it to organizations that will. Just off the top of my head and without asking any of them if they need extra funding, I can think of several worthy Utah environmental groups: The High Uintahs Preservation Council, the Utah Rivers Council, the Nine Mile Coalition, the Utah Environmental Congress, Save Our Canyons, Friends of the Great Salt Lake and my sentimental favorite, the Glen Canyon Institute. I'm sure this barely scratches the surface of worthy would-be recipients. But all of these organizations are doing good and noble work and when someone with SUWA's assets can lend a hand, why not?

Ultimately aren't we all on the same side? Don't all these groups share a common goal—to improve the quality of Utah's natural resources and to preserve and protect the beauty of a landscape that is dear to us all? Brant Calkin urged SUWA to “spend its money wisely.” What could be wiser and ultimately more satisfying than sharing its largesse where it can accomplish the most?

MOAB CITY COPS . . . LEAVE THE ZEPHYR WEBMASTER ALONE!!!

For the last couple of years, the Zephyr web site has been managed and maintained with skill and reliability by Moabite Gary Henderson. He's also a baker at Red Rock Bakery (and a longtime advertiser) on Main Street.

Three times now in the last couple of months, Gary has been “pulled over” by Moab's finest while riding his BICYCLE to work in the early morning hours.

He was forced to provide ID, though clearly he had done nothing wrong and was even required to explain a “lump in his pocket” that the police thought looked suspicious.

This is nothing new for the Moab Police Department; I personally experienced this kind of harassment (though not quite so direct) a little more than a year ago. And many Moabites have their own stories to tell.

I hope that Chief Navarre and Mayor Dave Sakrison and the City Council will pay a bit more attention to these kinds of incidents. Maybe you guys could table a few subdivision proposals for a while and devote some time to the well being of your constituents . . . it seems to me that's about all the city and county governments ever deal with nowadays.

And leave Gary alone!

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, the link to the second story can be found here: <https://www.eenews.net/articles/quietly-philanthropic-tycoon-makes-his-mark-in-the-west/>.

Mr. Speaker, the Biden administration didn't even pretend to care what rural Utahns thought about this rule. I sent a letter nearly a year ago with my Natural Resources Committee colleagues, asking the agency to hold more public listening sessions on this rule, including a session in Utah. Instead, the agency ignored this request and finalized the rule.

Over 60 percent of Utah's land is federally managed. I have counties with 90 percent, yet no public listening session was held in Utah.

This rule has an oversized impact on our State. That is why the WEST Act must pass today.

We must fight to stop this rule and then immediately repeal it under the

next administration. It is critical that Utah's lands remain under the stewardship of those who have tended it for generations.

There is a lot of hyperbole in Washington, and I am genuine when I say this is one of the most offensive attacks on rural Utah I have seen in my career. I will continue to work tirelessly to repeal this disastrous effort.

My bill, the WEST Act, is pushing against this flawed rule. We should be empowering local communities, not punishing them.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico (Ms. STANSBURY).

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, I stand today to also respectfully oppose H.R. 3397, or what my colleagues across the aisle are calling the WEST Act.

I, too, have great respect for the chair and for the sponsor of this bill, and especially for the farmers, ranchers, and land stewards who were just referenced, but I vehemently disagree with the premise of what this bill and the underlying rule do and how it was characterized.

This bill would overturn a long-overdue administrative action to protect our public lands, wildlife, and cultural sites and access to the outdoors, with the intent of tipping the scales back to a time when extractive industries—oil and gas companies, multinational mining corporations, and developers—had the upper hand in dictating the uses of our public lands.

Like so many efforts by the GOP this Congress to chip away at our rights, unfortunately, this bill seeks to undermine and strip away the Bureau of Land Management's recently released final public lands rule, which establishes a framework to protect our Nation's public lands and ensure healthy ecosystems, waters, and wildlife, and a historic effort to protect the special places and cultural sites that are so important to our communities, their identities, and who they are, especially for our Tribal communities.

Unlike the disinformation that has been offered up here today, this rule will not stop other productive uses on public lands but will ensure that they are informed by the best-available science, protect our ecosystems, and provide for climate resilience, and it will ensure that we are not developing on sensitive and sacred sites.

In fact, in New Mexico, when we implemented a similar rule on our State lands, not only did it not end resource development but the State saw historic revenues from these activities on State lands while we managed to protect the special places that make us who we are.

I say to my friends out there across the West: Don't buy into the political hype and disinformation. This actually is about protecting our public lands and is what our public lands management is supposed to look like. That is why it was supported by more than 90 percent of the comments that were

submitted. The vast majority of Americans, in fact, over 80 percent across the political spectrum, support protecting public lands.

That is why I strongly stand with the President, Secretary Haaland, and the good people of BLM, who are working every day to preserve our lands, waters, and cultural sites.

Under the same rubric of protecting our public lands and waters, I also stand to oppose H.R. 3195, which would similarly withdraw a Department of the Interior effort to protect 225,000 acres in the Boundary Waters from mineral leasing. This bill would rescind DOI's public land order and would put America's most visited wilderness at risk of sulfide or copper mining by a large multinational corporation based out of South America.

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

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico.

Ms. STANSBURY. Mr. Speaker, in spite of over a million dollars that this corporation has spent lobbying the U.S. Government, the people have spoken and submitted over 675,000 public comments to protect the Boundary Waters.

That is why I support the protection of this pristine, interconnected waterway, forest ecosystems, and the homelands of the Anishinaabe people who have lived here since time immemorial.

One mining accident could irrevocably destroy these lands and waters forever. New Mexico knows this history all too well, which is why I strongly oppose H.R. 3195 and support the administration's actions in protecting Boundary Waters.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), the chairman of the Congressional Western Caucus.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. WESTERMAN, the chairman of the Natural Resources Committee, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3397, the Western Economic Security Today Act.

Since day one in office, President Biden has consistently attacked our Western way of life. His administration's latest effort is one of the most egregious examples of Federal overreach against our public lands in decades.

Two weeks ago, the Bureau of Land Management finalized their conservation and landscape health rule in spite of staunch opposition to the proposal. This rule illegally elevates conservation under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act's multiple-use mandate for public lands, contrary to congressional intent, and means that America's lands could be locked up from their intended purposes.

The rule threatens production of America's abundant natural resources, grazing, and recreational access to our

public lands, all for the sake of a political handout to climate alarmists and activists.

As chairman of the Congressional Western Caucus, I have been fighting against this rule because prosperity in rural Western America is under attack. I am proud to join my friend from Utah in support of this legislation to overturn this rule and protect our Western way of life.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MOORE).

Mr. MOORE of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman WESTERMAN for bringing this important bill to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3397, the Western Economic Security Today Act, led by my friend and colleague, Mr. CURTIS.

This bill will stop the latest Biden administration attack on the Western way of life. Last week, I attended a Natural Resources Committee field hearing in Hurricane, Utah, and heard firsthand how destructive the BLM's conservation and landscape health rule will be to communities.

By allowing arbitrary standards and vaguely defined leases to lock up lands from grazing, energy production, and recreation, the BLM is leaving rural America behind and costing our economy billions of dollars in the process.

We are going to hear the back and forth about this particular bill today. What it comes down to is actually listening to the people doing the job. That is what we do out West. We actually do the job that America needs for our energy, for our food. Everything that we live on in our society primarily comes from out West.

For Washington, D.C., bureaucrats to not listen to ranchers that have been grazing and farming that land in Utah for generations is the most offensive thing that can exist in this world of politics, and there is a lot there. This does not make sense. Go listen to somebody who is looking and seeing. They are terrified because there is no trust. There is trust in the balance that we want to talk about because there is always government overreach when we talk about the balance of using Federal lands.

The multiuse is so concerning. They want to be able to graze, keep fire risk low, and grow livestock in a responsible way. They do not trust that the balance trying to be sold on this particular initiative is sincere. I believe them when they say this is bad because I am representing them.

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

Mr. Speaker, look, I have, again, great respect for the chairman and the gentleman from Utah who just spoke, but balance is exactly what we are trying to achieve. As a Representative from the West, I can tell you that my constituents support this rule, as do the vast majority of folks out West.

There have been these repeated references to Washington. I think the phrase was Washington bureaucrats. I don't know about the gentleman from Utah. Perhaps he doesn't have a relationship with the land management in his State. I certainly have a very productive and robust relationship with our BLM partners in Colorado, including the Western headquarters, which is based in Grand Junction, Colorado—one of the reasons, by the way, that one of the comment sessions, the forums hosted by the BLM with respect to the rulemaking on this particular rule, was held in Colorado.

The agency is listening to the folks on the ground, to citizens, to folks in rural America, to folks in the Rocky Mountain West, to hunters and anglers who, by the way, also support this rule.

There have been multiple references to this notion that somehow, by the BLM promulgating this rule, that enables multiple use and does not put one use ahead of another, that that would somehow negatively implicate hunters or anglers—not true.

How do we know it is not true? Because the back-country hunters and anglers sent a letter yesterday to the Speaker of the House. I will read from it:

We strongly urge the House of Representatives to vote “no” on these bills. The bills that they are referencing include, among others, the WEST Act.

In particular, I will again read from their letter, not my words:

H.R. 3397, that is the WEST Act, would prohibit the implementation of the recently finalized BLM public lands rule. Hunters and anglers widely supported this forward-looking, comprehensive rule that will have a meaningful impact on fish and wildlife habitat by prioritizing conservation and restoration alongside other types of land use.

□ 1600

This is a reasonable rule. It is a prudent rule that unfortunately is being threatened by this extreme bill that I don't think the majority of the American people will support.

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

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

This isn't just a minor rule. This is a major rule that the BLM is pushing out.

When they held their listening sessions, they were located in places that were inconvenient for communities and stakeholders who are most affected by the rule to actually participate in.

Only three of the listening sessions held by the BLM were in person, and they were all three in major cities. They were in Albuquerque, Denver, and Reno.

Two of the five listening sessions were held virtually, affecting rural communities who have limited access to the internet.

The BLM refused to hold listening sessions in the following Western States: Alaska, Arizona, California,

Idaho, Montana, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Wyoming, and Washington.

You would think if they really cared about what the local stakeholders thought, they would have gone out to them and had listening sessions where people could have participated.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BENTZ), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Water, Wildlife, and Fisheries.

Mr. BENTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chair WESTERMAN for giving me the opportunity to speak in favor of this important bill.

This bill would reverse a rule that essentially destroys multiple use of Federal lands. However, to put this in perspective, we should call out how much land we are actually talking about.

Looking at the Bureau of Land Management's web page, the Bureau of Land Management administers more surface land, 245 million acres, or one-tenth of America's land base, and more subsurface mineral States, 700 million acres, than any other agency in the United States.

The BLM's mission, which is principally defined by the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, FLPMA, directs the agency to carry out a dual mandate, that of managing public land for multiple uses while conserving national, historical, and cultural resources.

Mr. Speaker, this is incredibly important because what the rule does is to prioritize conservation. Contrary to what we have heard repeatedly from the other side of the aisle, there is a prioritization.

Let me read from the rule itself, page 19583 of the Federal Register, which says: “The Bureau of Land Management proposes new regulations that, pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), as amended, and other relevant authorities, would advance the BLM's mission to manage the public lands for multiple use and sustained yield ‘by prioritizing the health and resilience of ecosystems across those lands.’”

Now, one could argue, I suppose, that means it just brings it level, but I would suggest it makes it much more important than the other uses. It certainly could be read that way.

The proposed rule provides that the BLM will protect intact landscapes—will protect, doesn't say might—restore degraded habitat, and make wise management decisions based on science and data.

To support these activities, the proposed rule would apply land health standards to all BLM-managed lands and uses and clarify that conservation is a “use”.

Well, what they are trying to do is say it is no higher on the scale than any of the other uses, but in point of fact, in the same paragraph, they suggest and, I think, direct otherwise.

It astounds me that my colleagues from across the aisle—actually, I wrote

down shocks. I think it is a better word—that they would want to increase our reliance on China for rare earth minerals, which this bill would do by making it possible to stop mining, to continue to turn a blind eye to the children and others laboring in slave labor conditions in Congo, to continue to export our needs for rare earth minerals to other countries where damage to the environment is extraordinarily greater than would be the case here in America.

Why we persist in trying to export these horrific activities and try to pretend they are not happening is beyond me.

This rule that our bill would reverse gives us an opportunity to perhaps, at least start doing our part of shoring up the minerals necessary for all of the so-called green bad deal. I think it is referred to as the Green New Deal on the other side of the aisle or the green deal.

The point is that this bill would make it that much more difficult to obtain the minerals necessary in this country. This is truly overreach by the BLM and something that needs to be reversed.

To suggest that this has not been prioritized is incorrect at several levels, one of which I already called out. The other, you can go to page 19588 of the Register, and it calls out what conservation means. It says: “Within the framework of the proposed rule, ‘protection’ and ‘restoration’ together constitute conservation.”

Protection and restoration. Those words sound so great, but what it amounts to is a barrier to our entry upon some of those millions upon millions of acres of public land—another barrier, as if we didn't have enough.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from California (Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE).

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to oppose H.R. 3397, legislation that would require the Bureau of Land Management to withdraw a finalized Biden administration rule that expands conservation on Federal land.

The rhetoric surrounding the BLM final rule has claimed it is nothing more than a mere land grab by the Federal Government, which could not be further from the truth.

The final rule is an avenue to conserving not only our public lands but also Tribal sacred sites and cultural resources.

The final rule allows sacred sites and cultural resources to be placed under conservation leases for preservation and protection. It is a step in the right direction to strengthen cultural prevention.

The United States has a shameful history of dispossession of land through Federal policy, statutes, and cultural and physical violence inflicted upon indigenous peoples, such as the Indian Removal Act and the dissolution of Tribal governments and reservations under the termination era.

Our government's past actions were not only a land grab from indigenous peoples but left a lasting impact on the generations to come.

These policies have led to many Tribal communities losing access to sacred sites, traditional foods, medicine, and resources, and they have led to intergenerational trauma.

As Members of Congress, we have an obligation to uphold the trust and treaty responsibility. While we have legislation such as the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act and the National Historic Preservation Act, they are not implemented to the full degree of their intent.

BLM's final rule is an opportunity to strengthen existing protections for Tribal sacred sites and cultural resources.

We must ensure that all legislation passed through this Chamber strengthens Tribal sovereignty and cultural preservation.

For this reason, at the appropriate time, I will offer a motion to recommit this bill back to committee. If the House rules permitted, I would have offered the motion with an important amendment to this bill.

My amendment would simply ensure that Tribal sacred sites and cultural resources would not be adversely impacted before the enactment of the legislation.

I hope my colleagues agree that we should ensure all legislation passed does not further contribute to cultural loss and destruction of sacred sites.

Instead, the legislation we pass should bring together Federal land managers and Tribal nations to develop land management policies that integrate traditional ecological knowledge and protections for sacred sites and cultural resources when proposed projects could impact Tribal nations and their citizens.

I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD the text of this amendment immediately prior to the motion to recommit.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join me in voting for the motion to recommit.

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

I would just simply add, and then I know we will continue with this debate, but echoing the sentiments of my colleague from California, there have been repeated, in my view, misstatements about the full ambit of the BLM rule.

To be crystal clear, this is from the executive summary of the rule, it says: "To support efforts to protect and restore public lands, the proposed rule clarifies that conservation is a use on par with other uses of the public lands under FLPMA's multiple-use and sustained-yield framework."

This is later in the same summary: "The rule does not prioritize conserva-

tion above other uses. Instead, it provides for considering and, where appropriate, implementing or authorizing conservation. . . ." on an equal footing with other uses consistent with the plain language of FLPMA. That is from the rule. Context matters, and I think it is an important clarification.

Lastly, I would say, Mr. Speaker, there was some commentary with respect to the full spectrum of engagement by the BLM with citizens across the country as it was promulgating this rule and reference was made to the locations where these forums were held.

I trust that the chairman, my good friend from Arkansas, has been to the communities that he listed—I certainly have—to Reno, to Albuquerque, and to Denver, and I can tell him that every one of those municipalities is nestled within 10, 15, 20, 25 miles of extensive lands that are managed both by the BLM and the Forest Service. How do I know? Because I live in Colorado, and I happen to represent many acres of land managed by the BLM.

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

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

As my colleague, Mr. BENTZ, read from the Federal Register and then my friend from Colorado read from the rule, the summary of the rule, I thought what would be more intellectually honest is if that summary said the proposed law because this goes way beyond a rule.

I also thought, who wrote this? And the answer is: I don't know. It is some nondescript bureaucrat over at the administration that wrote this law.

He is rewriting law, and as Congress, we have to stand up to the administration and say: Congress writes the laws, the administration enforces the law, and we have to put a stop to this administrative state that writes laws that have just as much effect as if Congress had passed a law.

If Congress wanted to add conservation, restoration, or mitigation to multiple use, then Congress should do that.

Right now, the law says: The multiple use is domestic livestock grazing, fish and wildlife development utilization, mineral exploration and production, rights-of-way, outdoor recreation, and timber production.

That is the law, and it is time that we put a stop to bureaucrats writing laws that are not held responsible by anybody.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), the chair of the Oversight and Investigations Subcommittee.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3397, the WEST Act offered by the gentleman from Utah (Mr. CURTIS).

Only Congress has the authority over lands and territories in the United States and we have already spoken out on the BLM 2.0 rule that mimics, and we have defeated it.

Unfortunately, the Bureau of Land Management continues to sidestep congressional authority and has finalized a new rule to further restrict Federal lands for multiple use, including outdoor recreation, ranching, mineral development, and energy production.

Since his first day in office, Joe Biden has abused his authority to add large swaths of acreage to the Federal estate, ignoring the concerns of local communities and stakeholders, even to the point that last year, they were caught trying to amortize our public lands on the New York Stock Exchange.

Arizonans don't want another rule that blocks access to public lands. This new rule represents the latest rush to lock the gates on Federal lands by the Biden administration and directly threatens every aspect of American life.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support the WEST Act.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this bill.

Our Nation is home to some of the most beautiful landscapes in the world. These public lands promote biodiversity, they support local economies through tourism and recreational opportunities, and really, they truly showcase what we mean when we sing "America the Beautiful."

I have been working my entire time in Congress to pass meaningful legislation that would conserve public lands in Colorado and beyond.

My home State of Colorado has more than 8.3 million acres of public lands, and the entire West has tens of millions of acres more.

Enjoying these public lands is intrinsic to the cultural idea of the American West and protecting them helps communities who are powered by outdoor recreation tourism.

These public lands are also vital in mitigating the impact of climate change and in improving the health of our planet.

Restoring and protecting ecosystems throughout the land supports the biodiversity of plants and animals, and it leads to a healthier balance for all of those who rely on these protections.

□ 1615

Last year, along with Senator MARTIN HEINRICH from New Mexico and Congressman JARED HUFFMAN from California, I called on the Department of the Interior to finalize the Conservation and Landscape Health rule, because BLM-managed lands are often overlooked in conversations about addressing biodiversity and climate change, even though these areas are some of the most unique and special public areas that we have throughout this country.

I was excited when the Biden administration finally announced the rule earlier this month because I knew it

would build on the administration's work to protect States like mine and to support a healthier and cleaner environment for all.

The rule is a major victory for preserving and protecting those landscapes and enhances our ability to ensure that future generations can enjoy them for years to come.

Just last week, I met in Denver—which by the way is just within a few miles of many of these lands that will be protected—with the Bureau of Land Management Colorado State Director Doug Vilsack, to discuss the importance of this rule, BLM's work in Colorado, and how we can protect additional lands throughout our country.

Congressman NEGUSE's and my home State of Colorado is ground zero for the important work that BLM is doing, and I support their efforts here in Congress because I know defending public lands is good public policy. Attacking our hardworking agency is not.

The bill we are considering today is a waste of our time, and it only serves one purpose: To undermine the important public land goals of the Biden administration.

By gutting this rule, Congressional Republicans would open the beautiful lands for exploitation and would prevent any administration from implementing any other rule that would further protect public lands. They are putting the mining and drilling lobby over the American people, millions of whom enjoy these lands every day.

This bill would also harm the local communities whose lifeblood is these important public lands. Western States, who are home to the overwhelming majority of BLM-managed lands, would be significantly impacted, and not in a good way, by this bill. These efforts are misguided, and they further reinforce that the majority is not focused on the issues that matter to our constituents.

I will continue to work to protect public lands, and I urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on the motion to recommit and "no" on this bill.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Idaho (Mr. FULCHER).

Mr. FULCHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Arkansas for his work on this issue and also to the gentleman from Utah for sponsoring the legislation.

The Bureau of Land Management's recently finalized Public Lands Rule would fundamentally destroy the multiple-use land management policy Americans have relied on for decades.

I want to reinforce something my friend from Arkansas pointed out earlier. This is an administrative rule. This is not congressional action, yet it has the same force and effect of law. This is a rule BLM has put forth.

This policy is not just an addition of unnecessary bureaucratic red tape. It would effectively lock up 1 out of every 10 acres of land in the United States and thereby shatter the way of life for

many families and businesses across the West.

In my home State of Idaho, citizens have enjoyed the vast natural resources the State has had to offer for decades. Considering that BLM is responsible for managing about 12 million acres of Federal land in our State, this rule change will have drastic impact on the future of recreation, grazing, and natural resource production.

Now, as a fourth generation Idahoan, I am a proud supporter of the WEST Act as it defends the way of life for Americans across the West and empowers local voices.

By protecting the land used to feed and fuel our country, H.R. 3397 would safeguard some \$201 billion in economic output and protect 783,000 jobs in rural communities.

On a related note, thanks to this administration's open-border policy, our national security has pretty much been obliterated. That makes our enemies happy, especially considering that we are also dependent on those same enemies for our natural resources. This legislation actually reduces our reliance on foreign adversaries by maintaining domestic access to energy and mineral resources across the West, which is so important.

The WEST Act will protect public land management as we know it and safeguard the future of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge passage.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. ROSENDALE).

Mr. ROSENDALE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman WESTERMAN and Congressman CURTIS for leading the charge on stopping this disastrous Biden administration rule.

I am proud to be an original cosponsor of the WEST Act. This legislation will prohibit the BLM's Conservation and Landscape Health rule from going into effect.

Our past speaker just described very well the difference between rule and law. The BLM-proposed rule will lock up large swaths of public land across the country for Federal conservation leases that would limit recreational activities, timber production, animal grazing, and important energy development on public land. The rule is unconstitutional, it is unpopular, and it will devastate rural communities.

Article I, Section 1, of the United States Constitution makes it clear that Congress writes the law, not the executive branch. In 1934 and 1976, Congress passed the Taylor Grazing Act and the Federal Land Policy Management Act. Both require a multiple use policy on public lands. This rule is unconstitutional because it circumvents both laws Congress passed to enforce an executive branch policy.

When collecting limited public input on this rule over a limited 75-day period, the BLM only allowed five public forums in exclusively urban city cen-

ters. This deliberate dodging of stakeholders whose land they are attempting to commandeer shows how little this administration cares about their scathing disapproval in rural America.

Lastly, this move will irreparably impede sustainable and productive grazing practices in Montana and devastate rural communities throughout the country by requiring ranchers to compete with coastal corporations for the limited number of available leases.

I am sick and tired of the American farmer, who creates food security, being trampled by radical environmentalists who think their soy burgers magically appear on grocery store shelves.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

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

I would just simply say, again, there have been a number of misstatements with respect to the constitutionality and the statutory authority of this particular rule that has been promulgated by the BLM.

It is clearly constitutional. It is consistent with the statutory authority that Congress has ultimately conveyed to the BLM via FLPMA. You don't have to take my word for it. You can read the statute. Section 302 very clearly states that the agency has the authority to ultimately ensure multiple use by "the management of the public lands and their various resource values so that they are utilized in the combination that will best meet the present and future needs of the American people."

Now, that phrase arguably could be nebulous to some. Well, the good news is that Congress did, in fact, clarify what those present and future needs of the American people happen to be. Again, I will quote from the statute: "The use of some land for less than all of the resources; a combination of balanced and diverse resource uses that takes into account the long-term needs of future generations for renewable and nonrenewable resources, including, but not limited to, recreation, range, timber, minerals, watershed, wildlife and fish, and natural, scenic, scientific and historical values; and harmonious and coordinated management of the . . . productivity of the land and the quality of the environment with consideration being given to the relative values of the resources and not necessarily to the combination of uses that will give the greatest economic return or the greatest unit output."

That is the statute. You have the statutory authority supporting a rule that by its plain language simply puts conservation on par with other uses. This is not complicated.

The American people support this rule. Hunters and anglers support this rule. Recreationists support this rule. Constituents in Colorado and States across the West support this rule, and so should the Congress.

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

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Utah (Ms. MALOY).

Ms. MALOY. Mr. Speaker, I agree with everything my colleagues have said about this rule violating the intent of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, FLPMA, of 1976. I intended to spend most of my time talking about that, but it was pretty well covered.

This is an inappropriate use of an administrative action to change the intent of a legislative action. As a Member of Congress, I rise to support everything they have said about why that is wrong.

I also want to talk about what role BLM lands play in Utah. I represent Utah, and so does JOHN CURTIS, my colleague, who introduced this bill.

The reason this is so important for those of us in Utah is that the Federal Government manages most of the land in our State. There are counties in my district that are more than 90 percent managed by the Federal Government. A lot of that is BLM land. We have a lot of experience with multiple use, with grazing, logging, ranching, recreation, fishing, all the things we just talked about, coexisting in the same BLM tracts in Utah.

The reason this rule is deeply unpopular in my State is that it comes in and makes one use trump all of the other uses on what should be multiple-use land managed for sustained yield.

The role that BLM lands play in our economy and our culture cannot be overstated. In some of the counties I represent, the majority of families get at least part of their livelihood from grazing on public land. If those livelihoods go away, it will have a big impact on our economy. It also has a big impact on our lifestyle, our culture.

That is why changes like this should be made by Congress. They should be debated by people who represent the people in Utah or in other western States who are facing the same drastic cultural livelihood changes from this kind of rule, instead of this coming from an administration where it is written by bureaucrats who, like the chairman, I can't identify with.

I don't know who wrote the rule. I don't know what input they took from people in my district, but I know that I hear from people in my district, and I represent them.

Mr. Speaker, I ask all of my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time for closing.

Mr. Speaker, I have participated in a lot of debates during my time in Congress. This has got to be one of the most confounding for me, because repeatedly, unfortunately, I have colleagues, friends on the other side of the aisle, making statements about what this rule does when the plain language of the rule says the exact opposite.

There are folks here in the gallery, I suspect, who are just as confused as I

am. One need look no further than the plain language of the rule. The rule says that it is putting conservation on par with these other uses. Grazing is allowed under the rule. Oil and gas development is allowed under the rule. Conservation is allowed under the rule.

If my colleagues don't want conservation considered by the BLM with respect to how these lands are managed, which is clearly what they believe, then they should just say so.

□ 1630

They should just be candid with the American people that they don't think these lands should be managed with conservation in mind at all. I disagree with that view, and the American people disagree with that view, but that is an intellectually honest position.

Be that as it may, don't mischaracterize the rule that the agency ultimately promulgated because the American people can see it for themselves. They can read the same plain language that I have read repeatedly on the House floor over the course of the last hour of debate.

Mr. Speaker, Congress charged the Bureau of Land Management with seeking balance statutorily. That is the word we used in the statute giving BLM its authority: "so that they are utilized in a combination that will best meet the present and future needs of the American people." That is what the Biden administration has done with respect to the development of this rule.

When we had the hearing on this bill in the Natural Resources Committee, a constituent of mine testified in support of the bill. Eagle County Commissioner Kathy Chandler-Henry said that she made the trip to Washington to be here to support this particular rule.

I think her testimony said it best, so I will quote it here: "I support the BLM's proposed public lands rule. It will empower the agency to deliver on its multiple-use mandate by placing conservation values on equal footing with other uses on our public lands."

That is it. People in Colorado, in my State, in my district, and throughout the West rely on our public lands for a wide variety of uses and benefits.

I speak with some authority on this particular subject because I represent a congressional district that is larger than eight States in the Union. That includes over 40 percent of it being public lands managed by the BLM and the Forest Service. When I talk about the need to prioritize resilience and balance, I speak about it on behalf of those communities that I am so honored to represent.

I appreciate the dialogue that we have had with my colleague from Utah and, of course, with my friend, the chairman from Arkansas, but I respectfully disagree with respect to this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that perhaps my colleagues will see the light and vote against H.R. 3397. I certainly will be. I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to avoid making reference to occupants of the gallery.

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

Mr. Speaker, we really must pass Representative CURTIS' WEST Act.

This burdensome and unnecessary law that is being disguised as a rule is not only a threat to the West, but it is also a threat to our national security, to American energy dominance, to our food security, to the environment, and to the separation of powers that are established in our Constitution.

Passing the WEST Act and withdrawing this rule will restore Congress' intent over the multiple uses of BLM land and protect the over 700,000 jobs across the West that rely on access to our public lands.

We can't allow the Biden administration to singlehandedly upend 50 years of congressionally mandated land use policies to the whim of environmental extremists and coastal elites. We can't allow an unelected, unaccountable, and unnamed bureaucrat to write law.

I thank Representative CURTIS for his strong leadership on this issue. I know that he has heard many concerns about the rule from his constituents, including as recently as last week at a Federal Lands Subcommittee hearing in southern Utah.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLZEY). Pursuant to House Resolution 1173, the previous question is ordered on the bill, as amended.

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

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

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

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

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. Kamlager-Dove of California moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3397 to the Committee on Natural Resources.

The material previously referred to by Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE is as follows:

Ms. Kamlager-Dove moves to recommit the bill H.R. 3397 to the Committee on Natural Resources with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Add at the end the following:

SEC. 3. EFFECTIVE DATE.

Notwithstanding any other provision of this Act, section 2 of this Act shall not take effect until the Secretaries determine, in consultation with Tribes, that section 2 of this Act will not have an adverse impact on Tribal cultural or sacred sites.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XIX, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

Burgess	Hageman	Moore (UT)	The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 209, nays 205, not voting 15, as follows:	Foster	Levin	Sánchez
Burlison	Harris	Moran		Foushee	Lieu	Sarbanes
Calvert	Harshbarger	Newhouse		Frankel, Lois	Lofgren	Scanlon
Cammack	Hern	Norman		Frost	Lynch	Schakowsky
Carey	Higgins (LA)	Nunn (IA)		Gaetz	Mace	Schiff
Carl	Hill	Obernolte		Gallego	Manning	Schneider
Carter (GA)	Hinson	Ogles		Garamendi	Matsui	Scholten
Carter (TX)	Houchin	Owens		García (IL)	McBath	Schrer
Chavez-DeRemer	Hudson	Palmer		Miller-Meeks	García (TX)	McClellan
Ciscosani	Huizenga	Pence		Mills	Garcia, Mike	Scott (VA)
Cline	Hunt	Perry		Molinaro	Garcia, Robert	Scott, David
Cloud	Issa	Pfluger		Moolenaar	Goldman (NY)	McGarvey
Clyde	Jackson (TX)	Posey		Gooden (TX)	McGovern	Sewell
Collins	James	Reschenthaler		Mooney	Gomez	Sherman
Comer	Johnson (LA)	Rodgers (WA)		Moore (AL)	Meeks	Sherrill
Crane	Johnson (SD)	Rogers (AL)		Granger	Gonzalez,	Slotkin
Crawford	Jordan	Rogers (KY)		Moore (UT)	Vicente	Meng
Crenshaw	Joyce (OH)	Rose		Graves (LA)	Moran	Smith (WA)
Curtis	Joyce (PA)	Rosendale		Graves (MO)	Gottheimer	Sorensen
D'Esposito	Kean (NJ)	Rouzer		Green (TN)	Green, Al (TX)	Moore (WI)
Davidson	Kelly (MS)	Roy		Banks	Norman	Soto
De La Cruz	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford		Greene (GA)	Nunn (IA)	Spanberger
DesJarlais	Kiggans (VA)	Salazar		Bean (FL)	Harder (CA)	Stansbury
Donalds	Kiley	Scalise		Brent	Hayes	Stanton
Duarte	Kim (CA)	Schweikert		Grothman	Himes	Irvin
Duncan	Kustoff	Scott, Austin		Guest	Horsford	Mullin
Dunn (FL)	LaHood	Self		Bice	Houahan	Stevens
Edwards	LaLota	Sessions		Guthrie	Palmer	Strickland
Ellzey	LaMalfa	Simpson		Banks	Hoyer	Nadler
Emmer	Lamborn	Smith (MO)		Biggs	Perez	Suozzi
Estes	Latta	Smith (NJ)		Bilirakis	Hoyle (OR)	Napolitano
Ezell	LaTurner	Smucker		Harris	Huffman	Neal
Fallon	Lawler	Spartz		Bishop (NC)	Perry	Swalwell
Feenstra	Lee (FL)	Stauber		Boebert	Ivey	Takano
Ferguson	Lesko	Steel		Bost	Higgins (LA)	Norcross
Finstad	Letlow	Stefanik		Brecheen	Posey	Thanedar
Fischbach	Loudermilk	Steil		Buchanan	Jackson (IL)	Ocasio-Cortez
Fitzgerald	Lucas	Steube		Hinson	Jackson (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Fitzpatrick	Luetkemeyer	Strong		Buchanan	Jackson Lee	Omar
Fleischmann	Luna	Tenney		Houchin	Rodgers (WA)	Thompson (MS)
Flood	Luttrell	Thompson (PA)		Buchanan	Jacobs	Pallone
Foxx	Mace	Tiffany		Houchin	Rogers (AL)	Jayapal
Franklin, Scott	Malliotakis	Timmons		Buchanan	Rutherford	Panetta
Fry	Maloy	Turner		Burgess	Rogers (KY)	Jeffries
Fulcher	Mann	Valadado		Burgess	Rose	Pappas
Gaetz	Massie	Van Drew		Burgess	Rosendale	Tokuda
Garbarino	Mast	Van Duyne		Burgess	Rouzer	Tonko
Garcia, Mike	McCaull	Van Orden		Burgess	Rutherford	Kamala Harris
Gimenez	McClain	Wagner		Burgess	Rutherford	Titus
Gonzales, Tony	McClintock	Walberg		Burgess	Rutherford	Pelosi
Good (VA)	McCormick	Waltz		Burgess	Rutherford	Pelosi
Gooden (TX)	McHenry	Weber (TX)		Burgess	Rutherford	Pelosi
Gosar	Meuser	Webster (FL)		Burgess	Rutherford	Pelosi
Granger	Miller (IL)	Wenstrup		Burgess	Rutherford	Pelosi
Graves (LA)	Miller (OH)	Westerman		Burgess	Rutherford	Pelosi
Graves (MO)	Miller (WV)	Williams (NY)		Burgess	Rutherford	Pelosi
Green (TN)	Miller-Meeks	Williams (TX)		Burgess	Rutherford	Pelosi
Greene (GA)	Mills	Wilson (SC)		Burgess	Rutherford	Pelosi
Griffith	Molinaro	Wittman		Burgess	Rutherford	Pelosi
Grothman	Moolenaar	Womack		Burgess	Rutherford	Pelosi
Guest	Mooney	Yakym		Burgess	Rutherford	Pelosi
Guthrie	Moore (AL)	Zinke		Burgess	Rutherford	Pelosi
NOT VOTING—14						
Adams	Grijalva	Nickel		Estes	Malliotakis	Underwood
Arrington	Langworthy	Smith (NE)		Ezell	Maloy	Vargas
Blumenauer	Magaziner	Sykes		Fallon	Mann	Pascarella
Cole	Murphy	Trone		Feenstra	Massie	Tonko
Diaz-Balart	Nehls			Ferguson	Mast	Torres (CA)
ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE						
The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.						
□ 1728						
Mr. LYNCH changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."						
So the motion to recommit was rejected.						
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.						
The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.						
The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.						
RECORDED VOTE						
Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.						
A recorded vote was ordered.						
The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.						
NOES—205						
Aguilar						
Allred						
Amo						
Auchincloss						
Balint						
Barragán						
Beatty						
Bera						
Beyer						
Bishop (GA)						
Blunt Rochester						
Bonamici						
Bowman						
Boyle (PA)						
Brown						
Brownley						
Budzinski						
Bush						
Carbajal						
Cárdenas						
Craig						
Crockett						
Crow						
Davids (KS)						
Davis (IL)						
Davis (NC)						
Dean (PA)						
DeGette						
DeLauro						
DelBene						
Deluzio						
DeSaunier						
Dingell						
Doggett						
Escobar						
Eshoo						
Espaillat						
Evans						
Fitzpatrick						
Fletcher						
Fischbach						
Grijalva						
Langworthy						
Cole						
Magaziner						
Diaz-Balart						
Murphy						
NOT VOTING—15						
Adams						
Arrington						
Blumenauer						
Cole						
Diaz-Balart						
Fischbach						
Grijalva						
Langworthy						
Nehls						
Nickel						
Smith (NE)						
Sykes						
Trone						
□ 1736						
So the bill was passed.						
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.						
A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.						

SUPERIOR NATIONAL FOREST RESTORATION ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to recommit on the bill (H.R. 3195) to rescind Public Land Order 7917, to reinstate mineral leases and permits in the Superior National Forest, to ensure timely review of Mine Plans of Operations, and for other purposes, offered by the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. McCollum), on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk will redesignate the motion.

The Clerk redesignated the motion.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 205, nays 210, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 170]

YEAS—205

NAYS—210

NOT VOTING—14

Mses. LEGER FERNANDEZ and PRESSLEY changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the question was on the passage of the bill.

the ayes appeared to have it.

The yeas and nays were ordered

The yeas and nays were ordered.
The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 212, nays 203, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 171]

YEAS—212

Aguilar	Craig	Hoyle (OR)
Allred	Crockett	Huffman
Amo	Crow	Ivey
Auchincloss	Cuellar	Jackson (IL)
Balint	Davids (KS)	Jackson (NC)
Barragán	Davis (IL)	Jackson Lee
Beatty	Davis (NC)	Jacobs
Bera	Dean (PA)	Jayapal
Beyer	DeGette	Jeffries
Bishop (GA)	DeLauro	Johnson (GA)
Blunt Rochester	DelBene	Kamlager-Dove
Bonamici	Deluzio	Kaptur
Bowman	DeSaulnier	Keating
Boyle (PA)	Dingell	Kelly (IL)
Brown	Doggett	Khanha
Brownley	Escobar	Kildee
Budzinski	Eshoo	Kilmer
Bush	Espaillat	Kim (NJ)
Caraveo	Evans	Krishnamoorthi
Carbajal	Fletcher	Kuster
Cárdenas	Foster	Landsman
Carson	Foushee	Larsen (WA)
Carter (LA)	Frankel, Lois	Larson (CT)
Cartwright	Frost	Lee (CA)
Casar	Gallego	Lee (NV)
Case	Garamendi	Lee (PA)
Casten	Garcia (IL)	Leger Fernandez
Castor (FL)	Garcia (TX)	Levin
Castro (TX)	Garcia, Robert	Lieu
Cherifilus-	Goldman (NY)	Lofgren
McCormick	Gomez	Lynch
Chu	Gonzalez,	Manning
Clark (MA)	Vicente	Matsui
Clarke (NY)	Gottheimer	McBath
Cleaver	Green, Al (TX)	McClellan
Clyburn	Harder (CA)	McCollum
Cohen	Hayes	McGarvey
Connolly	Himes	McGovern
Correa	Horsford	Meeks
Costa	Houlahan	Menendez
Courtney	Hoyer	Meng

Mfume	Ramirez	Strickland
Moore (WI)	Raskin	Suozzi
Morelle	Ross	Swalwell
Moskowitz	Ruiz	Takano
Moulton	Ruppersberger	Thanedar
Mrvan	Ryan	Thompson (CA)
Mullin	Salinas	Thompson (MS)
Nadler	Sánchez	Titus
Napolitano	Sarbanes	Tlaib
Neal	Scanlon	Tokuda
Neguse	Schakowsky	Tonko
Norcross	Schiff	Torres (CA)
Ocasio-Cortez	Schneider	Torres (NY)
Omar	Scholten	Trahan
Pallone	Schrirer	Underwood
Panetta	Scott (VA)	Vargas
Pappas	Scott, David	Vasquez
Pascarel	Sewell	Veasey
Pelosi	Sherman	Velázquez
Peltola	Sherrill	Wasserman
Peters	Slotkin	Schultz
Pettersen	Smith (WA)	Waters
Phillips	Sorensen	Soto
Pingree	Spanberger	Watson Coleman
Pocan	Stansbury	Wexton
Porter	Stanton	Wild
Pressley	Stevens	Williams (GA)
Quigley		Wilson (FL)

NOT VOTING—14

Adams	Grijalva	Nickel
Arrington	Langworthy	Smith (NE)
Blumenauer	Magaziner	Sykes
Cole	Murphy	Trone
Diaz-Balart	Nehis	

□ 1748

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MOMENT OF SILENCE FOR FALLEN OFFICERS

(Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, in a horrific act of violence, four law enforcement officers were killed in Charlotte, and four more were injured as the U.S. Marshals Regional Fugitive Task Force sought to serve a warrant on a very dangerous person.

I rise today on behalf of Representative ADAMS who is back in her district, standing with the community following this tragic event.

I ask my colleagues to join us in a moment of silence to honor the four law enforcement officers who gave the ultimate sacrifice to keep our community safe, to support the four officers who were injured, and to recognize the courage of all the first responders who answered the call on that day.

HONORING JAMES ERNEST STEWART, JR.

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of James Ernest Stewart, Jr.

A lifelong resident of Waycross, Georgia, Jim graduated from Waycross High School and later pursued a finance degree at the University of Georgia.

After graduating, Jim served the Nation in the Army Intelligence Division in Europe and later took up his father's family business, Stewart Candy Company, where he served as chairman of the board for over 65 years.

In addition to the family business, Jim took on many leadership positions in his community. He served as chairman of the board of Commercial Bank of Waycross. He also was the founding chairman of the board of Waycross Bank & Trust, WB&T Bankshares, and Southwood School.

For his achievements and community involvement, Jim was selected for the Herrin Business Award and the Community Service Award from The Childrens YMCA.

He was even granted an award in his honor, the James E. Stewart Award, for the service he lent to the community. Jim's community involvement will forever be remembered by friends, family, and all.

EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES FOR EASTERN NORTH CAROLINA

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

Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, in eastern North Carolina, there is a growing need for employment opportunities that can provide young people with careers.

To address this, I recently facilitated a meeting at our Greenville office between representatives from the Newport News shipyard, community colleges, and workforce development officials from across the region.

The objective was to explore ways of collaborating to create more job opportunities in our part of the State.

Given the increasing demand for Naval ships and submarines, everyone left optimistic about the potential for future collaboration. The meeting was productive and full of promise and hope.

Currently, more than 1,100 North Carolinians are employed at the shipyard. By working together, we can ensure that even more people from our region have access to good-paying jobs and can live the American Dream right in eastern North Carolina. We are taking positive steps toward creating a brighter future in the East.

□ 1800

RECOGNIZING LAUREN CLICK

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

Mr. BURCHETT. Mr. Speaker, I recognize my dear friend Lauren Click for all of her hard work and dedication at Henry's Deli in Corryton, Tennessee.

Lauren first started working at Henry's Deli through a program at Gibbs High School where she got on-

the-job training. After she graduated, she walked back into Henry's and asked for a full-time job. She has been working there with Betty and Austin for 17 years now, and she is Henry's longest-standing employee. She takes care of stocking their chips, drinks, paper towels, and occasionally greeting me.

She absolutely loves her job, and she knows everyone coming in and out of the deli. Everyone knows her, too.

I would bring groups to the deli back when I was county mayor where I would see Lauren working there, and she and I got to be friends then. I still go in there, and she always has a big smile for me and a big hug whenever I walk in.

On February 5, she turned 39 years old. I was disappointed I had to be up here with you-all and couldn't go to the deli and wish her a happy birthday, because I was stuck up here with you-all, as I stated once before.

I will say it now here on the House floor: a very late and very happy birthday to Lauren. She brings a lot of joy to the folks at Henry's Deli, and I am glad that she and I are good friends.

I say a special thanks to the folks at Henry's for helping Lauren find a great place in life because she is wonderful, she is one of God's creatures, and she is perfect.

SUPPORTING MANUFACTURING USA

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

Ms. STEVENS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of Manufacturing USA, the network of research institutes that develop manufacturing technologies through public-private partnerships.

Ten years since the creation of Manufacturing USA through the American Manufacturing and Innovation Act, or the RAMI Act, we are seeing firsthand why these institutes and funding them is so critical to our country.

This was an initiative that started under President Obama and has carried forward through two Presidential administrations since. From MxD's ability to push the bounds of digital tools in manufacturing to ARM's ability to revolutionize the sector with robotics, to all of the amazing biomanufacturing institutes furthering materials science and biotechnology applications, to Remade's work of creating a circular economy, to PowerAmerica and its forthcoming sibling ensuring American leadership in the semiconductor industry, to my hometown hero, LIFT, creating technologies needed for an electric future.

My friends, this is Manufacturing USA. This is workforce development in action.

RECOGNIZING GOVERNOR JANICE K. BREWER

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

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize someone who is undoubtedly one of the greatest public servants my State has ever known, Janice K. Brewer.

Jan Brewer served Arizona for decades, starting in the State House of Representatives and then in the State Senate where she was majority whip. She also served on the Maricopa County Board of Supervisors and then as Arizona's Secretary of State. After a gubernatorial vacancy, Jan became Arizona's 22nd Governor and was overwhelmingly reelected for a second term.

Governor Brewer is someone I have admired for her independence and convictions. She dedicated her time in office to leave our State better than she found it, and her efforts helped lay the foundation for Arizona's current success and prosperity.

Arizona's Eighth Congressional District thanks Governor Jan Brewer for her amazing legacy of service to the Grand Canyon State.

REMEMBERING DR. CRYSTAL ELLIS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize the passing of a towering, transformational leader of northwest Ohio and Toledo Public Schools, Dr. Crystal Ellis. Indeed, he has been a crystal-clear force for today and the tomorrows to come.

Dr. Ellis was born in 1933 in Springfield, Ohio, in the depths of economic struggle. As an African American pre-civil rights, he faced raw discrimination but was determined to overcome that by playing basketball at Bowling Green State University like his idol, Charlie Share. In 1951, Dr. Ellis became the first African American to play for the Falcons at Bowling Green.

He left college to join the U.S. Army and continued playing basketball on a military team, finishing his education at BGSU and the University of Toledo, and he became BGSU's most valuable player.

He moved to Toledo to raise his family and work for the YMCA and was then hired by the Toledo Public Schools in 1969 and rose to superintendent, serving from 1969 until his retirement in 1996. He was a teacher, coach, mentor, principal, prophet, leader, and the district's first African-American superintendent.

Superintendent Ellis, a very measured man, led by example. Toledo and our region are deeply grateful for his life and legacy and contributions to educating every child and every person in our community.

Rest in peace, Dear Superintendent Ellis.

He will be deeply missed. In his name, may our community move forward with his unfinished dream to educate every child and person, no matter how difficult their circumstance.

FINDING SOLUTIONS TO WILDFIRE DEVASTATION

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, last month, a colleague and good friend, Congresswoman JILL TOKUDA, and myself toured my district. This is post fire devastation of the 2018 Camp fire and how our recovery efforts are going 5 years later.

It is a solemn connection Representative TOKUDA and I share, as last August her district suffered the catastrophic Lahaina fire.

Here we are checking out Lahaina, and here she is with me in Paradise, California.

The Lahaina fire replaced the Camp fire as the deadliest one in the United States since at least 1910.

Through the Bipartisan Policy Center, we were also able to visit her district as well at no expense to the taxpayers. Through bipartisanship, we worked across the aisle together and discussed finding solutions that work in multiple regions of the country for something that has plagued both our districts so viciously: wildfire.

As my colleague Representative TOKUDA and the residents of Lahaina go through their own recovery and rebuilding process, it is important to share the lessons that we learned in northern California in recovering from a major disaster and navigating the FEMA process. I hope these lessons can be learned for the benefit of her district, mine, and others going forward as necessary.

SAFEGUARDING THE RIGHT TO CONTRACEPTION

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

Ms. MANNING. Mr. Speaker, extreme Republican politicians continue to attack women's reproductive freedoms. First, they overturned Roe, demolishing abortion rights for millions of Americans across the country, including in my home State of North Carolina.

Now, they are attacking fertility treatments, like IVF, and they are even coming after birth control. In fact, Supreme Court Justice Clarence Thomas explicitly called for the reconsideration of *Griswold v. Connecticut*, the case that first established the right to contraception. Just last year, 195 Republicans in the U.S. House of Representatives voted against the right to use birth control.

I will not stand by and watch extremist politicians strip away women's rights. That is why I reintroduced the Right to Contraception Act, to safeguard the right to access all FDA-approved birth control from political attacks.

I encourage my colleagues to join me in supporting my Right to Contraception Act and stand up for women's health and freedom.

IN MEMORY OF BRYAN KENDALL

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

Mr. MEUSER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the tragic loss and memory of Bryan Kendall. His tragic passing in a farm accident last weekend has left an immense void in our community, touching the hearts of Lebanon County and beyond.

Bryan was a proud dairy farmer, and he was known as the heart of Villa Dale Farm, a legacy spanning three generations.

Though his life came to an end far too early, Bryan's memory lives on in the hearts of those who knew him. He cherished his role as a devoted husband to Alyssa and as a father to two sons.

Farmers like Bryan are essential to keeping food on every American's table. It is important to recognize the risks that farmers face in their profession, and we should all be thankful for the hard work of the men and women who feed our nation.

In echoing the sentiments of countless others, Bryan will very surely be missed.

REMEMBERING DEACON ANTHONY KOURY

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

Ms. WILD. Mr. Speaker, earlier this month, our community lost a giant with the passing of Anthony Koury, a longtime deacon of Our Lady of Lebanon Maronite Catholic Church in Easton, Pennsylvania.

For more than 60 years, he served Our Lady of Lebanon as an altar server, lector, bingo worker, cantor, volunteer, and deacon. He also spent more than 40 years at Notre Dame High School in Bethlehem working as a teacher, coach, and athletic director.

Deacon Koury lived a life of total service to his family, to his church, and to his surrounding community. He will be greatly missed, and I am so thankful for his work as a champion of our Lebanese community.

May he rest in peace.

NATIONAL WELDING MONTH

(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 April as National Welding Month. Welding careers are fundamental to safety and advancing the quality of life worldwide. This month, we raise awareness about the welding industry and its career paths.

The welding industry is a foundation of manufacturing. Skilled welders not only keep products rolling off an assembly line and buildings rising into the skyline, but they also keep the economy booming.

As co-chair of the Bipartisan Career and Technical Education Caucus, recognizing National Welding Month is especially important. Welding is a trade-based education, and students who choose to enter a career in welding can graduate high school with a diploma and certifications in one hand and multiple job offers in the other.

Mr. Speaker, a great example are the 12 high school students from Venango County who recently received their welding certificates through the Community College of Allegheny County at Venango Technology Center.

Students in the program were all juniors and seniors from Titusville, Cranberry, Oil City, or Franklin High Schools. Upon graduating from high school, the students will also have earned 18 full credits through CCAC for their work.

Mr. Speaker, this is what a career in technical education provides. It teaches learners of all ages skills to help them succeed in the workforce.

PARKINSON'S AWARENESS MONTH

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

Ms. BARRAGÁN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Parkinson's Awareness Month. Parkinson's disease is a neurological disorder that makes it a challenge to move, speak, and perform everyday tasks we often take for granted. Parkinson's slowly robs people of their independence and mobility.

Nearly 1 million people in the U.S. live with this heartbreaking disease, and my father was one of them. I watched him battle Parkinson's for the last 10 years of his life.

I also want to recognize our colleague, JENNIFER WEXTON, who shared last year that she was diagnosed with a form of atypical parkinsonism, PSP.

She has shared her story and been a strong advocate of the National Plan to End Parkinson's Act, which passed the House as the first-ever legislation solely dedicated to ending Parkinson's.

The House has done its job. I call on the Senate to pass this bipartisan bill. Together, let's honor our caregivers, advocate for research and better treatments, and create a future where Parkinson's is overcome.

□ 1815

CELEBRATING MICHAEL ZADERECKY'S 106TH BIRTHDAY

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

Mr. MILLER of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise to recognize a patriot and true American hero, Mike Zaderecky, of Parma, Ohio, who just celebrated his 106th birthday.

A 1937 graduate of the now-closed Slavic Village South High School, Mike attended Kent State University before being drafted into the Army.

As a private first class in the 8th Infantry Division, 45th Field Artillery Battalion, Mike served in World War II's European theater, patrolling beaches at Normandy shortly after the landings.

In 1945, Mike returned home to Ohio.

Mike continued to selflessly serve his community as a Parma city councilman and a city heating inspector. After retiring, Mike couldn't help but continue his service, working another 28 years as a bailiff. Known as Uncle Mikey in court, he ran a tight ship, keeping both unruly lawyers and equally unruly youngsters in check.

At a time when membership in veterans organizations is in decline, Mike is a faithful member of American Legion Post 572. He is a true inspiration for young servicemembers returning to civilian life.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. Zaderecky for his selfless service and wish him a very happy birthday.

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PROTESTS AND STUDENTS

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I represent the district where Columbia University is located, and as protests have continued to escalate, I have had the opportunity to meet with many Jewish students on the Columbia campus.

I strongly believe that the ability to peacefully protest is a fundamental American value, and I support a student's ability to free expression. However, instances of anti-Semitic hate speech have left these students feeling scared and alone. I want to tell them tonight: You are not alone.

However, vandalism, breaking the law, and anti-Semitism aren't part of peaceful protesting. As the recent escalation has disrupted campus life and placed students in harm's way, the university must immediately prioritize providing safety and order for all students on campus.

As Members of Congress, we have a duty to pass meaningful legislation to protect students and all Americans against anti-Semitism and other forms of hate, and we will do that.

RECOGNIZING DR. DEVIN STEPHENSON

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the remarkable contributions of Dr. Devin Stephenson to northwest Florida.

He currently serves as president of Northwest Florida State College but will be leaving our community to take a post as the head of Florida Polytechnic.

During his time at Northwest Florida State College, Dr. Stephenson began an aviation institute that has become a center of excellence. He has revolutionized the way our State colleges administer nursing education with some of the best technology in that field in the world, and the dual enrollment charter school at Northwest Florida State College has maintained its position as number one in Florida.

He has done so many things for so many thousands of people. We will miss him greatly as he heads on to his new pursuits, and we wish him well at Florida Polytechnic University.

PAYING TRIBUTE TO THE HONORABLE DONALD M. PAYNE, JR.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FLOOD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include any extraneous material on the subject of this Special Order hour today.

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. It is with great honor that I rise today to anchor this joint CBC Special Order hour along with my distinguished colleague, Assistant Leader JOE NEGUSE. For the next 60 minutes, members of the CBC have an opportunity to honor the life of our late Congressman Donald Payne, a leader of great importance to the Congressional Black Caucus, Congress, the constituents he represented, and all of America.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. NEGUSE), who is the assistant leader.

Mr. NEGUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Florida (Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK) for her leadership. I also thank the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, Chairman HORSFORD, and all of my colleagues gathered today to honor a great man, a kind man, and a good man, our beloved

colleague, Congressman Donald Payne, Jr.

With incredible style and a bone-deep optimism that was truly contagious, Don was a kind and gentle giant in the people's House. His dedication to the people of New Jersey was inspiring. His good-natured spirit and his humor were a comfort to us all.

Don used his voice, often standing in this very Chamber—delivering more speeches in the people's House in this Congress than any other Member of this august body—to elevate the issues that matter to his community, the people of New Jersey, and the American people. His impact has been felt and will be felt by countless folks across the State of New Jersey and across our great country, including those who benefited from his efforts to expand access to safe drinking water, to implement better pay and safer working conditions, and to do so much more.

Above all else, he was a kind, good, and decent man.

I was proud to call him a friend, as we all were. As we prepare to lay him to rest, our hearts go out to his wife, Beatrice, and their triplets.

May they find comfort in their loving memories of a good, kind, and decent man.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK very much for bringing us together to honor this great person.

Anyone who ever watches the House of Representatives knew that Mr. PAYNE was first row, first seat. Any President or head of state who came into this body had to pass by him and pay their respects as he paid his respects in return, and practically every day, he did a Special Order on a priority. Whether it was in command of a discussion or what happens in the distinguished visitor's chair, Donald Payne was to be reckoned with.

It is with immense sadness that I rise today to honor our dear colleague. Mr. Speaker, as you can see from the flowers and the black crepe, we are all mourning him deeply.

Donald Payne came from a tradition of leadership, patriotism, effectiveness, and excellence. Public service was in his DNA. Many of us served with his father, Donald Payne, Sr., who was globally recognized as a great leader. Long before Donald Payne, Jr., was here, his father sang his praises. One day, he would replace him.

During his nearly 12 years here in the House, he strengthened our legislative efforts, especially in infrastructure at the helm of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. He led a fight to secure clean drinking water for every child.

Indeed, even in what would be his final remarks on the floor, when we heard him just a matter of weeks ago,

he made the case for lowering housing costs and expanding supply, demonstrating his total commitment to working families in the Garden State of New Jersey and beyond.

In our Caucus in the Congress, Congressman Payne was beloved. He was truly beloved. Indeed, all of us who served with him have been blessed by his personal kindness, his sense of humor, and his devotion to finding common ground.

Again, he was respectful of this institution by treating it with great dignity.

The dapperness of his apparel was always a source of joy to us and brightened our day.

Again, I hope it is a comfort to his wife, Beatrice; their triplets, Donald III, Jack, and Yvonne; and the entire Payne family that so many people mourn their loss and are praying for him at this sad time with a special thank-you to them for sharing Donald Payne with us in the Congress.

It is an honor to call him a colleague, and the American people benefited from his leadership and service.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Nevada (Mr. HORSFORD), who is the chairman of the CBC.

Mr. HORSFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague, Representative CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK, for leading this very important Special Order hour. I thank all of my colleagues who are here and the assistant Democratic leader, Mr. NEGUSE, as well.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight, as our dear colleague would say to his constituents, Mr. Speaker, with my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus and, in fact, the entire House of Representatives to remember a man of the people.

The loss we all feel for our dear friend and colleague, Congressman Donald M. Payne, Jr., is immeasurable. Words really cannot express how deeply he will be missed by our Caucus, but we want to express our heartfelt condolences and our prayers to the Payne family, to his staff, and to anyone and everyone who knew him.

He is forever in our hearts, and we are so sorry for your loss.

As chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus, it is an honor to work with my colleagues each and every day for the betterment of our constituents, this body, and our country. It was an honor to work with a man of such good character, passion, and deep commitment to serving his community and our country as Donald M. Payne, Jr.

He was a kind and thoughtful person, a person who always had a good spirit despite some of the most difficult health conditions that anyone could experience. He always had laughter and a humor about him and an optimism that was truly contagious.

To our Caucus, Donald Payne was prolific, literally prolific, on this floor. He came to this floor to speak for the people. He had a goal of being “the Mi-

chael Jordan of 1-minutes,” and he would go on to win that award not once, not twice, not three times, but five awards in a row. For those who may not know, a 1-minute speech is when you come to this body and bring attention to an issue that is important to the constituents whom you represent.

Despite sometimes not being in the best of health, he found the time and every opportunity to speak to his constituents and to speak on behalf of them.

That is how many of us will remember him. We will remember him with a smile, always dressed to impress, heading to the House floor to speak to the country on behalf of the people and the community that he loved the most.

He was a man of purpose and a man of humility. He was a public servant through and through. This House has been made better for his leadership.

Congressman Payne, Jr., will always be a part of the history that we make here on behalf of the American people. I join my colleagues in honoring his memory, his legacy, and his life by continuing the work to fight for the people on the issues that matter to them most.

May God bless your soul, Congressman Donald Payne. Thank you for giving us the opportunity to know you, to be friends with you, and to serve with you.

Your legacy will live on, and may God bless you.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WATERS).

Ms. WATERS. Mr. Speaker, it is difficult for me to stand here this evening as I mourn the loss of my dear friend, Donald Payne, Jr.

In my own way, I adopted Donald Jr. and he accepted me as his other mother.

I loved him because he was a fighter. Experiencing his own health problems, he worked hard to address the health problems in our society and to educate and legislate to get healthcare and support for others.

He was a gentleman. All the Members loved, supported, and respected him. All the Members of Congress loved him because of his spirit.

I loved his support for all others when he was having his own problems.

I also enjoyed loving his dress. Mr. Speaker, he had those beautiful bow ties, and he wore those fabulous suits and shoes in all of his colors that he coordinated.

I would compliment him, and we would laugh and joke about the fabulous eyeglasses that he had and on and on.

□ 1830

He was a man of style and fashion. I am going to miss him, and I am going to miss inquiring about his wonderful children, his triplets, and about what they were doing.

Additionally, I am going to just plain be overcome with grief and try to get

some relief in the fact that I knew him, and may he rest in peace.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. BISHOP).

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of a remarkable man, my colleague and dear friend, Donald Payne, Jr.

Donald was a kindhearted public servant who dutifully served New Jersey's 10th Congressional District. For Donald, like his father, whom he succeeded, representing his district was heartfelt and personal. From the district of that district, he provided invaluable insight to the most profound issues facing our country, from our national security and major infrastructure needs that keep the American people and commerce flowing, to the more personal challenges that we face, like the unique challenges of men's healthcare and overall health policy, and the path our country could chart to address injustice and create equitable opportunities for the country's underserved communities.

He was a vibrant voice in this Chamber every day, a sharply dressed messenger helping to educate us all, communicating the everyday lived experiences of Americans to help craft more compassionate policy, improve the quality of life for all, and help create a more perfect union.

He was beloved on both sides of the aisle and, of course, by his family and the people he served. Though he has transitioned from this life, it is my hope that his spirit remains alive in all of us in all that we do.

To God be the glory for the life and the legacy of Congressman Donald Payne, Jr.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, today, we mourn the loss of Congressman Donald Payne, Jr., a thoughtful leader, a dear friend, a son of Newark who never forgot where he came from or who he served, a legislator whose kindness brought us together even during the most divisive political times.

I had the privilege of serving alongside both Donald Paynes, but Donald Payne, Jr., served with me on the Homeland Security Committee during his entire tenure in Congress, and he achieved great things.

When he came to the committee in 2013, the world had just come crashing down for parents in Newtown, Connecticut, whose children were gunned down at an elementary school. Donald Payne, Jr., a father of school-aged triplets, vowed to make schools safer in this country. It is because of him, because of his relentless advocacy, that the Department of Homeland Security

is reporting to Congress on school security.

Additionally, it is because of Donald Payne, Jr., who wrote the Homeland Security for Children's Act, that the Department of Homeland Security now must plan for children's unique needs during disasters. Donald Payne, Jr.'s legacy is making children safer.

As we mourn together, let us celebrate together. Every goal, every accomplishment, every move Donald Payne, Jr., made here in the Halls of Congress was in the service to his wife, Bea; his children, Donald, Jack, and Yvonne; the city of Newark; and the people of New Jersey's 10th Congressional District. Donald Payne, Jr., leaves a legacy that they all can—we all can—be proud of.

We note how Congressman Payne was a snazzy dresser. I couldn't touch him, but, in his memory, I am putting on some of his favorite shades for this evening.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to have an opportunity to highlight the legacy of our colleague and my friend, Donald Payne, Jr.

Last week, New Jersey lost a great public servant far too soon. Many knew Don for his trademark bow tie, big smile, and friendly demeanor.

Let me tell a bit more about his life and journey. Don's mother died when he was just 5 years old, and after his mother's passing, Don and his siblings were raised by his father. I think many know his father, Donald Sr., also my colleague, was the first Black Member of Congress from New Jersey. He was also a Congressional Black Caucus chairman.

However, Don Jr. tended to the trail blazed by his father by fighting for healthcare for all, delivering Federal funding to the largest and most important transportation project in American history, and replacing lead drinking water pipes that made kids in his district sick. In honor of his father, he led bipartisan efforts to research, prevent, and treat colorectal cancer.

Don was a powerful politician in New Jersey, as both a county commissioner and Newark City councilman. New Jersey allowed you to hold both offices at the same time. Many felt it was a step down for him to come to Congress, but he felt it was an obligation and duty to follow his father's footsteps, and he was determined to make the best of it.

Now, Don was always struggling with health issues from the very first day that he came here, but it didn't stop him from his work, from voting, from doing more special orders than any other Member, as was mentioned by my colleagues tonight. In a town known for sharp elbows, Don always showed kindness. He always took the time to ask how you were doing. He made sure you knew that you had a

friend who had your back no matter what.

Don Payne can serve as an example for all of us. He didn't care if you were Black or White, Christian or Jewish, rich or poor. We were all in this effort together to get things done that would make a difference in our quality of life.

Don didn't worry about himself. He was funny and self-deprecating. If there was anything he didn't like, it was conceit or thinking that you were better than other people. Don's goal was always to help others, and that is what he would ask of us: Work every day to make a better life for your community, your State, and your country.

This week, the American flag flies at half-mast at the Capitol in his honor. We join his wife, Beatrice, and his children, the triplets, Donald III, Jack, and Yvonne, in mourning his passing. Donald Payne, Jr., made his family and constituents proud. His work is done, but it won't be forgotten.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California, (Ms. LEE).

Ms. LEE of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding and for bringing us together tonight. It is hard to stand here and look over here. Where is Don? Every night, here he was speaking truth to power.

Tonight, I rise with my colleagues in remembrance of our beloved friend and colleague, Congressman Donald Payne, Jr.

Now, I got to know and love Don before I actually met him. His proud father, our beloved Donald Payne, Sr., made sure of that. The entire Payne family was committed to service, extending to the next generation. Don Jr.'s son was an incredible intern in my office. He was brilliant. He was passionate. He was his father a few years younger. His son, I will tell you, made a major contribution to my office, and we were and became a better office because of Don Jr.

Don Jr. was passionate. He was kind, he was gentle, and a brilliant man who was determined to not let his health challenges stop him from his visionary and his bold work. I remember traveling abroad with him. He would always take time, yes, for his medical treatments and be right back in our meetings, providing his insight on global affairs. He showed us how to live a full life, regardless of his difficulties.

His loss will be immensely felt in New Jersey's 10th Congressional District, where he worked tirelessly to rebuild our Nation's infrastructure, provide clean drinking water for disadvantaged communities, invest in minority-owned businesses, and bring awareness to colorectal cancer in the Black community.

We talked a lot about a variety of treatments for diabetes. As a member of the Appropriations Committee, which funds NIH, he was very instrumental and insightful in helping me with my work with regard to diabetes and cancer.

My condolences go to his family and his loved ones, including his wife, Beatrice, and their three children. I hope that they find strength in their memories and love for this great man who fought the good fight, and he fought a good fight until the end.

May he rest in eternal peace and power.

I thank the gentlewoman again for giving us a chance to speak this evening on behalf of our beloved Congressman, Donald Payne, Jr.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), our Democratic leader.

Mr. JEFFRIES. I thank the distinguished gentlewoman for yielding.

It is with great sadness that we gather here today to honor the life and the leadership and legacy of Don Payne, Jr., but also celebrate that life, that leadership, and that legacy of our dear brother, who was a gentle giant; a kind, compassionate man; powerhouse in terms of his legislative capacity, though he didn't spend a lot of time promoting his accomplishments. He just let the work be done and speak for itself.

However, that is work that was transformational. He stood up for the people that he represented in his beloved Brick City of Newark, his beloved State of New Jersey, and for people all across the country, particularly underrepresented communities in the area of healthcare.

He was a champion in providing access and information and affordability to Black men and to other historically underrepresented communities suffering from disproportionate high rates of ailments, and that is a legacy that will be with us in this Congress, in this country, and, indeed, throughout the world for years and decades to come.

It was my honor, along with JOYCE BEATTY and ROBIN KELLY and STEVEN HORSFORD and MARC VEASEY, to come into Congress together with Donald Payne, Jr. He often made reference to the fact that he arrived a few months before us in a special election, so we affectionately called him the dean of the class of 2012. What a great dean he was, what a great man he was, what a great colleague and friend he was, and may he forever rest in power.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, our Democratic leader, for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida has 34 minutes remaining.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New York (Ms. CLARKE).

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for yielding.

I rise today on behalf of the people of the Ninth District of New York, the

Clarke family, and myself to remember a true gentleman from New Jersey, the honorable and incomparable Congressman Donald M. Payne, Jr.

Just about everyone who was blessed to know my dear friend, Donald, will remember a man with unwavering principles guided by his belief that every American deserves an advocate willing to fight for their best possible future, not to mention his incomparable sense of style. Those bow ties were just classic.

I think back fondly on my time serving alongside Donald throughout his six terms in the House of Representatives and the precious time we shared. We both served on the Committee on Homeland Security together.

□ 1845

One of the memories I have is sitting by his side, deep into the early morning in defense of Secretary Mayorkas during the sham impeachment proceedings, as he admonished those who chose to laugh at the depiction of an officer—as they continued to move different issues forward that were certainly not truthful—on horseback who was using a whip on human beings at the border.

The second instance is of his righteous anger at the existence of a challenge coin commemorating the abuses Black and Brown migrants faced at our southern border.

Each of these stories exemplify the singular commitment to justice and moral courage which defined Donald's tenure here in Congress.

We supported one another in our districts, and we would move back and forth, him coming to Brooklyn, New York, and me going to Newark, New Jersey, to be of support to one another. We shared so much in common: our sense of humor, our sense of fashion, and our genres of music.

We often talked about the fact that when we were younger, we would frequent the same nightclubs right there in Newark, New Jersey, and that was one of our bonding moments.

I can say with confidence that all of Congress will dearly miss Congressman Payne's leadership, kind spirit, and unparalleled dedication to making progress.

So to Beatrice and the triplets, to his loved ones, friends, and staff, I send them love and light and extend my heartfelt condolences during this season of their bereavement.

Mr. Speaker, I will miss my brother and my dear friend.

Rest in peace, Donald Payne, Jr.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the Virgin Islands, STACEY PLASKETT.

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for anchoring this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud that we have gathered here this evening to celebrate the life and legacy of our dear friend and colleague, Congressman Donald Payne, Jr.

When I came to Congress, I knew of his father, Donald Payne, Sr. I had gone to Georgetown's Foreign Service School and all of us Black students knew of the work of his father in elevating Africa, but I came to learn of his son, Donald Payne, Jr., and understood that he was just as passionate as his father; that he, in fact, elevated the legacy of his father by forging his own trail in the issues that were important to him.

We have lost a great man in the House, but Newark, New Jersey, the State, his staff, and especially his family, have lost a dear loved one who can never be replaced.

We must keep his legacy going: the impeccable fashion sense, kind heart, warmth, and a very wry sense of humor, very quiet, but it was there. It was very edgy at times. Donald Payne was, above all, a gentleman. He was a leader in healthcare, specifically with screening for colorectal cancer, Black men's health, and ensuring affordability. He had many initiatives for supporting disadvantaged communities.

I was proud to cosponsor H.R. 3382, the Colorectal Cancer Payment Fairness Act and H.R. 1765, the SNAP Benefits Fairness Act alongside him.

Mr. Payne was an advocate for minority and low-income communities and a voice of support for my home, the Virgin Islands. He was there with us after the hurricanes in 2017 of Irma and Maria. He was a man who always dealt in common sense, in kindness, and what is right, a man that put people over politics and he was our friend. He will be dearly missed.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to the time remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida has 27 minutes remaining.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to Representative BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN from New Jersey.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, first, let me thank the Congresswoman for affording me this opportunity.

Mr. Speaker, I am heartbroken by the passing of my dear friend, Donald Payne, Jr. Like myself, Don came from a family legacy of public service, and we bonded over discussions of our trailblazing fathers and the work that they did together in New Jersey.

I cherish the 10 years that I had the honor of working with Don on issues that were important to us, such as access to childcare, improved transportation, and, of course, fighting cancer.

I will especially remember our time on the Homeland Security Committee where we both chaired subcommittees dedicated to protecting vital infrastructure. I loved him like a brother, and he would often call me his "sister-mother" depending upon whether or not I was giving him a hard time about his health or some other issue.

Donald was a dapper dresser, always with matching glasses, matching bow tie, and matching suit. He was a true gentleman, a loyal friend, a great Representative, and my husband and I will pray for his soul and pray for the comfort of Beatrice and their children and family. We loved him dearly.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. GOTTHEIMER).

Mr. GOTTHEIMER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for convening tonight's Special Order hour.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to honor the life and legacy of our very dear friend and colleague, Congressman Donald Payne.

Donald, as everyone knows, was larger than life. I love that picture of him, and if you could see it in color, it would be even better because he brought so much color everywhere he went—his suits, his personality. He lit up a room. Not only was he a great friend, but a great father and husband. He was an incredible advocate for his beloved city, Newark, and New Jersey overall, and all the hardworking men and women he represented.

He spent his entire career serving New Jersey, including as a distinguished local official for the city of Newark and of Essex County.

It was such an honor to serve here with Don. When I was first elected, Donald was there for me. He showed me the ropes and shared his wisdom. He was never shy to rib me a little bit in the Jersey way with his humor and his kindness, and his signature bow tie.

His legacy will live on through his advocacy and his tireless championing of issues facing so many Americans: health issues and issues of clean drinking water for families and reliable transportation and great infrastructure.

The mark he left is everywhere in New Jersey, and more than his personality, it is the policies he left behind. He will be missed, but never forgotten. His legacy will live on in a big way in the great State of New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, my prayers are with his wife and his three wonderful children. I hope they can find great solace in the work he left behind and the positive impact he had on millions, not just in Jersey, but across our great country.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-McCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. SHEILA JACKSON LEE.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for having this Special Order Hour.

What a privilege to know Donald Payne, Sr., and to know Donald Payne, Jr.

I sat here tonight listening to my colleagues struggle with how they will describe this wonderful giant of a man, each came with their own excellent presentation, and what should we say about our dynamic duo of dad and son.

I thought, again, how privileged I was and am to have traveled with Don-

ald Payne, Sr., the dad, and to have sat next to Donald Payne, Jr., the son, during the course of Homeland Security and a number of other committees.

Let me tell you a thing or two. Both of them knew how to make you laugh. Both of them had a sense of joy and love for people other than themselves.

To his wonderful bride and his wonderful kids—that I would ask about in the early years—let me tell them that he never forgot them and always loved them dearly.

What I loved most about Donald Payne, Jr., was that he took life's journey, and he turned it into making life better for others. He was not so much worried about himself, but about Newark's journey. He wanted to turn the disease that Black men would always be impacted by into the corner that would help Black men have better health.

He would confront this idea of cancer that was so devastating to Black men, to be able to encourage them to learn about their own lives, and to say we are going to fight this thing and we are going to beat it. That was the way Donald Payne led his life, that the cancer that he had to fight was going to be a cancer that he was going to win.

He believed in encouraging Black men to look at their own health, look at yourself in the mirror, Black men, and stand up and be a man and live a longer life and live the life that we can live together.

Let's not shirk away from the challenges that confront our community. Let us talk about that life and have the best life you can possibly have.

So for a life dealing with healthcare and cancer in Black men, he wanted them to be able to confront it head-on, and we did that.

Isn't it interesting that I remember him garnering \$900 million for a transportation project, the same \$900 million that I got for a transportation project? We were excited that we could take our love of transportation and bring those dollars home to Houston and to New Jersey.

Mr. Speaker, there is much more than one can say, but I wanted to bring home the bacon, if you will, and, no, it will not be that. It will simply be the love we have for our fellow human beings, our neighbors. That is what we both hoped that we taught to each other and to our neighbors, and I hope that in spirit he will rest in power and rest in peace.

Let me remind you, Newark, New Jersey, and to his family, whatever he had in life, he was willing to give to others. That is what he will leave us. Whatever he had he wanted to give to someone else. Let us shout and celebrate his life and his legacy. I see you. Rest in power and rest in peace.

God bless.

Mr. Speaker, I come here today to celebrate the life and legacy of our dear Colleague and friend Congressman Donald Payne Jr.

I am deeply saddened by his passing and know that his family are experi-

encing the pain of grieving that only time can ease.

It is my hope that our words tonight on the friend we knew as Donald Payne Jr., will offer some measure of comfort.

Congressman Payne was not only a respected colleague but also a man of vision and compassion for the welfare of children.

I had the honor of arriving in the House of Representatives in 1995, as a freshman while Donald Milford Payne Sr. was serving as the U.S. representative for New Jersey's 10th Congressional District from 1989 until his death in 2012.

I enjoyed sitting next to Congressman Payne Jr. on the House Homeland Security Committee during the 118th Congress and knew him well from our work as Members of the Congressional Black Caucus.

During our time together in Congress we worked together on issues related to equity, justice, and fairness in the provision of federal resources for disaster mitigation, public safety, and border security.

In his work and in our conversations, Congressman Payne Jr. always expressed his devotion to ensuring that the needs of children were met.

In addition to his legislative achievements, he championed the cause of children impacted by disasters and staunchly advocated for and won changes in the Department of Homeland Security's approach in addressing the needs of children during disaster mitigation, evacuations, and recovery efforts.

Representative Payne was a man of great integrity and commitment.

He worked relentlessly to better his community.

He followed in his father's footsteps and became Congressman of the 10th Congressional District of New Jersey in 2012.

And as a Congressman, Donald Payne Jr. cared deeply about his constituents living in the Congressional District-10 and in the great state of New Jersey.

He fought tirelessly for New Jersey families and worked to create jobs and grow the economy.

It was important to him to protect and invest in our children, and to ensure the health and safety of each person who called New Jersey home.

Rep. Payne, Jr. began his long career in public service when he founded Newark South Ward Junior Democrats, becoming its first president.

He also served as an adviser to the YMCA Youth in Government program. He attended Kean College (now Kean University), where he studied graphic arts.

His many accomplishments included being a strong supporter of the Affordable Care Act, which provides thousands of New Jerseyans with access to high-quality, affordable health care.

He also advocated for investing in and protecting the health of our children and introduced the TEST for Lead Act to protect children from lead-contaminated drinking water in schools.

Congressman Donald Payne, Jr. was also a vocal advocate for cancer prevention, introducing the National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month Resolution to raise awareness about the need for regular cancer screenings.

He introduced the Removing Barriers to Colorectal Cancer Screening Act, so Medicare beneficiaries could get polyp, or cancerous growth, removals covered during routine colorectal cancer screenings.

The bill was signed into law in 2019.

As an addition to this act, Rep. Payne, Jr. introduced the Colorectal Cancer Payment Fairness Act to make sure Medicare provides complete coverage of colorectal cancer screening tests and polyp removals by 2023, so patients don't have to pay for the procedure.

He also introduced the Donald Payne Sr. Colorectal Cancer Detection Act to require Medicare to cover FDA-approved blood-based screening tests and help Americans determine their risk for colorectal cancer.

Throughout Congressman Payne Jr.'s career, he fought to protect the rights of every American.

His unwavering support for equal justice, propelled him to vote for the passage of H.R. 1280, the George Floyd Justice in Policing Act.

This bill increases accountability for law enforcement misconduct, restricts certain policing practices, enhances transparency in data collection and establishes national best practices and training requirements.

Congressman Donald Payne Jr. served as a senior Member of the House Committee on Homeland Security and chaired its Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response, and Recovery during the 116th Congress and was Ranking Member in prior Congresses.

He also served as the Ranking Member of the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials for the House Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

In that role, Rep. Payne, Jr. improved passenger and freight rail nationwide.

He protected Americans through his work to improve communications between emergency agencies and provide greater resources to aid victims during and after national emergencies.

During his time on the Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials, Rep. Payne, Jr. introduced the INVEST in America Act, which became the bipartisan, \$1.2 trillion Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act, to provide funds for critical road and rail projects, such as New Jersey's Portal North Bridge and Hudson River Tunnel in the Gateway Program.

Thanks to his efforts, the new law included \$66 billion for passenger rail, the largest federal investment in rail in 50 years, and \$55 billion to replace lead water pipes nationwide. In addition, the law included \$8 billion for New Jersey's highways, \$4.5 billion for the

state's public transit, and \$42 billion to improve New Jersey's traffic safety.

Congressman Payne Jr. built a record of achievement in a divided Congress.

Through his hard work and non-yielding attitude, Representative Payne introduced two bills that were signed into Public Law by President Barack Obama, including the Department of Homeland Security Interoperable Communications Act of 2015.

This bill ensures that Department of Homeland Security personnel can reliably communicate during emergencies.

He also introduced a bill to secure public areas of transportation facilities, such as airports, which was incorporated into the FAA Reauthorization Act and signed into law in October of 2018.

Representative Payne Jr. fought against discrimination and antidemocratic efforts that would seek to limit voting rights.

And as an original cosponsor of the Freedom to Vote, the John R. Lewis Act of 2021, Congressman Donald Payne Jr. help to restore voting protections from the Voting Rights act of 1965, which was abolished in the Supreme Court decision *Shelby County v. Holder* in 2013.

The Equality Act is yet another bill that Congressman proudly supported.

This bill addresses systemic discrimination in our schools, jobs, and communities.

And for the first time in history, ban discrimination based on actual or perceived sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity in education, federal funding, employment, housing, credit, and the jury selection process.

To empower communities of color, I voted for the passage of the Commission to Study and Develop Reparations Proposals for African Americans.

This bill will increase transparency, unity, healing, and research to address our nation's historically unequal treatment of African Americans, Indigenous Americans, Latino Americans, and minority groups, as well as the effects of systemic racism.

Congressman Donald Payne Jr. meant many things to many people.

He was a steadfast public servant, a proud father, and loving husband.

Congressman Payne was a dedicated public servant, a champion for his constituents, and a staunch advocate for social justice and equality.

His legacy of service will continue to inspire generations to come.

I offer my deepest condolences to his loving wife Beatrice and their triplets, Donald III, Jack, and Yvonne, colleagues, friends, constituents, and his dedicated Subcommittee staff and personal office staff.

Congressman Payne's memory will always remain in our hearts.

As a legislative body we must continue to forward his vision of justice, equality, and a more equitable society.

Congressman Payne Jr. will be missed dearly.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman

from Minnesota, Representative ILHAN OMAR.

Ms. OMAR. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to join my colleagues to honor the life and legacy of the late Congressman Donald Payne, Jr.

Donald was one of the first people to say hello to me. I recognized his name as soon as he introduced himself. I had met his father as a young girl in a refugee camp in Kenya. We talked a lot about his father's love and wishing the best for those of us who were born on the Continent and how much he desired to carry on some of that work.

I got to see him almost every single day getting ready to do his 1 minute and I would get an opportunity to check in with him. He not only showed up for every 1 minute every time it was scheduled, but he showed up and fought for his beloved community every day he was in office.

His dedication to following his father's legacy by serving others, his deep human decency, his commitment to the people of New Jersey will have a lasting impact for generations to come.

I will miss our chitchats. I will miss seeing his beautiful smile, and I will miss knowing that he was here to cheer me up.

I am sending love and light to his family, to his staff, and to all the people who loved him. May he rest in power.

□ 1900

Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts (Ms. PRESSLEY).

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of our beloved colleague, Donald M. Payne, Jr., of New Jersey's 10th District.

He was born into a legacy of service but forged his own path. He was warm, witty, and a warrior—a happy one, but a warrior. A warrior for transportation justice, for workers' rights, for healthcare, for gun safety, for clean water.

He never wavered in his exuberance for life or for this work. He was a prolific orator, especially on the House floor. I will always remember him smiling, nattily attired, wearing a colorful suit, bow tie, glasses, and sometimes a fedora that I would ask him to loan me.

I will remember him heading to the House floor with purpose to speak on behalf of the people and the community that he loved.

Mr. Speaker, Black men deserve to grow old. I am heartbroken as I consider consecutively and collectively the loss of Elijah, John, Alcee, Donald McEachin, and now our beloved Donald M. Payne, Jr. It breaks my heart that we are losing yet another member of our historic Congressional Black Caucus. He was an exemplary Member of Congress and an even better man.

Job well done, Congressman Payne. Rest in peace, in power. Your legacy will live on. Our deepest condolences to Beatrice, to Donald, to Jack, Yvonne,

all of your family by blood and by bond, including your staff.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from New Jersey (Ms. SHERRILL).

Ms. SHERRILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember our dear friend and colleague, Donald Payne, Jr.

He was a model public servant, a man who represented the best our State had to offer. From a very young age, he strove to make New Jersey a better place for everyone.

He brought his personal experiences to the Halls of Congress, fighting to expand access to healthcare, which no question changed people's lives. He was an expert when it came to modernizing our Nation's infrastructure, and a partner I turned to as we fought together to make the Gateway Tunnel a reality.

As you have heard, Donald was so much more than just an expert policymaker or a thoughtful legislator. He was a kind, kind man. I remember when he said to me one day: "You know, Congress can be a lonely place."

If you knew Donald Payne, it was never a lonely place because he was always looking out for you. He was always bringing a smile to so many faces, even though he was going through such difficult health struggles. He always made time to ask how you were doing.

He always had his bow tie, his sharp suits on, and he would always take a minute to smile when you complimented him and to say how great it was to see you.

He is going to be missed. He was a presence here that will be sorely missed by all of us. It was an honor to call him a friend. It was an honor for many years to call him my Congressman, and it is an honor to speak today of him. May he rest in peace.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. KIM).

Mr. KIM of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of my colleague and my friend, Congressman Donald Payne, Jr.

It is difficult standing in this Chamber knowing that we will never see Donald walk in here and sit with us again. I remember the first time that I sat with him here in these chairs, I was a brand-new Member of Congress, and he was willing to share a quiet moment with me as I was unsure of myself in this extraordinary yet overwhelming place.

When I sought his advice, he told me there is no single way to be a Member of Congress, but he suggested that all of us focus on being ourselves and delivering for our State and our constituents. In some ways, with so much going on, it helped give some clarity and elegant simplicity to this intimidating yet complicated work that we do.

I will remember Donald for his kindness, as many have talked about today. I will remember Donald for the pride he took in his community and his State, and I will remember Donald for his in-

credible dedication. These are the things we would all be proud to be remembered by, the things we carry with us as we pick up his work to move it forward.

He loved his job. It was an honor he never took for granted, and you could see it in everything he did. My thoughts are with his family and his community. Donald, we will miss you.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend and colleague Congresswoman CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK for yielding to me.

We are here to honor the memory of a dear friend and colleague, Congressman Donald Payne, Jr., a remarkable public servant and a true champion of justice, equality, and progress. I was honored to serve alongside him on the Committee on Homeland Security and Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Donald Payne was not just a public servant. He was a force for change, a voice for the voiceless, a beacon of hope for the people of New Jersey and all Americans. He dedicated his career to fighting for racial justice and equal rights. He believed in a future where education was accessible to all, championing free college tuition and sustainable infrastructure that would benefit everyone.

In Congress, he demonstrated exceptional leadership, serving as the ranking member and chairman of the critical subcommittees focused on transportation, infrastructure, and emergency preparedness. His commitment to improving public transportation, expanding voting rights, and addressing the urgent threat of climate change earned him respect and admiration from colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

Beyond his legislative achievements, Congressman Payne was known for his unwavering dedication to the well-being of working families and those most vulnerable among us. He understood that progress is measured not only by the laws we pass, but by the lives we touch and uplift.

As we honor Congressman Donald Payne, Jr.'s legacy today, let's commit ourselves to renewing the values he held dear. The Congressional Black Caucus will continue to fight for justice, equality, and opportunity. May we always remember his unwavering belief that our Nation's greatest lies in our ability to lift each other up and build a better future together.

Rest in power, Congressman Payne. Your legacy will continue to inspire and guide us in the noble work of serving the American people. You will be sorely missed, my dear friend, but never, ever forgotten.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield now to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding. I rise

today to pay tribute to the life and legacy of my friend and colleague, Congressman Donald Payne, Jr.

Congressman Payne was a fierce advocate and a dedicated public servant who fought tirelessly throughout his distinguished career for the city, county, State, and country that he loved. He wasn't just a Member of Congress. He was a pillar of hope and strength for the communities he served and the people who he represented and who he loved.

He was a mentor and a role model to many, myself included, always willing to lend a helping hand and offer words of encouragement. This institution can be intimidating, but having a big brother here made it home.

His passing leaves a profound void in our delegation and in this institution. The Halls of Congress will be a little less bright and a lot less stylish without him. I will miss the looks he would give me when we were getting into some good trouble in committee or on the House floor. It was a privilege to serve alongside him.

As we remember our friend, let's recommit to the ideals he lived by—justice, equality, and the pursuit of a better tomorrow for all. In doing so, we can honor an incredible Congressman and a man whose life exemplified the best of what it means to serve others. Thank you for everything, Don. We will carry you with us.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

It is an honor to stand before you today and express my deepest appreciation for Congressman Donald Payne, Jr.'s outstanding dedication and remarkable achievements. As we gather here tonight, I am reminded of the immense impact that one individual can have, not just on their district, but on the entire Nation.

His dedication to addressing critical issues facing our society, from healthcare to gun violence prevention, economic equality to social justice is a legacy that will endure for generations to come. Furthermore, Congressman Payne, Jr.'s leadership on international issues has been nothing short of exemplary.

As a member of the Congressional Black Caucus, I have had the privilege of working with him on various issues. Let us continue to support and honor his legacy by working together to build a more inclusive future for all Americans.

Thank you, Congressman Donald Payne, for your friendship, dedication, leadership, and service. The 10th Congressional District of New Jersey was truly fortunate to have you as their voice in Congress. May you rest in power.

Congressman Donald Payne would always be here for every Special Order hour. We could all rely on him to be here with his smile and his encouragement. I remember the first days when I first started in Congress, he was always

supportive. He stood with me on issues that affected Haiti and the Caribbean and Black issues. He stood us with us when we had to do Special Order hour and came here. He always had a speech for everyone. He always had a mission to make sure that his district and the communities he served had a place in Congress, but more than that had a voice in Congress.

Donald Payne will be missed, as a great friend to the Congress, as a great friend to me, as a great friend to everyone in Congress who he knew. We will think of him every single day: his smile, his laugh, his joy.

As we remember him today, it is a sad time for us, but we find joy in knowing that he is in a better place.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Florida has about 4 minutes remaining.

Mrs. CHERFILUS-MCCORMICK. Mr. Speaker, that concludes our joint CBC and Assistant Leader JOE NEGUSE's Special Order hour. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. AMO. Mr. Speaker, I join my colleagues in Congress and the Congressional Black Caucus in honoring a committed public servant and dedicated champion: Congressman Donald Payne, Jr.

Mr. Speaker, I did not have the blessing of serving alongside Congressman Payne for as long as some here tonight.

But I rise today to pay tribute to a man who showed me the same kindness when we first met as he showed to his lifelong friends and loved ones.

I will never forget his willingness to chat in the cloakroom—to impart some wisdom on this new kid.

When we spoke, Congressman Payne encouraged me to use my voice to help others. He knew, more than most, that the personal is political and the political is personal.

Congressman Payne followed in the footsteps of his father—Donald Payne, Sr.—a former chair of the Congressional Black Caucus and New Jersey's first Black Member of Congress.

There is no question that Congressman Payne was a fierce advocate for the interests of his Newark district.

As a member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee and the Committee on Homeland Security, he focused on investing in our rail and transit systems, championing men's health for all communities, and keeping Americans safe.

Most of all, he never lost sight of what his neighbors felt and needed. And he was uncommonly open about his personal health and his years-long battle with diabetes.

If there is a lesson to remember from Congressman Payne's service, it is that we can help everyday Americans feel less alone if we lead with kindness, empathy, and understanding.

In this era of infallible politics—where every vulnerability and human moments are picked apart and attacked—is it not courageous to use your struggles to lift those up around you?

Is it not heroic to foster deep connections between the work we do and the struggles that everyday Americans face?

In 2022, when Democrats passed the Inflation Reduction Act, insulin was capped at \$35 a month cap for Medicare patients.

Congressman Payne's declaration after the bill's final passage went right to the very heart of why it mattered.

He addressed how insulin is life-saving medication for diabetics, highlighting how patients have been gouged for years. And he underscored that no American should choose between food and medicine.

I will always appreciate his fierce advocacy and the warm compassion he showed me when I was first sworn in.

Congressman Donald Payne, Jr. will be sorely missed. May his memory guide us forward as we carry on the legacy he forged in Congress.

□ 1915

FOCUSING ON DEBT, BOND MARKETS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 9, 2023, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT).

Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we were joined in this Capitol by the family of Colonel Ralph Puckett. Colonel Puckett passed away at the age of 97, and in just a minute, I would like to read to you the official citation of his Medal of Honor.

Before I read the Medal of Honor Citation, I want you to recognize this man, outside of being a warrior's warrior, was one of the most wonderful people who I have ever had the privilege to meet. That warrior's warrior, though, had a Distinguished Service Cross, two Silver Stars, two Bronze Star Medals with combat V, and five Purple Hearts, as well as many other awards. What a blessing it was that we, as the United States of America, got to know Colonel Ralph Puckett.

Mr. Speaker, the official citation:

“The President of United States of America, authorized by act of Congress, March 3, 1863, has awarded, in the name of Congress, the Medal of Honor to First Lieutenant Ralph Puckett, Jr., United States Army, for conspicuous gallantry and intrepidity at the risk of his life above and beyond the call of duty.

“First Lieutenant Ralph Puckett, Jr., distinguished himself by acts of gallantry and intrepidity above and beyond the call of duty while serving as the commander, 8th U.S. Army Ranger Company during the period of 25 November 1950 through 26 November 1950, in Korea.

“As his unit commenced a daylight attack on Hill 205, the enemy directed mortar, machine gun, and small arms fire against the advancing force. To ob-

tain supporting fire, First Lieutenant Puckett mounted the closest tank, exposing himself to the deadly enemy fire. Leaping from the tank, he shouted words of encouragement to his men and began to lead the Rangers in the attack.

“Almost immediately, enemy fire threatened the success of the attack by pinning down one platoon. Leaving the safety of his position with full knowledge of the danger, First Lieutenant Puckett intentionally ran across an open area three times to draw enemy fire, thereby allowing the Rangers to locate and destroy the enemy positions and to seize Hill 205.

“During the night, the enemy launched a counterattack that lasted 4 hours. Over the course of the counterattack, the Rangers were inspired and motivated by the extraordinary leadership and courageous example exhibited by First Lieutenant Puckett. As a result, five human wave attacks by a battalion strength enemy element were repulsed.

“During the first attack, First Lieutenant Puckett was wounded by grenade fragments but refused evacuation and continually directed artillery support that decimated attacking enemy formations, repeatedly abandoned positions of relative safety to make his way from foxhole to foxhole to check the company's perimeter, and distribute ammunition amongst the Rangers.

“When the enemy launched a sixth attack, it became clear to First Lieutenant Puckett that the position was untenable due to the unavailability of supporting artillery fire. During this attack, two enemy mortar rounds landed in his foxhole, inflicting grievous wounds, which limited his mobility.

“Knowing his men were in a precarious situation, First Lieutenant Puckett commanded the Rangers to leave him behind and evacuate the area. Feeling a sense of duty to aid him, the Rangers refused the order and staged an effort to retrieve him from the foxhole while still under fire from the enemy.

“Ultimately, the Rangers succeeded in retrieving First Lieutenant Puckett, and they moved to the bottom of the hill, where First Lieutenant Puckett called for devastating artillery fire on the top of the enemy-controlled hill.

“First Lieutenant Puckett's extraordinary heroism and selflessness above and beyond the call of duty were in keeping with the highest traditions of military service and reflect great credit upon himself, his unit, and the United States Army.”

Mr. Speaker, may Ralph Puckett, Jr., lie in peace.

Lord, thank You for allowing us the privilege of this man.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I am going to try to explain something. I have come behind this mike a number of times, and I have had a little trouble. Apparently, I am not communicating well, so I am going to try a

slightly different way. Let's back up a bit.

I think I was behind this mike 2 weeks ago and then the week before that and probably the week before that. One of my comments was that I can't figure out how the United States can have a 2.7, 2.8, 2.9, at one point, GDP growth and still be borrowing at the rate we are borrowing.

Remember, a week or so ago, we had 3 days during that week when we went over a \$100,000 a second borrowing. We see tax receipts up 7-plus percent, yet we are still burning through cash at an incredible rate and having to borrow.

It turns out, last Friday, we got the punch line. We were wrong. The Atlanta Fed and others had their math wrong. We got an update. We were all thinking that the GDP the Atlanta Fed had been estimating the first quarter of this calendar year—not fiscal year, calendar year—was sitting at about 2.7 percent. They came in and said no, they were wrong. It looks like we are at about 1.6 percent.

That is a big deal, and it helps explain why we were having such difficulty getting the math to line up. Why is this a big deal? The other concept I have been trying to sell and trying to sink into our skulls here is the bankers, the people who buy U.S. sovereign debt, when you have to borrow \$2 trillion, \$3 trillion a year, and refinance several trillion a year—don't make the bond markets upset with you.

As of today, the 2-year note went over 5.05 percent. We are not there yet, but we are almost to last year's highs. It is the highest this calendar year, but we are back to really expensive debt. I have some data here that says we are still not back to the historical average of where U.S. debt should be.

If I came to you right now and said one of the reasons Members of Congress need to act like adults, besides our obligation to govern, is: Do you really want to make your bankers nervous?

Think about this. We were playing around with some math the other day. It is hard math to do because you have to figure out how much comes to market in U.S. sovereigns that have to be refinanced, how much are virgin issues, saying this is our excess spending this year. We were playing with numbers. Remember, 1 point of interest has 100 basis points in it, so 1 basis point, 1/100th of percent of interest in a 365-day calendar year, would be about maybe \$800 million.

Think of some of the things we fight over here and the words we sometimes say on this floor. You can actually watch bond markets go: These people aren't serious about ever paying us back.

The second concept here is that as we walk through this, remember, we fixate on the Federal Reserve. The Federal Reserve does the short end of interest rates, the 2 years. That is where they have influence. When you start to look at 10 years, 20 years, and 30 years, the

debt market is saying: Do we get paid back? What will U.S. inflation be? What is governance going to be? Are they going to play some games with how they pay? Are they going to raise taxes dramatically? So, we are going to be fixing this instrument, and then U.S. taxes go up here, and our actual rate of return crashes.

For my brothers and sisters here on the left and the right, be careful when you want to engage in the nihilism, the burn the place down. You think it is sort of fun. One of these days, the bond market is going to look at us, and this happened in the 1990s—we have already had a couple of bond auctions in the last 12 months that were undersubscribed the way we thought they would be. You are actually now seeing articles saying American bonds are getting harder to sell. I think that was from The Wall Street Journal this last week. You have to understand that you are playing games with fire.

Interest this year, if today's interest rates hold, we are approaching \$1.2 trillion this fiscal year. That means Social Security is \$1.45 trillion; interest is \$1.2 trillion; Medicare is underneath that; and defense is number four.

One of the punch lines I wanted to bring. Just so you can see it is—we threw together a little chart. Remember, these are just 12 countries, and then the United States. We are number 13 on there. The markets price U.S. debt higher, meaning they consider it more risky. Risk comes in many forms when you start to look at debt markets, from what is the inflation, what is the likelihood to be paid back, are there going to be other risk profiles, what is happening to the country demographically.

When you start to realize the United States right now pays higher interest rates on a 10-year bond than Greece, higher than the United Kingdom, Canada, the Republic of Korea, Greece, Spain, France, Germany, Japan, and Switzerland. They are down here at the bottom. Understand, you take these industrialized countries, we are functionally number 14 on the price.

King dollar, the currency that is used all over the world for exchanges—most transactions in the world, we represent about 46 to 48 percent of all transactions. We dominate that as a reserve currency.

Yet, because of how our inflation runs, because of how our governance has been running, because of our demographics, because of what we are talking about in taxes and plans to grow the economy and the stunning amount of debt we are borrowing, we have 13 countries in the industrialized world that have cheaper 10-year bonds than we do.

I am trying to find some way to help this body sort of understand that now you have the responsibility—you are going to come and argue and say I am going to cut this spending. Great. God bless you. Do it, but if you are going to come behind these mikes and say you

are going to burn the place down, you may make markets here and around the world just nervous enough that with a few ticks, you just cost billions and billions.

Remember, we are borrowing about \$8.5 billion a day. Think of some of the debates we have here. We are knifing each other for fractions of that because we are not willing to tell the truth. The hardest truth I say over and over—and maybe I am an idiot for doing it—from today through the next 30 years—remember, I used to come here with a chart that said 30-year debt from now is \$116 trillion. Then I brought one that was \$130 trillion. Then CBO, about 2 to 3 weeks ago, said, no, Schweikert, you are wrong. It is going to be \$141 trillion 30 years from now. A hundred percent of that is borrowing—interest, healthcare, almost all Medicare.

Then, 8, 9 years from now, when the Social Security trust fund has been emptied out and seniors are about to take a 25 percent cut and we are about to double senior poverty, do we make a political decision to reach into the general fund and make up that difference?

Those three things are 100 percent of that increase in debt over the next 30 years. The rest of the budget is pretty much flat.

That is hard for us to process because we don't want to tell each other the truth. The earned benefits—Medicare, Social Security—and then our obligation to pay the interest on the money we have borrowed is the primary driver of our debt, but we are going to do a clown show here and say we don't tax rich people enough. Then, I show up with the reports that basically when you go over the numbers—and I have done entire floor speeches just on this report—when you did every bit of taxes on the \$400,000 and up, you maximize their capital gains tax, maximize their income tax, maximize their estate tax, maximize everything, and then you adjust for its effect on the economy, you get about 1.5, 1.6 percent of GDP.

The last 366 days—remember, it is a leap year—we have borrowed over 9 percent of GDP. The running average I think for this fiscal year—remember, fiscal year is different than a calendar year—I think we are in the mid-4s, 4 percent of GDP.

□ 1930

The entire tax scheme—well, except for unrealized capital gains, which is a bizarre idea that the Democrats have, which is hey, you have a house, so you own a piece of real estate. You're over 400, we want a tax gain you haven't recognized yet, although most of that gain is probably inflation. Work with me here. The Democrats' tax scheme of taxing the rich, if you do tax maximization, the concept of I maximize your income tax before the number rolls over.

We maximized your estate tax before you start getting rid of assets or are done building them, or we've maximized your capital gains before you say, we are never selling this.

You get about 1½ percent of GDP when you do the economic effects. The last 366 days we were borrowing about 9 percent.

For those of us who want to cut things, if you start to look at the chart, remember, the blue is what we get to vote on.

Everything in the red is Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and interest. Well, now interest is much higher. There are other mandatory programs. We only get to vote on about 25, 26 percent of the budget.

If you split out defense, out of that \$7 trillion spending of your U.S. Government, we get to vote on about \$965 billion. So less than one-seventh is non-defense discretionary, and that is where all the cuts—now, I can cut it dramatically. We could get rid of all of it. You get rid of all \$965 billion in non-defense discretionary, so there is no Park Service, no FBI, none of this. It is all gone. We are heading towards borrowing about \$2.8 trillion. You don't get anywhere close to balancing the budget, and that is getting rid of almost everything you think of as government.

There seems to be this unwillingness to understand the scale of the borrowing. We may come back to that chart.

Once again, I also need to help folks sort of understand the voracious appetite we are bringing to market on debt.

There was a bizarre article I was looking at just before coming to the floor, some economist who I have never heard of trying to argue—must have been some leftwing radical—saying, don't worry, debt is fine. The Treasury numbers aren't that bad.

Of course, he sort of missed the numbers. I have noticed it was one of those classic articles with lots of feelings explained but no actual math in it.

This may be a little hard to see. You see this spike here? That is the peak of the spending during the pandemic.

Here is we are today. Don't know if you can see it on this chart because these little bars are really small, but our borrowing is higher than during the peak of the pandemic.

If someone out there has a more brilliant way to try to explain, we are making ourselves fragile to interest rate exposure to the markets.

The bond market very soon will run this government. Think about that.

I think it is Carville which had a—I think it was in his book. He commented that in his next life, he wants to come back as the U.S. bond market. This actually happened in the nineties when the bond market was a little cranky about something. He makes the point that the next day, he had Speaker Gingrich and President Clinton working it out and making the bond markets calm.

Today's debt to GDP is dramatically higher than it was back then. Does anyone actually think at all about what would happen if we had a failed bond market, a bond auction in the United States?

Now, I actually believe Treasury is doing a fairly competent job of trying to smooth it out. They are trying to give lots of visibility. We are going to be borrowing—except how many of you watch what happened yesterday? They put out their refunding notice saying, hey, it turns out, well, this quarter we are going to have to borrow about \$41 billion more than we expected.

The next moment, you have a 2-year bond, excuse me, a 2-year note. There is a different definition when it is 2 years shorter, paper shorter.

It was a 2-year note that went over 5 percent, and it has remained there today. This stuff gets expensive when you are borrowing trillions and trillions and trillions.

I am trying to help our brothers and sisters understand. Those of you who think that we are going to go back to normal, the last 10 years weren't normal.

There are already books out on what an interesting experiment the previous decade was with artificially low interest rates, except now we spent the last 3 years with inflation sort of paying for it.

Here was the last, functionally, 10 years with 2.2 as an average on U.S. sovereign. Here is where we are right now, and this is low.

We did this, oh, I think 6 weeks ago. We had 3.3. I think it is substantially higher right now. If you go back from 1975 to 2001, the average on U.S. sovereign debt was 7½ percent. Even when we strip out the early 1980s, the Volcker years when they were trying to crush inflation, you get a number that actually is still in the mid to high sixes.

What happens if we go back to that? If that is normal, if that is nominal, how many of your businesses, how many of your lives, how much of this U.S. debt will we have to refinance?

This year, a little under \$10 trillion will come to market. That is the stuff we have to refinance. Remember, part of that refinancing is when you stay very short on what they call the curve, which is a fancy way of saying we are going to borrow some 30 days, and 1 years, and 2 years, and 5 years, and 10 years. The short stuff here you have to refinance over and over and over. When interest rates are this high on U.S. sovereign debt, and you have \$10 trillion coming to market, maybe 2 or 3 of that is new debt, the rest is refinanced.

What would happen if you had a spike back to normal? Remember, we are already modeling right now approaching \$1.2 trillion in interest this fiscal year, becoming the second biggest expense in U.S. Government.

I have this chart. I didn't have time. I was going to cross it out again. I do need to explain one thing because I want to be technically accurate.

You will actually see U.S. debt referred to as "publicly held total debt." Publicly held is what goes to auction. That is what you are often worried about because that has the interest

rate fragility. That goes out and people bid on it. It might be your pension plan. It might be your savings. It might be some nice family on the other side of the world that walks into their neighborhood bank and says: We want something safe that we can get some interest on, and they pull that money and come out and buy a U.S. bond.

Then over here is the big number. That is where my 1.2 number is. Treasury, I think a month ago, came out and said their number then was \$1.1436 trillion. With the higher interest rates—I am just doing a back of the envelope calculation—it is higher than that.

That is total borrowing. That is when they reach over and borrow the cash out of Social Security. They reach in and borrow the cash out of Medicare Part A. They borrow the cash out of the transportation fund, the railroad retirement fund, all these trust funds out there, except they have to pay interest on that, and eventually, they have to pay it back.

We are actually looking at some weird numbers right now because remember, every month Social Security has to take all the tax receipts and reach in and grab a little bit of the trust fund money because the tax receipts—because we have the growth—as we have gotten older, the growth of those in their earned benefit years and the number of workers.

Even though employment and labor force participation are excellent right now, we still have to reach into the Social Security trust fund. It gives you a sense of how tough U.S. demographics are.

I have come behind the mike multiple times and pointed out that in 15 years the United States is probably going to have more deaths than births. We didn't make a chart on it. We should have.

How many of you also saw last Friday the estimate for last year's fertility rates? There was some jerk out there that was going at me because I was using a number of 1.63.

Turns out he is right. I was wrong. The number was 1.62. It was even worse. The United States now has lower births, fertility rates, than much of western Europe.

Why is that important? If you have sort of pay-as-you-go systems where today's workers are contributing into pools that help pay for today's retirees, and the number of workers is going to be shrinking in the coming decades, besides the dislocation that is going to be happening, your local elementary school may wake up and, all of a sudden, start to have fewer kindergartners coming in and fewer second graders and fourth graders and so on. We are already seeing that in some of the school districts in Arizona, and we are a growth State.

The point I am trying to nail down is: our bond rates are higher than 13 other industrialized countries. Should that tell you what the bond markets think about us? This is actually a more

recent phenomenon, seeing this differential with this many. What does that tell you about what the world thinks about our controlling inflation, about our governance, our demographics, our tax policy?

When you saw last week the IMF—when the IMF is putting in their international report on debt and taking a swipe at the United States saying, two things that were fascinating: they are worried about us and our scale of borrowing, and the fact that the United States and China are the two big economies sopping up much of the world credit.

We are actually crushing much of the developing world because we are consuming all the money that would be helping them build up their economies. There is some ugly stuff in here.

For all my Democrat colleagues who run around and talk about the morality of helping the developing world, it turns out our voracious appetite to spend and spend and spend and spend and spend and not tell the truth, and interest and healthcare are our primary drivers.

What are you willing to do to help us change the price of healthcare, not the financing of it? ObamaCare was a financing bill. Medicare for all is a financing bill. They don't actually change the cost by using technology to make people healthier and crash the price of healthcare. Even when the IMF is going at us, maybe we should think about that it is sort of embarrassing.

When you actually have people that—I have never met him. I know he is controversial. I don't think he is any Republican. Larry Fink, in his shareholder newsletter, is actually putting out information saying, he is worried about U.S. borrowing and the scale of it. When you all saw Jamie Dimon in his comments, he is worried about it.

Don't listen to me. Maybe some of the people that have armies of economists that work for them, maybe they are worth actually giving some mind to instead of some idiot on social media who is making crap up.

You have to understand. If you have someone also do this: David, we are just going to grow ourselves out of the debt.

Okay. I showed you a chart a moment ago that last Friday, they recalculated—put out the official calculation. It may get updated one or two more times, but the first quarter fell down to 1.6.

Here is how you have to understand this. Here is, functionally, our borrowing. This is publicly held debt. This is the GDP growth from 2023.

□ 1945

Until this growth is actually beyond the borrowing, because you go out and borrow a trillion dollars, we have got to pay interest on a trillion dollars. If the GDP, the size of our economy, grows a trillion dollars, we only get 17, 18 percent of that in tax receipts. Are you with me? When someone says we

are going to borrow a trillion dollars but we will grow the economy a trillion, the math doesn't work that way.

I have shown you these charts before. When we have had very high marginal tax rates, we get about 18 percent of GDP. When we have had very low marginal tax rates, we get about 18 percent of GDP in taxes to the U.S. Government. There is a whole formula why that works that way.

You need the growth. You desperately have to have the growth. I can't make the math work without really good growth, but it doesn't come anywhere close, doesn't come anywhere mathematically close to closing the gap of our borrowing.

You have got to understand how dystopian this future looks. This chart is already getting a little out of date, but we see deficits reaching 14 percent of GDP in 30 years. We seem to be racing pretty hard to get there. You see this gap? This is the history of tax receipts. When we have had high marginal tax rates or low marginal tax rates. They have the model actually going up to 17.9 near the end of the next 30 years, but we also have our spending at 31.9.

What is the chance we get anywhere near the end of this without this economy collapsing, without the people we need to borrow money from saying they are not loaning to the United States Government anymore? What happens when we have to make the decision that we are just going to inflate the debt, we are going to wipe out your savings; we are going to set off inflation, we are going to have to lower your COLA, so we make everyone poorer in America, but we are going to use that as the hidden tax? Understand, actually the biggest tax in modern history has been the last 3 years of inflation.

I am going to say this multiple times before I finish this presentation. My district, the Phoenix-Scottsdale area, if you don't make, I think it is, 23.6 percent more than, I believe, the day President Biden took office, you are poorer today. Do you think that could explain why some people are cranky?

Let's walk through this. I was trying to explain this a moment ago. The last 366 days, we are borrowing slightly over 9 percent of GDP. If you go from the fiscal year, October 1, we are already borrowing over 4.2 percent of the economy.

This is what I was just trying to share. If you go back to January of 2017—remember, we didn't do tax reform until December of 2017—to January of 2021, right before the pandemic, if you were a production and non-supervisory employee, your income went up 9.8 percent. Today, since January 2021, when Biden took office, you are 2.7 percent poorer. If you want to understand why people feel stress, much of our society is poorer today because of that hidden tax called inflation.

One more time: Remember, when we tell you we are going to cut our way to

prosperity or we are going to tax our way to prosperity, that is just stupid. That is not how the math works.

You see this chart next to me? We only get to vote on that blue portion, and half that blue portion is defense. How much of that do you want cut? This is what you are playing with, and that is why we need to create a revolution of technology to change the cost of the services we provide.

Now, let's talk a little bit about hope, something I don't do enough of because there is so much crappy news around here. There are some really, really helpful things in technology. I have stacks of these things because I sit on an airplane 10 hours a week when I go back and forth from D.C. back home to Arizona.

There are some amazing things happening. About 3 weeks ago, a month ago, we had the first new drug that was developed completely by artificial intelligence. We now have some papers coming out of a cervical cancer screening that is done with AI that has remarkable accuracy, an AI for skin cancer detection where it is doing remarkably high-quality detection, and a stethoscope that uses AI in the background to identify whether there is going to be heart failure. That is remarkable.

There are these amazing things happening. We now know how to cure sickle cell anemia, which is the first genetic-altering drug. Now that we know how to do it, you are going to see all sorts of other things.

If you are a geek watching this, look up "inverse vaccine" and read about the hope of the things that it might do.

There are also other crazy things outside of healthcare. Here is one where a robot goes out and fixes potholes and dramatically cuts the cost of road maintenance.

Here is actually one that is fascinating. They actually came up with this crazy idea of how to get hydrogen to businesses. We have been talking about how we want to have hydrogen as one of our additional energy sources. Hydrogen is fairly efficiently made with natural gas and electrolysis. Instead of building a big electrolysis center, their model is you already have a gas line to your business, so we will just build a piece of equipment right there where you convert it right there and burn the hydrogen in your facility.

There are brilliant disruptions coming that will grow this economy, that will actually help us make government smaller.

We have a piece of legislation, and I don't know if I will ever get a hearing on it around here, but we should. The GAO just announced about a month and a half ago, two months ago, for the eighth year in a row, the Pentagon is unauditible. They can't audit it. They have no idea what the inventories are, all of the things we should know in an audit.

Why do we tolerate that? Why isn't this body losing its mind over something like that, just from a national security standpoint? Maybe they need more. Maybe they need less. Maybe we have too much of something. We don't know. When you walk around the campus here, there are all sorts of people in uniforms and all sorts of people from defense contractors saying we need more of this. How do we know? We can't audit you.

Turns out that a couple of the biggest and couple of smallest audit companies, CPA companies, compliance companies, have come up with Audit AI, artificial intelligence that crawls through the books, crawls through the inventories, and crawls through the asset lists. You can use AI to audit the Pentagon. If that works, you could use AI to look for fraud in Medicare, Medicaid, and other programs. How about durable equipment fraud that you read about so often? You could use AI for that.

Right now, there has been an experiment—and I haven't gotten the final report of how well it works—but if you call the IRS during this tax season, there is a very good chance the individual you are talking with is a ChatGPT, a chat computer. My understanding is that the satisfaction was higher talking to the AI because it stayed on the phone with you longer and would work through helping you fill out your form. Those are ways to use technology to make this government smaller.

I have already done whole presentations on the morality of this government using its resources to cure diseases because it turns out it is really good economics. It is moral. The knockoff effects, what they called second degree, third degree, fourth degree—there are a whole series of things you calculate.

How about family formation or less people dying. Remember, we are about to have the fifth year in a row where a prime age male's life expectancy is shorter, but this body will knife each other when we are just trying to add technology to telehealth because it will force someone out there to change their business model and maybe also find a better, faster, cheaper way to do it because they have to compete against technology.

I will argue disruption and adopting the technology is the only path I can mathematically come up with to crash this debt or stabilize it. We just need to stabilize it, so the debt doesn't grow faster than the economy. To do that, you are going to disrupt bureaucracies, you are going to disrupt incumbent business models, and that is the way America is supposed to work.

There is a reason you didn't go to Blockbuster Video last weekend. The technology has changed. You don't stand in line for your little silver disc anymore. You go home and hit a button and you have how many streaming services? If Blockbuster video had

hired enough lobbyists, this place probably would have slowed down the internet for them. That is mean, but I am trying to get people to think.

We have got to get ourselves to push. We have got to be willing to disrupt, because I will argue we are Americans, and we are supposed to do things better every day. The cures, changing the way government works, making our economy constantly evolve, becoming better, faster, cheaper, and more affordable.

It basically comes down to a single line: Prosperity is moral. If you looked at the inflation data, the new GDP data that came out on Friday, we are on the cusp of going back to something horrible from almost 40 years ago called stagflation. That is immoral. This body can make that not happen, and we can make this a prosperous future. I believe we only have 3 to 5 years to embrace the disruption, but if we don't do it, we have engaged in a really immoral act here.

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

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 1, 2024, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

EC-3966. A letter from the Program Analyst, Food and Nutrition Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) Process and Technology Improvement Grants — Fiscal Year 2024 Request for Applications (RFA) [Assistance Listing Number (ALN): 10.580] received April 25, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

EC-3967. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Division of Regulatory Services, Office of Postsecondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final priorities, requirements, and definition — Augustus F. Hawkins Centers of Excellence Program [ED-2024-OPE-0002] received April 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

EC-3968. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Legislation, Regulation and Energy Efficiency, Office of Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy, Department of Energy, transmitting the Department's final rule — Energy Conservation Program: Test Procedure for Uninterruptible Power Supplies [EERE-2022-BT-TP-0005] (RIN: 1904-AF11) received April 25, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3969. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Office for Civil Rights, Depart-

ment of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — HIPAA Privacy Rule To Support Reproductive Health Care Privacy (RIN: 0945-AA20) received April 17, 0224, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3970. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's policy statement — Project-Area Wage Standards in the Labor Cost Component of Cost-of-Service Rates [Docket No. PL24-1-000] received April 26, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

EC-3971. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 25-467, "Sladen's Court Designation Act of 2024", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3972. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 25-468, "Blue and White Marching Machine Way Designation Act of 2024", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3973. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 25-466, "Pastor John W. Davis Way Designation Act of 2024", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3974. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 25-465, "Annie's Way Designation Act of 2024", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3975. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 25-464, "St. Luke's Way Designation Act of 2024", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3976. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 25-463, "Self Storage Lien Enforcement Modernization Amendment Act of 2024", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3977. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 25-462, "Robert L. Yeldell Way Designation Act of 2024", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3978. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 25-461, "Floodplain Review Authority Amendment Act of 2024", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3979. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 25-460, "Jesse Mitchell Way Designation Act of 2024", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3980. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 25-459, "Lee Elder Way Designation Act of 2024", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3981. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 25-457, "Black LGBTQIA+ History Preservation Establishment Act of 2024", pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3982. A letter from the Chairman, Council of the District of Columbia, transmitting D.C. Act 25-458, “Office of the Administrative Hearing Jurisdiction Amendment Act of 2024”, pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 602(c)(1); (87 Stat. 814); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3983. A letter from the Director, Office of Acquisition Policy, Office of Government-wide Policy, General Services Administration, transmitting the Administration’s summary presentation of final rules — Federal Acquisition Regulation; Federal Acquisition Circular 2024-05; Introduction [Docket No.: FAR-2024-0051, Sequence No.: 3] received April 23, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability.

EC-3984. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; 2024 and Projected 2025 Specifications for the Summer Flounder and Scup Fisheries, and 2024 Specifications for the Black Sea Bass Fishery [Docket No.: 231215-0305] (RIN: 0648-BM59) received April 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-3985. A letter from the Fisheries Regulations Specialist, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Fisheries Off West Coast States; Coastal Pelagic Species Fisheries; Biennial Specifications; 2023-2024 and 2024-2025 Specifications for Pacific Mackerel [Docket No.: 231211-0299] (RIN: 0648-BM44) received April 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-3986. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration’s final rule — Fisheries of the Caribbean, Gulf of Mexico, and South Atlantic; Reef Fish Fishery of the Gulf of Mexico; Vermilion Snapper Management Measures; Amendment 47 [Docket No.: 170720688-8385-02] (RIN: 0648-BH07) received April 24, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

EC-3987. A letter from the Division Chief, Officer of Regulatory Affairs, Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, Firearms, and Explosives, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department’s direct final rule — Bipartisan Safer Communities Act Conforming Regulations [Docket No.: ATF 2022R-09; AG Order No.: 5921-2024] (RIN: 1140-AA57) received April 19, 2024, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. JORDAN: Committee on the Judiciary. H.R. 7343. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to provide for the detention of certain aliens who commit assault against law enforcement officers; with an amendment (Rept. 118-478). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. COMER: Committee on Oversight and Accountability. H.R. 7530. A bill to limit youth offender status in the District of Columbia to individuals 18 years of age or younger, to direct the Attorney General of the District of Columbia to establish and operate a publicly accessible website containing updated statistics on juvenile crime in the District of Columbia, to amend the District of Columbia Home Rule Act to prohibit the Council of the District of Columbia from enacting changes to existing criminal liability sentences, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 118-479). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. BLUMENAUER (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. NEGUSE, and Ms. MACE):

H.R. 8164. A bill to amend the Lacey Act Amendments of 1981 to prohibit certain activities involving prohibited primate species, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 8165. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to establish qualifications for the appointment of a person as a marriage and family therapist, qualified to provide clinical supervision, in the Veterans Health Administration; to the Committee on Veterans’ Affairs.

By Ms. BUDZINSKI (for herself, Mr. BOST, and Mr. CRAWFORD):

H.R. 8166. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to issue regulations requiring that optional combat boots worn by members of the armed forces wear be made in America, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. MOYLAN, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 8167. A bill to require the Secretary of Defense to award grants to fund research on orthotics and prosthetics; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. MOYLAN, Mr. RUIZ, and Mr. BILIRAKIS):

H.R. 8168. 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 Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania (for herself and Mr. LIEU):

H.R. 8169. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to prohibit the use of lead ammunition on all lands and waters under the jurisdiction and control of the Forest Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Natural Resources, 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. EDWARDS (for himself, Mr. TRONE, and Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 8170. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to provide for certain exceptions to the mileage limitation for Appalachian development highway system projects; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois:

H.R. 8171. A bill to amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act to provide for additional procedures for families with children under the age of 6, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. GOLDEN of Maine:

H.R. 8172. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require certain online platforms which display political advertisements to display with the advertisement a notice identifying the sponsor of the advertisement and to ensure that the notice will continue to be presented in the advertisement if a viewer of the advertisement shares the advertisement with others on that platform; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GOLDEN of Maine:

H.R. 8173. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to prohibit former Members of Congress from engaging in lobbying contacts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDEN of Maine:

H.R. 8174. A bill to amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to prohibit certain individuals from service as an agent of a foreign principal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GOLDEN of Maine:

H.R. 8175. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit 501(c)(4) entities from using more than 10 percent of total expenditures on certain political expenditures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GOLDEN of Maine:

H.R. 8176. A bill to provide for disclosures of certain foreign contributions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, and 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. GOLDEN of Maine:

H.R. 8177. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to require senior Government officials and their family members to divest foreign financial interests, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Accountability, and in addition to the Committee on House Administration, 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. GOOD of Virginia (for himself and Mrs. MILLER of Illinois):

H.R. 8178. A bill to amend the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act to remove the requirements relating to registered apprenticeships; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. KUSTOFF (for himself, Mr. MANN, and Mr. STRONG):

H.R. 8179. A bill to require the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out research and development with respect to winter oilseed crops, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 8180. A bill to amend the Consolidated Appropriations Act, 2022 with respect to a civil action relating to the disclosure of intimate images; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. PEREZ (for herself and Mr. DUNCAN):

H.R. 8181. A bill to prohibit the Consumer Product Safety Commission from issuing a rule related to table saws until 5 years after a patent related to the saws has been dedicated to the public or expired, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS, Mr. FERGUSON, Ms. GREENE of Georgia, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MCCORMICK, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, and Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia):

H.R. 8182. A bill to establish the Ocmulgee Mounds National Park and Preserve in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Ms. SPANBERGER (for herself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. OWENS):

H.R. 8183. A bill to direct the Attorney General to convene a national working group to study proactive strategies and needed resources for the identification and rescue of children from sexual exploitation and abuse, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. STEEL (for herself and Mr. MORELLE):

H.R. 8184. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal the scheduled reduction in the deduction for foreign-derived intangible income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEIL (for himself and Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 8185. A bill to amend the Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 to include financial criminal activities associated with the facilitation of severe forms of trafficking in persons within the factors considered as indicia of serious and sustained efforts to eliminate severe forms of trafficking in persons, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Ms. STEVENS (for herself, Mrs. GONZALEZ-COLÓN, and Mr. TORRES of New York):

H.R. 8186. A bill to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to establish a grant and loan program that provides amounts to eligible entities to use to develop, create, or preserve qualifying affordable dwelling units, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TONKO (for himself and Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana):

H.R. 8187. A bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish and carry out a program to support the development, maintenance, implementation, and adoption of digital identification systems for advanced energy technologies for the purpose of increasing critical material supply chain transparency; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. TORRES of California (for herself, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. MENG, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 8188. A bill to create a civil action for non-consensual sexual protection barrier removal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. TORRES of California (for herself, Ms. BONAMICI, Ms. NORTON, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Ms. MENG, and Mr. TRONE):

H.R. 8189. A bill to encourage States to voluntarily pass laws to authorize civil damages and equitable relief for nonconsensual sexual protection barrier removal, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself and Mr. GOLDEN of Maine):

H.R. 8190. A bill to review and consider terminating the designation of the State of Qatar as a major non-NATO ally, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. OMAR, Ms. LEE of California, Mr. FROST, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. BROWN, Ms. JACOBS, Mr. CARDENAS, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. WILLIAMS of Georgia, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. McGARVEY, Mr. MFUME, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina, Mrs. HAYES, Mr. McGOVERN, Ms. TLAIB, Mr. GOLDMAN of New York, Mr. DOGGETT, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. CROCKETT, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. STEVENS, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. TONK, Mr. ALLRED, Mrs. RAMIREZ, Ms. ESCOBAR, Mrs. MCBATH, Mr. EVANS, Ms. STRICKLAND, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. UNDERWOOD, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Mr. HORSFORD, Mr. TRONE, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. ROBERT GARCIA of California, Mr. LANDSMAN, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. GARCIA of Texas, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. McCLELLAN, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MC CORMICK, Ms. WATERS, Ms. SEWELL, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mrs. FOUSHÉE, Mr. CARTER of Louisiana, Mr. NEGUSE, Mr. IVEY, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. AMO, Mr. CARSON, Mrs. SYKES, Ms. BUSH, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. TORRES of New York, Mr. CLYBURN, and Mr. MEEKS):

H.R. 8191. A bill to prohibit discrimination based on an individual's texture or style of hair; to the Committee on the Judiciary, 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 Ms. WILSON of Florida (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BROWN, Mr. BOWMAN, Mr. CLYBURN, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. FROST, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JAYPAL, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, Ms. OMAR, Ms. PRESSLEY, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SEWELL, and Mr. SOTO):

H.R. 8192. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to require States to designate public high schools as voter registration agencies, to direct such schools to conduct voter registration drives for students attending such schools, to direct the Secretary of Education to make grants to reimburse such schools for the costs of conducting such voter registration drives, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration, 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 Mrs. BEATTY (for herself and Ms. CASTOR of Florida):

H.R. 8180. A resolution recognizing the importance of diversity, equity, and inclusion efforts in medical education; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. COSTA (for himself, Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. CORREA, and Mr. MURPHY):

H. Res. 1181. A resolution expressing support for designation of April as "National Donate Life Month" and expressing gratitude to all Americans who have registered to be organ and tissue donors; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FITZPATRICK (for himself and Mr. DELUZIO):

H. Res. 1182. A resolution recognizing the role of Semper Fi & America's Fund and their contributions to supporting members of the Armed Forces, veterans, and military families for the past 20 years; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. FRY (for himself, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. DUNCAN, Mr. TIMMONS, Mr. NORMAN, Ms. MACE, and Mr. CLYBURN):

H. Res. 1183. A resolution commending the University of South Carolina Gamecocks women's basketball team for winning the 2024 National Collegiate Athletics Association Women's Basketball National Championship; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GOLDMAN of New York (for himself, Ms. BROWN, Mr. CARDENAS, Mrs. CHERFILUS-MC CORMICK, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. COHEN, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. MENG, Ms. NORTON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. KAMLAGER-DOVE, and Ms. McCLELLAN):

H. Res. 1184. A resolution recognizing the 50th anniversary of the Ms. Foundation for Women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NEWHOUSE (for himself, Mr. BOST, Mr. D'ESPOSITO, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Ms. HOULAHAN, and Mr. SMITH of Nebraska):

H. Res. 1185. A resolution designating the month of May as "National First Responder Month"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. RAMIREZ (for herself, Mr. CASAR, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. NORTON, Ms. TLAIB, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. LEE of Pennsylvania, Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Ms. ESCOBAR):

H. Res. 1186. A resolution recognizing the indispensable role of the Indigenous people of Guatemala in ensuring a democratic transition following the 2023 general election in the face of judicial corruption, political exclusion, and historic marginalization, and urging the Government of Guatemala to follow through on its commitments to represent and equitably serve all Guatemalans; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mrs. STEEL (for herself and Mr. CORREA):

H. Res. 1187. A resolution recognizing the 49th anniversary of Black April and the Fall of Saigon on April 30, 1975; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY AND SINGLE SUBJECT STATEMENTS

Pursuant to clause 7(c)(1) of rule XII and Section 3(c) of H. Res. 5 the following statements are submitted regarding (1) the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution and (2) the single subject of the bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. BLUMENAUER:

H.R. 8164.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution
The single subject of this legislation is:
Animal welfare.

By Ms. BROWNLEY:

H.R. 8165.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
Marriage and Family Therapists

By Ms. BUDZINSKI:

H.R. 8166.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
This bill would require the Department of Defense to issue regulations prohibiting any member of the armed forces from wearing optional combat boots that aren't entirely made and sourced in the United States. This would both help protect our soldiers and improve domestic manufacturing.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 8167.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill would authorize grant funding for research in the orthotic and prosthetic (O&P) medical field and would establish a centralized collection of O&P outcomes-based research.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 8168.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (relating to the power of Congress to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.)

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill would authorize grant funding for institutions of higher education to expand or add master's degree programs in the orthotic and prosthetic (O&P) medical field and would establish a second VA Training Center of Excellence for O&P medical care.

By Ms. DEAN of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 8169.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8
The single subject of this legislation is:
Environmental Conservation

By Mr. EDWARDS:

H.R. 8170.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

"Regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes."

The single subject of this legislation is:

Establishes an exemption application for states to apply for a waiver of the route's mileage limitation if the final alignment, as determined through the NEPA documenta-

tion process, exceeds the current Appalachian Development Highway System mileage limitation.

By Mr. GARCÍA of Illinois:

H.R. 8171.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Constitution Article I, Section VIII

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Lead-Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act to provide for additional procedures for families with children under the age of 6, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GOLDEN of Maine:

H.R. 8172.

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, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to require certain online platforms which display political advertisements to display with the advertisement a notice identifying the sponsor of the advertisement and to ensure that the notice will continue to be presented in the advertisement if a viewer of the advertisement shares the advertisement with others on that platform.

By Mr. GOLDEN of Maine:

H.R. 8173.

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, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit former Members of Congress from engaging in lobbying contacts.

By Mr. GOLDEN of Maine:

H.R. 8174.

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, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Foreign Agents Registration Act of 1938 to prohibit certain individuals from service as an agent of a foreign principal.

By Mr. GOLDEN of Maine:

H.R. 8175.

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, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to prohibit 501(c)(4) entities from using more than 10 percent of total expenditures on certain political expenditures.

By Mr. GOLDEN of Maine:

H.R. 8176.

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, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To provide for disclosures of certain foreign contributions, and for other purposes.

By Mr. GOLDEN of Maine:

H.R. 8177.

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, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To require senior Government officials and their family members to divest foreign financial interests.

By Mr. GOOD of Virginia:

H.R. 8178.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

The single subject of this legislation is:
Striking the registered requirement for apprenticeship programs

By Mr. KUSTOFF:

H.R. 8179.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Under Article I, Section 8, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Congress shall have power to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing powers and all Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department of Officer thereof.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This legislation requires the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out research and development with respect to winter oilseed crops.

By Ms. MACE:

H.R. 8180.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:
To increase accountability for the non-consensual disclosure of intimate images.

By Ms. PEREZ:

H.R. 8181.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 of the US Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:
Commerce

By Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia:

H.R. 8182.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article IV, Section 3, clause 2.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To establish the Ocmulgee Mounds National Park and Preserve in the State of Georgia, and for other purposes.

By Ms. SPANBERGER:

H.R. 8183.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8 of the US Constitution

The single subject of this legislation is:
To direct the Attorney General to convene a national working group to study proactive strategies and needed resources for the identification and rescue of children from sexual exploitation and abuse, and for other purposes.

By Mrs. STEEL:

H.R. 8184.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The single subject of this legislation is:
Taxation

By Mr. STEIL:

H.R. 8185.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The single subject of this legislation is:

The bill modifies the minimum standard for foreign government action toward the elimination of human trafficking.

By Ms. STEVENS:

H.R. 8186.

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, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Housing

By Mr. TONKO:

H.R. 8187.

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, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

The single subject of this legislation is:

This bill supports increasing transparency in advanced energy supply chains.

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 8188.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in

The single subject of this legislation is:

Judiciary

By Mrs. TORRES of California:

H.R. 8189.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

According to Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: of the United States Constitution, seen below, this bill falls within the Constitutional Authority of the United States Congress.

Article 1: Section 8: Clause 18: To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in

The single subject of this legislation is:

Judiciary

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 8190.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

The single subject of this legislation is:

To review and consider terminating the designation of the State of Qatar as a major non-NATO ally, and for other purposes.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 8191.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: [The Congress shall have Power . . .] 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.

The single subject of this legislation is:

To prohibit discrimination based on an individual's texture or style of hair.

By Ms. WILSON of Florida:

H.R. 8192.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 15: 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.

The single subject of this legislation is:

Voting

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 33: Mr. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 35: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
 H.R. 79: Mr. MEUSER and Mr. MILLS.
 H.R. 355: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.
 H.R. 587: Mr. BUCSHON, Mr. PENCE, Mr. BOST, Ms. VAN DUYNE, Mr. NEWHOUSE, and Mr. SMUCKER.
 H.R. 620: Mr. KEAN of New Jersey.
 H.R. 648: Ms. CARAVEO.
 H.R. 807: Ms. WATERS.
 H.R. 998: Ms. MACE.
 H.R. 1097: Mr. YAKYM.
 H.R. 1322: Mr. TURNER.
 H.R. 1323: Mr. D'ESPOSITO.
 H.R. 1425: Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, Mr. MEUSER, Mr. BACON, and Mr. BEAN of Florida.
 H.R. 1582: Ms. BALINT.
 H.R. 1619: Mr. MFUME.
 H.R. 1719: Mr. TURNER, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. KILMER, and Ms. SLOTKIN.
 H.R. 2377: Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 2499: Mr. ROSENDALE.
 H.R. 2663: Mr. AMO and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
 H.R. 2666: Ms. MALLIOTAKIS and Mrs. STEEL.
 H.R. 2700: Mr. BEAN of Florida.
 H.R. 2715: Mr. SPANBERGER.
 H.R. 2748: Mr. BUCSHON.
 H.R. 2785: Ms. CRAIG and Mr. FLOOD.
 H.R. 2809: Mr. NEWHOUSE.
 H.R. 2845: Mr. NORCROSS.
 H.R. 2851: Ms. SPANBERGER.
 H.R. 2966: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.
 H.R. 2998: Mr. DELUZIO.
 H.R. 3079: Mrs. KIGGANS of Virginia.
 H.R. 3139: Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana.
 H.R. 3413: Mr. PFLUGER, Mr. ALLEN, and Mr. THOMPSON of California.
 H.R. 3432: Mrs. DINGELL.
 H.R. 3611: Mr. SUOZZI.
 H.R. 3635: Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 3656: Ms. SALAZAR.
 H.R. 3773: Mr. STAUBER.
 H.R. 4121: Mr. JACKSON of North Carolina, Mr. MOSKOWITZ, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Ms. WEXTON, Mr. KEATING, Mr. JACKSON of Illinois, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. SLOTKIN, and Ms. ESHOO.
 H.R. 4412: Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 4757: Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 4763: Mr. MCHENRY.
 H.R. 4769: Mr. LYNCH and Mr. YAKYM.
 H.R. 4966: Mr. CARSON.
 H.R. 5003: Mr. NORCROSS.
 H.R. 5030: Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. TURNER, Ms. MALOY, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. HARDER of California.
 H.R. 5048: Mr. NICKEL.
 H.R. 5103: Mr. FRY and Mr. CARL.
 H.R. 5212: Mr. LYNCH.
 H.R. 5247: Ms. NORTON.
 H.R. 5250: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 5403: Mr. PENCE.
 H.R. 5477: Mr. BEYER and Mr. CONNOLLY.
 H.R. 5561: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.
 H.R. 5728: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 5748: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI.
 H.R. 5806: Mr. CLINE.
 H.R. 5808: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 6001: Mr. NORCROSS.
 H.R. 6049: Mr. SOTO and Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.
 H.R. 6086: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
 H.R. 6090: Mr. STAUBER and Mr. MCCLINTOCK.
 H.R. 6201: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. HIMES.
 H.R. 6219: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 6224: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 6384: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 6414: Mr. GIMENEZ and Mr. SELF.
 H.R. 6451: Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas.
 H.R. 6516: Mr. SHERMAN.
 H.R. 6538: Mr. D'ESPOSITO.
 H.R. 6619: Mr. DONALDS and Ms. MACE.
 H.R. 6621: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 6720: Mr. NORCROSS.
 H.R. 7082: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GALLEGOS, and Mr. MOULTON.
 H.R. 7148: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania.
 H.R. 7218: Ms. WILSON of Florida.
 H.R. 7297: Ms. ROSS and Mr. BURCHETT.
 H.R. 7379: Mr. SCHWEIKERT.
 H.R. 7390: Ms. TLAIB.
 H.R. 7438: Mr. LUETKEMEYER and Mr. NADER.
 H.R. 7478: Mr. MEUSER.
 H.R. 7618: Mr. NEGUSE and Mr. TRONE.
 H.R. 7629: Mr. MAST, Mr. MFUME, Ms. LOFGREN, and Mr. TORRES of New York.
 H.R. 7688: Ms. BALINT.
 H.R. 7764: Mr. NORCROSS.
 H.R. 7779: Mr. ZINKE.
 H.R. 7808: Mr. CARTER of Georgia and Mr. HARDER of California.
 H.R. 7959: Mr. MCCORMICK and Mr. WILLIAMS of Texas.
 H.R. 7971: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
 H.R. 7996: Mr. DAVIS of North Carolina.
 H.R. 8051: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.
 H.R. 8068: Mr. YAKYM.
 H.R. 8075: Mr. POSEY.
 H.R. 8114: Mr. BILIRAKIS and Mr. DUNN of Florida.
 H.R. 8120: Mr. LAWLER.
 H.R. 8135: Ms. MOORE of Wisconsin.
 H.J. Res. 117: Mr. GOOD of Virginia.
 H.J. Res. 128: Mr. BISHOP of North Carolina.
 H.J. Res. 1037: Mr. STEIL.
 H. Res. 1170: Mr. BOST, Mr. WEBSTER of Florida, Mr. MIKE GARCIA of California, Mr. BANKS, Mr. GIMENEZ, and Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana.